A META-ANALYSIS ON THE IMPACT OF TEACHER FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Bahtiyar Merve TULGAR
201113112

MASTER'S THESIS

Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Education Master's Program with Thesis
Advisor: Prof. Dr. Aysu ERDEN

İstanbul
T.C. Maltepe Üniversitesi
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü
September, 2023

A META-ANALYSIS ON THE IMPACT OF TEACHER FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Bahtiyar Merve TULGAR
201113112
ORCID: 0009-0006-6680-7124

MASTER'S THESIS

Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Education Master's Program with Thesis
Advisor: Prof. Dr. Aysu ERDEN

İstanbul
T.C. Maltepe Üniversitesi
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü
September, 2023



JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

Bu belge, Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından 19.01.2021 tarihli "Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge" ile bildirilen 6698 Sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu kapsamında gizlenmiştir.

ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYUM BEYANI

Bu belge, Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından 19.01.2021 tarihli "Lisansüstü Tezlerin Elektronik Ortamda Toplanması, Düzenlenmesi ve Erişime Açılmasına İlişkin Yönerge" ile bildirilen 6698 Sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu kapsamında gizlenmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to extend my profound appreciation to my advisor Prof. Dr. Aysu ERDEN for her consistent support, instant feedback, and extensive understanding of my master's work and associated research. I would also thank Prof. Dr. Gürkan DOĞAN for his inspiration, invaluable guidance and support. I also owe my deepest gratitude to Lecturer Özlem PERVAN for her instant and formative feedback and generous support.

I am deeply grateful to my beloved husband, Dr. Okyanus TULGAR for being with me at every step of this process as always. He is the one who supported me continuously, believed in me forever, motivated me psychologically and morally and paved all the ways to make everything seem better to me.

Most importantly, I feel incredibly fortunate to have all my family members, especially my dearest mother and grandmother for their undeniable efforts in this journey, for devoting their time taking care of my two children, and for the continuous supportive words that kept me going during this process. They made everything easier and surmountable for me. Without them, it would not have been possible to conduct this study at all.

Lastly, I cannot express my gratitude and love for my precious son, Tuna and for my lovely little daughter, Nehir whom I believe brought me luck by their presence. They have always given me the strength needed to finish my thesis successfully.

Bahtiyar Merve TULGAR

September, 2023

ÖZET

ÖĞRETMEN GERİ BİLDİRİMİNİN ÖĞRENCİ YAZMA PERFORMANSI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ ÜZERİNE BİR META-ANALİZ ÇALIŞMASI

Bahtiyar Merve Tulgar
Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı
Danışman: Prof. Dr. Aysu Erden
Maltepe Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, 2023

Öğrencilerin yabancı dilde yazmaları üzerine öğretmen yazılı bildiriminin gerekliliği; öğrencilerin yazma yeterlililiğini geliştirmek için her zaman ilgi çekici bir konu olmuştur. Öğretmen geri bildiriminin olumlu katkıları olması beklense de alanyazında öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazma becerileri üzerindeki etkililiğini sorgulayan tarışmalar vardır. Bu çalışmanın amacı; kapsamlı bir alanyazın taraması ve ilgili çalışmaları toplama yöntemi olan meta-analiz kullanılarak öğretmen geri bildirimi ve bunun öğrencilerin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisi konusundaki çalışmaları derleyip incelemektir. Bu amaçla, son 15 yılda 24 ilgili makale ve yüksek lisans tezi incelenmiştir. Bu çalışma; söz konusu yayınları her birinin bulgularıyla derleyerek okuyucuların ilgili çalışmaları bir arada görmesini sağlayıp öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkisine ışık tutmaktadır. Bulgular, 24 araştırmadan 21'inin öğretmen geri bildirimini olumlu bulduğunu, 3'ünün ise tarafsız kaldığını ortaya koymuştur. Çalışmaların hiçbiri olumsuz sonuç vermemiştir. Bu sonuçlar; öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazmaları üzerinde %87,5 oranında olumlu bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Üstelik bu olumlu sonuçların %61,9'unda öğretmen geri bildiriminin oldukça etkili olduğu görüldü. Bu bulgular; öğretmen yazılı geri bildiriminin önemini göstermektedir ve bu konuda farkındalığı artırmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: yabancı dilde yazma, meta-analiz, üretken beceriler, öğretmen geri bildirimi, öğretmen yazılı (düzeltici) geri bildirimi, yazma, yazma performansı.

ABSTRACT

A META-ANALYSIS ON THE IMPACT OF TEACHER FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Bahtiyar Merve Tulgar
Master Thesis
Department of Foreign Language Education
English Language Education Master's Program with Thesis
Advisor: Prof. Dr. Aysu Erden
Maltepe University Graduate School, 2023

The necessity of teacher written feedback on student writing in EFL have always been a heated and challenging topic of improving student writing proficiency. Even though it is expected that teacher feedback has positive contributions, in literature there is a debate questioning the efficacy of teacher feedback on students' writing. The aim of this study is to investigate the studies on the topic of teacher written feedback and its impact on learners' writing performance by using meta-analysis, a method of collecting related studies by doing an extensive literature search. With this aim, 24 related articles and master's theses over the past 15 years were examined attentively. This study compiles these aforementioned publications with the findings of each and in this way enables the readers to be able to see the related studies all together shedding the light on the effect of teacher feedback. The findings revealed that 21 out of 24 studies found teacher feedback positive, while 3 remained neutral. None of the studies result in negative outcome. These results show that teacher feedback had a positive effect of 87.5% on students' writing. Moreover, 61.9% of these positive results were found to be quite effective. These findings raise awareness on the importance of teacher written feedback.

Keywords: L2 writing, meta-analysis, productive skills, teacher feedback, written (corrective) teacher feedback, writing, writing performance.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

ÖĞRETMEN GERİ BİLDİRİMİNİN ÖĞRENCİ YAZMA PERFORMANSI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ ÜZERİNE BİR META-ANALİZ ÇALIŞMASI

Geri bildirim, en genel tanımıyla, bir kişinin performansına ilişkin bir otorite tarafından verilen bilgi olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu otorite ister ebeveyn ister öğretmen olsun, burada önemli olan nokta, doğru geri besleme yapmanın mühim özelliklerinin farkında olarak öğrenci yazma performansını doğru bir şekilde değerlendirmek ve gözden geçirmektir. Geri bildirimin iki amacı vardır: bir sistemin ne kadar iyi performans gösterdiğine dair veri toplamak için kullanılabilir ve ayrıca bir sorunu keşfetmek ve onu düzeltmek için de kullanılabilir. Bütün bunları eğitim açısından ele alacak olursak, öğretmen geri bildirimi; öğrencilere geri bildirim vermenin en yaygın ve tercih edilen yöntemi olarak bilinir. Öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkili olabilmesi için belirli özellikleri taşıması gerekir. Öğrencilere verilen geri bildirimler açık ve yapıcı olmalıdır. Hiç kuşkusuz öğretmen geri bildirimleri öğrenciye iletirken üzerinde düşünmeli ve etkili olması için çaba göstermelidir. Basit ve gelişigüzel bir geri bildirim öğrencinin kendisini yetersiz hissetmesini sağlamaktan öteye gitmez.

Öğretmenler tarafından öğrencilerin seviyelerine, ihtiyaçlarına ve beklentilerine göre çeşitli geri bildirim türleri uygulanabilir. Öğretmenlerin kullanacağı türün belirlenmesi; öğrettiği beceriye, öğrenci düzeyine, yaşına, mevcut bilgi birikimine gibi değişkenlere göre değişmektedir. Ayrıca, hedefler ve görevler geri bildirimin kalitesini ve etkililiğini etkileyen diğer unsurlardır. Hedefler öğrencilerin zihninde net bir şekilde belirlendiğinde, genel fikir dizisini yeniden oluşturmak amacıyla onlara ulaşmak kolaydır.

Bu noktada 4 tür geri bildirimden bahsedebiliriz: sözel geri bildirim, dolaylı geri bildirim, dolaysız geri bildirim ve yazılı geri bildirim. Bu araştırmada öğretmenlerin öğrencilerine ilettikleri yazılı geri bildirimi ele alan çalışmalar kullanılmıştır. Bunun yanısıra, öğrenciye geri bildirim iletmenin temel olarak 3 muhatabı vardır: öğretmen geri bildirimi, akran geri bildirimi ve kendi kendine değerlendirilen geri bildirim. Tür olarak yazılı geri bildirim, kaynak olarak da öğretmen geri bildirimini kullanan bu araştırma, öğretmen yazılı geri bildiriminin önemini ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. Öğrencilerin

yabancı dilde yazmaları üzerine öğretmen yazılı bildiriminin gerekliliği, öğrencilerin yazma yeterlililiğini geliştirmek için her zaman ilgi çekici bir konu olmuştur.

Yazma, öğrencilerin İngilizce seviyeleri için oldukça geliştirici ama aynı zamanda zorlayıcı sayılabilecek üretken bir beceridir. Başka bir dilde yazı yazmak için bazı temel becerilere ve önemli miktarda bilgi birikimine sahip olmak gerekir. Bu beceriler yazmak için gerekli ögeleri üretmenin temelini oluşturur. Başarıyla tamamlanan diğer temel becerilerin yardımıyla kademeli olarak inşa edilir. Yazma, üretmeyi gerektiren bir beceri olduğu için akademik yıl boyunca da yazma derslerine oldukça yer verilmelidir. Bilindiği gibi öğrencilerin yabancı dilde yazma konusunda elde ettikleri başarının büyük bir kısmı o dili kullanma becerilerini etkili ve yeterli bir şekilde üretmesinden kaynaklanmaktadır. Ancak, sadece öğrencilerin çabası yeterli değildir. Bu aşamada, öğretmenlerin düzeltmeleri ve değerli geri bildirimleri yazma sürecinde büyük rol oynar.

Bu araştırmanın temel amacı, kapsamlı bir alanyazın taraması ve ilgili çalışmaları toplama yöntemi olan meta-analiz kullanılarak öğretmen geri bildirimi ve bunun öğrencilerin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisi konusundaki çalışmaları incelemektir. Bu anlamda bu çalışma, söz konusu yayınları, her birinin bulgularıyla inceleyerek okuyucuların ilgili çalışmaları bir arada görmesini sağlayıp öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkisine ışık tutmaktadır.

Bu meta-analizde, araştırmayı gerçekleştirmemize ve araştırma hedeflerimize cevap vermek için gerekli veriyi toplamamıza yardımcı olması için 16 makale ve 8 yüksek lisans tezi incelenmiştir. Araştırmaya dahil edilen çalışmalar, güncel olması açısından son 15 yılda yapılmış çalışmalardır. Bu 24 çalışma, dahil etme ve hariç tutma kriterleri dikkate alınarak ilgili 48 çalışma arasından titizlikle seçilmiştir. Her bir çalışma, içerisinde ayrı ayrı başlıklar halinde giriş, tez cümlesi, hipotezler (varsa), araştırma soruları, alanyazın taraması, metodoloji, katılımcılar, veri toplama, veri analizi, bulgular ve sonuçlar bölümlerini içerir. Bu anlamda bu çalışmanın, söz konusu yayınları her birinin bulgularıyla derleyerek okuyucuların ilgili çalışmaları bir arada görmesini sağlaması açısından önemli bir yeri vardır; öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkisinin değerlendirilmesine ışık tutmaktadır.

Bu çalışma, öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisini anlamak için bir araştırma stratejisi olarak meta-analizi benimsemiştir. Meta-analiz yöntemi, belirli bir konuda değişken sayıda araştırmadan elde edilen verilerin istatistiksel olarak toplanmasıdır. Analize dahil edilen çalışmaların etki büyüklükleri belirlenerek alanyazında ihtiyaç duyulan bir bulgu ortaya konur. Bu meta-analiz çalışması yapılırken kullanılan anahtar sözcükler "geri bildirim, öğretmen geri bildirimi, yazma, yazma becerisi, yazma performansı" olmuştur. Aramalar yapılırken "etki" ve "dil öğrenimi" ifadeleri de aramaları bağlama oturtmak ve daha alakalı belgeler bulmak için kullanılmıştır. Bulunan araştırmaların çoğu, bu araştırmanın amacı olan öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazma becerilerini nasıl etkilediğini gösteremediği için göz ardı edildi. Belirlenen süre olan son 15 yıldan önce yapılan çalışmalar, yazılı geri bildirim yerine sözlü geri bildirime odaklanan çalışmalar, araştırmanın amacı dışında belirli araçlara odaklanan çalışmalar, çevrimiçi geri bildirim biçimine odaklanan çalışmalar, sadece öğrencilerin konuyla ilgili algılarını içeren çalışmalar, geri bildirimin diğer dillerdeki etkisini araştıran çalışmalar ve açık erişime sahip olmayan çalışmalar araştırmaya dahil edilmedi. Araştırma, son 15 yılda yapılmış, diğer formlardan ziyade öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisini araştıran kapsamlı bir çalışmadır.

Veri toplama, meta-analizin en önemli basamağıdır. Bir meta-analiz çalışması yapmak; ilgili çalışmaların incelenmesini içerir. Bu da, etkili bir alanyazın taraması yaparak elde edilir. İlk adım yeterli bir birincil çalışma tümelleri oluşturmaktı. Bu nedenle, araştırmacı tanınmış çevrimiçi veritabanlarına -Google Scholar, Eğitim Bilgi Kaynak Merkezi (*Educational Information Resource Center,* ERIC), ProQuest, Journal Storage (JSTOR), Research Gate, Maltepe Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, Ulusal Tez Merkezi- başvurdu. Veri analizi, öğretmen geri bildiriminin yazma gelişimi üzeirndeki etkileirni belirleme kriterlerinin, tümü 2008-2023 yılları arasında yürütülen 24 araştırma makalesiyle karşılandığı belirlendi. Bu çalışmada yer alan 24 analizin her birinin sonuçları meta-analiz kullanılarak belirlendi. İşlenen yanıtlar, olumlu, nötr ve olumsuz arasında değişmiştir. Ayrıca, olumlu yanıtların etkililik düzeyi "biraz etkili", "etkili" ve "önemli ölçüde etkili" olarak derecelendirilmiştir. Bu spesifik çalışmalardan elde edilen ve incelenen veriler, yüzde cinsinden sonuçlarla açıklanmıştır. 24 çalışmanın 16'sı (66.7%) yayınlanmış dergi makalesi, 8'i (33.3%) yayınlanmış yüksek lisans tezidir.

Makalelerden 9’u yalnızca öğretmen geri bildirimi etkisine odaklanırken, 7'si öğretmen geri bildirimi araştırmasını akran geri bildirimi ile birleştirerek bu şekilde analiz eder. Benzer şekilde, tezlerin 4'ünün odak noktası sadece öğretmen geri bildirimi iken, diğer 4'ünün odak noktası öğretmen ve akran geri bildiriminin birleşimidir.

İlk değişkene (öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkisi) ilişkin olarak, 24 makalenin bulguları incelendiğinde, öğrencilerin yazma başarısı üzerinde öğretmen geri bildiriminin olumlu etkisinin hakim olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. 21 (%87,5) çalışmanın yanıtının olumlu olduğu belirlenirken, yalnızca 3 (%12,5) çalışmanın işlenmiş yanıtı nötrdür. Çalışmaların hiçbiri öğretmen geri bildirimi için olumsuz sonuç vermemiştir. Öğretmen geri bildiriminin etkililiğine (ikinci değişkene) ilişkin verilerin sıklığı değerlendirildiğinde, “Oldukça etkili” yanıtlar toplamın %61,9'unu oluştururken, “önemli ölçüde etkili” yanıtların yüzdesi %33,3'ü ve son olarak “biraz etkili” yanıtların oranı yalnızca %4,8'dir.

Bu sonuçlar, öğretmen geri bildiriminin öğrencilerin yazmaları üzerinde %87,5 oranında olumlu bir etkiye sahip olduğunu göstermektedir. Üstelik bu olumlu sonuçların %61,9'unda öğretmen geri bildiriminin oldukça etkili olduğu görüldü.

Genel çerçevede, incelenen makalelerin ve tezlerin çoğu, öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinden geri bildirim alma konusunda olumlu bir algıya sahip olduklarını göstermektedir. Araştırmalara katılanların önemli bir kısmı öğretmen geri bildirimini önemli ölçüde etkili bulmuştur ve bu da yazma sürecine dahil etmenin önemini vurgulamaktadır. Hem öğretmen hem de akran geri bildirimini içeren çalışmalarda, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler her iki geri bildirim biçimini de kabul etmişlerdir ve çalışmalarında iki türden de faydalanmışlardır. Ancak öğretmen geri bildirimine karşı daha olumlu bir tutum sergilemiş, bunun daha doğru ve yapıcı olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Bu bulgular; öğretmen yazılı geri bildiriminin önemini göstermektedir ve bu konuda yabancı dilde yazma öğretmenlerinin ve öğrencilerinin farkındalığını artırmaktadır.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI ii

ETİK İLKE VE KURALLARA UYUM BEYANI iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

ÖZET v

ABSTRACT vi

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET vii

TABLE OF CONTENTS xi

LIST OF TABLES xiv

ABBREVIATIONS xv

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Statement of the Problem 1

1.2 Aim of the Study 2

1.3 Significance of the Study 3

1.4 Limitations 3

1.5 Keywords and Identification 4

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 5

2.1 Writing as a Productive Skill 5

2.1.1 The Flower and Hayes writing process model 7

2.1.2 Knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming writing models 8
2.2 Feedback in Writing 9
2.3 Types of Feedback 10
2.3.1 Oral feedback 10
2.3.2 Direct and indirect feedback 11
2.3.3 Written feedback 12
2.4 Sources of Feedback 12
2.4.1 Peer feedback 13
2.4.2 Self-assessed feedback 14
2.4.3 Teacher feedback 14
2.4.3.1 The features of teacher feedback 15
2.4.3.2 The effectiveness of teacher feedback 16
2.4.3.3 Teacher written feedback 17
2.5 Students' Attitudes Towards Teacher Feedback 18
3 METHODOLOGY 20
3.1 Research Questions 20
3.2 Meta-Analysis as a Research Area 20
3.3 Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria 21
3.4 The Data Collection Tools 22
3.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation 23
4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION 24

4.1 Review of The Studies Included in Meta-Analysis 24

4.1.1 Review of the articles in journals 24

4.1.2 Review of the master's theses 70

4.2 Research Findings 96

4.3 Discussion for Research Questions 103

4.3.1 Research question 1 103

4.3.2 Research question 2 103

4.4 Discussion 104

5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS 106

REFERENCES 110

CURRICULUM VITAE 117

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Overview of the Analysed Articles 96

Table 2. Overview of the Analysed Theses 98

Table 3. Effects and Effectiveness of Teachers' Feedback Obtained from Articles.... 100

Table 4. Effects and Effectiveness of Teachers' Feedback Obtained from Theses 101

Table 5. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effect Obtained from Articles 102

Table 6. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effect Obtained from Theses 102

Table 7. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effectiveness Obtained from Articles .. 102

Table 8. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effectiveness Obtained from Theses 103

ABBREVIATIONS

ANCOVA : Analysis of Covariance

CF : Corrective Feedback

EFL : English as a Foreign Language

ELL : English Language Learners

ELT : English Language Teaching

ERIC : Educational Information Resource Center

ESL : English as a Second Language

ICLE : International Corpus of Learner English

IELTS : International English Language Testing System

IQ : Intelligence Quotient

JSTOR : Journal Storage

KTU : Karadeniz Technical University

LMD : License-Master-Doctorate

L1 : Native Language

L2 : Second Language

MANOVA : Multivariate Analysis of Variance

QR : Quick-Response

SD : Standard Deviation

SPSS : Statistical Package for Social Science

SRIs : Stimulated Recall Interviews

TOEFL : Test of English as a Foreign Language

TWE : Test of Written English

VIPs : Video Inclusive Writing Portfolios

WCF : Written Corrective Feedback

YÖK : Yükseköğretim Kurulu, (*Council of Higher Education*)

ZPD : Zone of Proximal Development

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Writing is often regarded as one of the most highly valued and indispensable productive skills which requires a considerable amount of background knowledge. Since it is a competence requiring production, writing lessons should be included a lot more during the academic year. According to Negari (2011), the act of writing is a multifaceted endeavour that encompasses several cognitive and metacognitive processes, such as brainstorming, planning, outlining, organizing, drafting, and rewriting. To have better papers, to improve the preceding one, a good constructive feedback is needed, either from a teacher, or from a peer or else on one's own. In a report of studies on how feedback affects revision, Beason (1993) claims that "*feedback and revision are valuable pedagogical tools (...) the research typically indicates that high school and college students improve their drafts upon receiving feedback*" (as cited in Ferris, 1997, p. 396).

One of the most common and widespread approaches to delivering feedback to students is to do it through their respective teachers. Giving feedback as teachers has always been a favoured way and teachers are accustomed to evaluating students' writing performances. Teachers have long been regarded as the most responsible and trustworthy source of providing the necessary corrective feedback on the issue of writing in classes. Making the right comments with detailed explanations and with elaborative explanations enclosed, they have been regarded as the guide that can identify the mistakes and correct them better than any other sources. Teacher-written feedback in this sense is the crucial part of the writing process for teachers as well as students. The imperative and distinct methodologies of instructor-provided written feedback on students' English writing have historically been a contentious and difficult issue with the enhancement of student writing abilities. According to Wen (2013), "*the effects of written feedback from teachers have been extensively investigated in the fields of writing in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL).*" (p.427). Therefore, among different kinds of feedback, teachers' written feedback is considered to be of utmost importance.

"*Not only does it facilitate students' revisions, but it also assists them during the step to step learning-to-write process*" (Harmer, 2004; Peterson, 2010, as cited in Agbayahoun,2016). Teachers also show great effort in the process of giving written feedback. Muicheartaigh (2000) stated that in this process, the teacher plays three very different roles: reader, writing instructor, and language specialist.

> A reader reacts to the content and ideas presented in the written work, showing interest by telling the student writers what the teacher likes or what cannot be understood. A writing teacher on the other hand, read a piece of writing with an aim to help the students grapple with skills in writing as a whole; understanding writing genre, working on text organization and dealing with coherence. Or, most of the time, the teacher plays the hat of a language expert or a resource person who helps learners with lexis, grammar and spelling – identifying and correcting them. (Chitravellu et al.,1995, as cited in Ismail, 2008, p. 46)

All in all, assessing the writing performance of the papers of EFL learners carries a crucial role in their academic development and this study is going to raise awareness on the importance of written feedback.

This study research into the studies and find out how teachers' feedback affect students' writing abilities with the data gathered. In order to manage the research, the researcher examined the compile of current studies on the topic which are 16 articles and 8 Master's Theses published between 2008 and 2023. The past 15 years have been characterized deliberately by the inclusion of exams that incorporate integrated language skills, a change that was implemented after the year 2008. Furthermore, the importance of writing has been amplified due to the proliferation of social media platforms as of that year. To gather and examine 24 studies concerning the aforementioned subject that were published within the specified time period, the research used the meta-analysis methodology.

1.2 Aim of the Study

The objective of this study is to investigate the last fifteen years' studies on the topic of teacher feedback and its impact on English writing performance. The studies were selected as of the year 2008. Since 2008, the previous 15 years, the introduction of tests

that include integrated language skills. In addition, since that time, the prevalence of social media platforms has dramatically increased the significance of writing. There are a good deal of studies related to the impact of teacher feedback in literature. Besides, after gathering the data about the topic, the efficacy level of the impact of teacher feedback is aimed to be measured. With this purpose, 24 academic articles and Master Theses that covered the subjects indicated above were evaluated for the study utilizing the meta-analysis method.

1.3 Significance of the Study

Teachers are regarded as the most responsible and trustworthy source to provide constructive feedback on students' classroom writing. So as to improve their writing performance, students need their guidance in a broad sense. In general, teachers try to do their best to be useful to their students in writing since their feedback is regarded to be worthwhile in constructing writing elements and a piece of writing in the end. Herein, the significance of teacher feedback is undeniable. Yet, there are more to learn about its effect on writing. Even though it is believed that teacher feedback will benefit students, there is controversy in literature regarding the effectiveness level of teacher feedback on students' writing. Essentially, there are plenty of studies on teacher feedback, yet there is not a meta-analysis studied about its impact on writing. The significance of this research is focusing on one angle of teacher feedback and keeping it current with the last years' studies. This research is going to look over the data about the efficacy of the teacher feedback based on the current studies which have qualitative and quantitative results. In this sense, the awareness about results on the effect of the teacher feedback will be helpful for all writing teachers and for further studies.

1.4 Limitations

The value of a meta-analysis study's findings increases with the number of research included in the analysis. Given the aforementioned context, the present study was conducted with the aim of investigating the influence of teacher feedback on the writing performance of students. While there are many studies that emphasize on teacher feedback in general, there aren't many works that focus solely on how teacher feedback affects students' writing abilities. Therefore, only the studies that emphasized

how feedback from teachers affected students' writing performance were chosen to be incorporated into this meta-analysis. Therefore, the researcher could use 24 studies in total appropriate for the research.

1.5 Keywords and Identification

Feedback: It is one of the nine events of teaching is feedback since it gives the learner information about performances and initiates the process of reinforcement. (Gagné et al., 1974).

Productive skills: The conveyance of information that a language user creates either orally or in written form is referred to as these language skills, which are also known as active skills. (Golkova & Hubackova, 2014).

Teacher feedback: The guidance and expertise offered by an instructor on the written progression of students to enhance their writing skills. (Wahyuni, 2017).

Teacher written (corrective) feedback: It is a sort of feedback that tries to enlighten students about the opinions of readers and assist them in revising their papers by highlighting any problems and adding comments to the text. (Şahan, 2012).

Writing: Writing is a sophisticated socio-cognitive skill requiring deliberate practice throughout formal education or training. (Dujsik, 2008)

Writing Performance: The evidence of how well students are progressing in written assignments in accordance with particular language proficiency components of a level (Dujsik, 2008).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The extant literature on writing and the place of feedback in writing are presented in this chapter. Beginning with writing in a broad sense and the parts in the chapters narrows down giving specific details about the place of feedback in writing. The chapter continues with the feedback types and the sources, combining one term from each section those of. At the end, it especially combines one term from each of these two sections as a new title "Teacher Written Feedback" that of which the study is going to handle basically. Finally, students' attitudes and perceptions are mentioned so that it gives an idea for the teachers in English Language Teaching (ELT).

2.1 Writing as a Productive Skill

Writing is a formative but also demanding productive skill serving as a valuable indicator for students' English levels. To achieve an adequate level of writing in another language, one has to have some certain basic skills which are needed for an accurate writing. These skills construct the base for producing the required elements for writing. It is built gradually with the help of successfully accomplished other basic skills. When all these are combined, they form a writing competence. Writing competence, then, is a writing ability that students possess and that reflects their knowledge as well as the thoughts, actions, and feelings they communicate in their writing (Ratminingsih, Marhaeni & Vigayanti, 2008, p. 279). Being one of the productive skills needed for an EFL student, writing constitutes the prduction phase along with speaking. However, receptive and productive skills are not entirely separate from one another; they complement each other. Receptive skills, namely reading and listening form the infrastructure for writing. Students' readiness in receptive skills has a huge effect on their writing competence.

The foundation of several kinds of productive skills and an essential component of language proficiency are passive skills (Golkova& Hubackova, 2014, p. 480). Besides these skills, grammar also plays the crucial part of it, so does the lexicon knowledge. It is literally a whole with all. Golkova & Hubackova (2014) stated the following:

> When one starts learning a foreign language, he surely and subconsciously is exposed to both categories of language skill. As mentioned before, productive skills - also called active skills - mean the transmission of information that a language user produces in either spoken or written form. Productive skills would not exist without the support of receptive ones. Passive knowledge - such as listening and reading - symbolises a springboard to active implementation of grammar structures, passive vocabulary lists, heard and repeated sounds of a foreign language. This theoretical background applies to any studied language. This should also prove that both types of skills are inseparable and one cannot exist without the other. When learning a foreign language, receptive skills usually come first and should be followed by practical application of productive ones. If a learning process lacks one of them, the final outcome will not be complete. (p. 478)

The importance of writing has been better understood in recent years. Both teachers and students have valued this skill more in recent years as it has become more evident how much writing contributes to them. Şahan (2012) argues that writing was used to execute grammatical structures and characteristics before the 1970s. It was considered as homework, but with the growing need for written communication, language teachers and researchers have been working to improve students' writing skills. Writing also requires attainment, saturation, and production in the end. Therefore, it is not a simple process. According to Cushing Weigle (2011), writing ability is a linguistic, cognitive, social, and cultural phenomenon.

As in other skills, writing contains some models to reach the needs and expectations of the students as well as teachers. These models can guide writing teachers in terms of presenting better understanding of the concept of writing and the ways to passing it in to the students in a right way. Regarding the core concept of constructing a good writing structure in the minds of students and subsequently observing the benefits in their writing assignments, two fundamental models can be introduced.

2.1.1 The Flower and Hayes writing process model

Hayes and Flower (1980) introduces a writing model including three basic factors: the task environment, the writer's long-term memory and various cognitive processes (as cited in Nagode, 2014, p. 90). This model's key novel finding is that "*writing is a recursive and not a linear process*" (Weigle, 2011), which means that the writer switches back and forth between various stages. The teacher's choice of pedagogic approach to teaching writing is significantly influenced by his or her concept of what writing is. Directly influenced, students are prone to reflect their understanding of writing and the production of it. Experienced students devote more effort to preparing, reviewing, and organizing the text while also correcting the substance and keeping the reader in mind (Weigle, 2011). To make all students interested and into writing is mostly the instructors' responsibility and ability as well. As students' cognitive levels are different, it is not that simple yet it is possible to surmount it to a significant degree with the adequate amount of effort and perseverance. Goals, predispositions, beliefs, and attitudes, along with cost-benefit calculations made by the writer, are also included in the Hayes and Flower model's (1996) addition of the motivational component.

On the issue of writing lessons in classes, it is a process which holds some steps in it. The writing processes consist of plan, translation, and evaluation stages, all of which are controlled by a monitor that "*functions as writing strategist which determines when the writer moves from one process to the next*" (Flower & Hayes, 1980, p. 374).

Dujsik (2008) expresses:

> Planning comprises three sub-processes, namely, generating ideas, organizing information, and setting goals. While writing, writers take ideas from planning, information from the task environment and from long-term memory, and convert them into written forms corresponding to information in the writer's memory (translate), and read/edit (review) to improve the quality of the text. Though consisting of hierarchical sub-processes, writing is a non-linear and dynamic process where "*writers constantly shift among pre-writing, writing, and revising tasks*" (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996, p. 19) during which they engage in the discovery and expression of meaning, but are not preoccupied with form (Silva, 1990).

> Accordingly, the writing process practiced in writing classrooms typically involves planning, drafting, revision, and editing. (p. 15)

2.1.2 Knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming writing models

Knowledge is the result of deliberate acts of creation and is created by constructing a structure of ideas (such as a design, a theory, or the answer to a challenging issue) out of simpler concepts (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 2014, p. 35). According to Bereiter and Scardamalia's two distinct processing writing models released in 1987, knowledge tellers (also known as immature, inexperienced, or unskilled writers in the study) and information transformers (mature, experienced, or competent writers) are two distinct sorts of writers (as cited in Dujsik, 2008, p. 16). On the contrary, Newell (1980) acclaims that knowledge creation and knowledge building is regarded to occur in problem spaces, which are conceptual spaces that comprise goal states, intermediate states, restrictions, and potential movements. For the problem spaces, knowledge building is supposed to be wider in terms of goal states as it inholds the building part itself whereas knowledge creation is related to one's intellectual level. Knowledge building is heavily related to the hard part. Bereiter & Scardamalia (2014) discusses that issue that a fundamental principle of knowledge building is idea improvement. The core concern of the knowledge-building educational strategy is concept improvement; students must work together to develop their ideas rather than delegating that responsibility to the instructor. Dujsik (2008) states the following:

> Investigating the relations between first language writing instruction and young learners' development of writing expertise, the researchers discovered that knowledge-tellers or immature writers compose text content by using topic and genre identifiers as cues to search for appropriate content and discourse knowledge in their memory and retrieve this relevant information for generating text. The retrieval process takes place automatically without the writers' plan for coherence. In contrast to knowledge tellers, knowledge-transformers, or mature writers, make use of more complex problem-solving skills while processing the content and discourse knowledge existing in the knowledge-telling process. Prior to developing texts, mature writers analyse the problem, plan, and set goals.

> These problem-solving skills or metacognitive strategies are generally lacking in immature writers. (p.7)

This sharp distinction emphasizes the importance of specializing in writing and background knowledge when transferring any information to the other party or to the paper, regardless of the addressee.

In a general framework, in order to enhance students' writing tasks, it is possible to achieve improvement by offering comments based on established models. The absence of feedback hinders the advancement of pupils' written work, rendering it stagnant and impeding their ability to make meaningful improvements. The subsequent section provides an overview of the attributes associated with feedback in the context of writing.

2.2 Feedback in Writing

Feedback in all forms can be defined as the information given by the authority concerning the performance of the learner. Whether the agent is a parent or a teacher, the crucial point here is evaluating and revising in a right way being aware of the critical features of giving the correct response. Solhi & Eğinli (2020) discuss that the concept of corrective feedback in writing pertains to the provision of constructive explanations on the suitability and precision of students' written work, with the objective of improving their writing proficiency and providing effective writing skills to them. Despite the variations in definition, feedback ultimately exists in service to the student, a necessary tool to bridge the gap between where they are and where they are actually meant to be. (Fazenbaker, 2018, as cited in Sadler, 2010). Bangert-Drowns et al. (1991) suggest that many theories of learning and instruction depend on the concept of feedback, therefore it seems sense that knowing the requirements for good feedback would aid in both theoretical development and instructional practice.

Feedback has two primary functions: it may be utilized as a means to gather data on how well a system is performing and additionally, it can be utilized to discover and fix problem signals. (Smith & Smith, 1968). As Kulhavy (1977) also mentions, if we apply the same logic to written teaching, we may conclude that feedback has one of two impacts on each response a student makes: (a) letting him know when he is accurate, and (b) correcting

him (or allowing him to correct himself) when he is incorrect. The premise is that when feedback is provided, this continual confirmation-correction process is responsible for test increments. Therefore, when it is regarded as a writing instrument, it is provided by correcting error messages. By analysing the instruments in a sentence level and a word level, the lexical and grammatical elements are detected and improved to a better version.

Ultimately, according to Wen (2013), no matter what strategies the teacher uses in written responses, it's important to remember that the goal of the feedback is to provide them the tools they need to evaluate their own performance and make adjustments as required.

2.3 Types of Feedback

It's possible to put a variety of feedback types into practice by teachers according to students' levels, needs and expectations. To draw advantage from the given feedback uttermost, receiving it in the correct type is essential for learners. Designating the type which teachers are going to use changes according to the skill they are teaching, the grade level of the students and the other variables. The sort of feedback the teacher will provide will depend on the teacher's preferences, the students' level, the types of writing assignments, and the stage of the writing process (Hyland, 2003). As a consequence of this, one may argue that it is essential to get the feedback in the right forms to get benefits from it.

2.3.1 Oral feedback

Though it is not preferred as written feedback or the other types of feedback, receiving oral feedback contributes to learners in a way. Weigle (2014) elaborates that there are three ways to provide Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) to students' work: written remarks, individual meetings, and audio recordings. When providing recorded oral feedback, the student receives the feedback through a platform as it is being shared with others. The input may be audibly or graphically recorded as the student reviews their creation (as cited in Solhi & Eğinli, 2020, p. 2). The benefits of capturing remarks to provide feedback are as stated:

> First, it is generally faster and easier for teachers to state their comments orally than in writing. Second, unlike written comments and individual conferencing,

> students can listen to the recorded comments several times and it can be an additional practice in listening comprehension. Third, the oral-aural channel and nonverbal information such as tone of voice and pitch can promote a positive interpretation of comments. (Weigle, 2014, as cited in Solhi& Eğinli, 2020, p. 2).

According to Brookhart (2008), oral feedback addresses all the same concerns as written feedback. She suggests that teacher-student conferences are a more formal and regulated kind of oral feedback than group oral feedback or whispering comments while a student's seat is passed by. She also makes some important arguments regarding student teachers. Considering all of these, oral feedback is regarded as an alternative form of transfering feedback to students, though in writing it is not mostly preferred.

2.3.2 Direct and indirect feedback

Teacher-written feedback is the crucial part of the writing process for teachers as well as students. Whether it is done directly or indirectly, teachers' back indication is substantial. Within this context, Bitchener et al. (2005) identifies that direct or explicit feedback happens when the teacher spots a mistake and provides the correct form. Indirect techniques apply to circumstances where the teacher acknowledges and error has been made but does not offer a correction, leaving the student to identify ad fix it. They add:

> Direct or explicit feedback occurs when the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form, while indirect strategies refer to situations when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but does not provide a correction, thereby leaving the student to diagnose and correct it. Additionally, studies examining the effect of indirect feedback strategies have tended to make a further distinction between those that do or do not use a code. Coded feedback points to the exact location of an error, and the type of error involved is indicated with a code (for example, ps means an error in the use or form of the past simple tense). Uncoded feedback refers to instances when the teacher underlines an error, circles an error, or places an error tally in the margin, but, in each case, leaves the student to diagnose and correct the error. (p. 193)

Direct feedback may be described as pointing out the mistakes and giving the student writer the appropriate format. When a teacher makes a suggestion that an error exists, they are delivering indirect feedback. Rather than providing the right form of the problem, they are letting the writer know that the error exists and leaving them the task of resolving it. (Ferris & Roberts, 2001, as cited in Şahan, 2012, p. 16).

2.3.3 Written feedback

Informing the students about the outcome of their assessments is a crucial part of learning. It needs to be effective as it is the bridge pier of the learning configuration. In order for a feedback to be effective, it should bare specific characteristics. Konold, Miller and Konold (2004) found that feedbacks were crucial in learning and written feedback from the teacher increased all students' performance. Specific, suitable, high quality feedback is required as well as input that is timely, accurate, constructive, outcome-oriented, encouraging, positive, intelligible, and focused on what is done well and what needs to be improved (Konold et al., 2004). As long as the written feedback has these characteristics, the benefit is inevitably apparent. It paves the way for learners to build their own settlement needed for writing. Keh (1990) defines written feedback as "*an input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision"* (p. 294). In other words, it is the comments, questions, and suggestions a reader gives a writer to produce reader-based prose as opposed to writer-based prose. About the written feedback, Şahan (2012) states: "*written feedback aims to inform students about the impressions of readers and help them revise their papers by marking the errors and writing comments on the paper*" (p. 18). Receiving these marked papers, students become aware of their errors, and this leads to a decrease in their unfruitful papers. Without a written guidance, all the effort the learner displays would be incomplete. On the other hand, with the support to be given, such as paying attention for the feedback to be effective, a lot can be added to learners.

2.4 Sources of Feedback

For learners, receiving feedback is quite helpful especially for their writing skills. It aids and shows the way whether they are headed in the correct direction, or not. In that sense, being the one who transmits the feedback to the learner makes a difference. There are

basically three interlocutors of conveying feedback. According to Wanchid: "*feedback can be counted under some titles based on the person conveying feedback, its focus and the way it is provided. Nevertheless, there are three main authorities of giving feedback which are the teacher, the writer and the peer*" (as cited in Altay, 2018, p. 38). In theory, this procedure can be carried out by the instructor, by a peer, or by the student themselves. Correspondingly, the speciality of the feedback changes more or less. Therefore, giving feedback matters as much as receiving it.

2.4.1 Peer feedback

The implementation of peer revision has garnered increasing attention as a valuable and effective means of providing feedback in the second language (L2) writing educational setting. (Villamil and Guerrero, 1998; Tsui and Ng, 2000, as cited in Ekşi, 2012, p. 34).

In her study, Paulus highlights the benefits of peer review, noting that the incorporation of audience awareness in the writing classroom cultivates an authentic feeling of readership. This practice facilitates the enhancement of students' analytical and critical-reading proficiencies. Moreover, it serves as a motivational factor for students to focus on their intended message by fostering deliberation on competing perspectives that have the potential to progress their ideas (as cited in Şahan, 2012, p. 15).

Students have diverse point of views about various topics. This is mostly valid in lessons. They have a wide window which may lead contributions to their peers. According to Lange (2011), while teacher assistance is vital for optimal learning, peer evaluation by students is necessary to fully adopt a social-constructivist approach on education (p. 12). Without the authority, learners take delight in receiving corrections from their peers with the same level and same status at times. Peer review gave pupils the chance to evaluate the quality and value of other students' work while also exposing them to a range of viewpoints and fostering the growth of a critical mind (Venables & Summit, 2003). Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) found that:

> Peer dialogue enhanced students‟ sense of self-control over their learning for five reasons. Firstly, students who have just recently learned the material are often able to explain the concept in a more accessible way to struggling students.

> Secondly, peer discussion promotes alternative perspectives to problems. Thirdly, when students comment on each other's work they develop a detachment to the work and can then assess their own work better. Fourthly, peer discussion can encourage students to be persistent. Lastly, it is sometimes easier for students to accept criticism from a peer. (p. 211)

2.4.2 Self-assessed feedback

Self-assessment is related to learner autonomy. Learners must have their autonomy to be able to assess themselves. They must possess an understanding of the specific knowledge they are required to acquire, the necessary steps to facilitate their learning process, the means through which they will access the relevant information, and the methods by which they will assess their own progress and achievements. In brief, it can be regarded as being their own teachers. The broad phrase "self-assessment" encompasses a variety of specific tasks that students might do, such as responding to drafts, correcting, and monitoring oneself (Flower et al., 1986; Hayes, 1996). Being independent of their teachers, students need to develop some basic skills to reach the level of assessing themselves. According to McMillan & Hearn, (2008), self-assessment involves two basic tasks: (1) monitoring and evaluating the standard of one's thinking and behavior during learning; and (2) identifying techniques that advance one's knowledge and abilities. Therefore, self-assessing requires being able to follow some requirements, react accordingly, evaluate properly without the guidance of an authority. The ability to become aware of accomplishments made at any given time and progressively over time will assist the learner improve learning, which is a primary purpose of self-assessment (Oscarson, 2009). Andrade & Du (2007) explains self-assessment as a pedagogical practice that entails students engaging in a reflective process to evaluate and analyse the calibre of their work and the extent of their learning, to determine how much they will represent the expressly stated goals or criteria, highlight the work's strengths and flaws, and modify as necessary. (as cited in Ratminingsih, Marhaeni & Vigayanti, 2018, p. 278).

2.4.3 Teacher feedback

The most typical and preferable kind of feedback is reportedly from teachers, compared to other forms of feedback such as peer or self-assessed feedback. Teachers have always

been regarded as decent and reliable source of giving the corrective feedback to their students regarding the issue of writing in classes. Making the right comments with detailed explanations and with elaborative explanations enclosed, they have been regarded as the guide that can identify the mistakes and correct them better than any other sources. Most importantly, as Ferris (1999) explained, if they were not given teacher feedback, students wouldn't feel the need to edit their written work.

2.4.3.1 The features of teacher feedback

Research by Hattie& Timperley (2007) supports that the direction of feedback in relation to task performance influences the strength of feedback. Feedback is more successful when it delivers information on correct responses rather than incorrect ones, and when it builds on preceding trail adjustments. Also, the objectives and tasks are another element that affect the quality and the efficacy of feedback. When the goals are clearly set in students' minds, it is easy to reach them with the purpose of regenerating the overall string of ideas. No matter in which skill they are engaging, students must face with the objectives well-set by the agent. After communicating the goals, teachers should also inform pupils of the critical parts they are going to give importance, what parts matter more and what kind of errors they should avoid in general. This knowledge will help students in directing their attention towards relevant aspects, enabling them to make self-corrections and ultimately enhancing their ability to write with greater ease and confidence. Ferris (2002) gives the following list of errors which may help teachers while deciding on what to respond to:

Genre-specific errors- those particular to the current text-type

Stigmatizing errors- those that most disturb the particular target community of writers

Comprehensibility errors- those that most interfere with the clarity of the writing

Frequent errors- those consistently made by the individual student across his or her writing

> Student-identified errors- those the student would like the teacher to focus on (as cited in Hyland, 2003, p.186).

By receiving feedback, the learner has the chance to coordinate performance with the counterpart who is more skilled and educated (Taşkıran & Göksel, 2022). This enables the person to enhance his own writing skills as this process provides different perspectives which will drag the learner to think extensively.

2.4.3.2 The effectiveness of teacher feedback

As it is well known, the success students get in writing in second language highly have its source in producing the skills of that language effectively and sufficiently. Concordantly, the amount of effort students make during this writing process matters a lot. Yet, only the effort of students is insufficient. At this stage, teachers' hand, their revisions and invaluable feedback play a big part in writing process. While it is quite tough to express oneself in written form in his mother tongue, performing it in a second language presents greater difficulty.

In line with Dujsik's (2008) analysis, writing is seen as a sophisticated socio-cognitive skill requiring deliberate effort and repetition through instruction or schooling.

Dujsik (2008) states his opinion:

> Writing in second language (L2) is viewed as equally complex, if not more, as it poses further challenges to learners, especially children and inexperienced writers, due to competing attention demands such as using the L2 writing system, deciding on content knowledge relevant to a writing topic, selecting proper vocabulary and grammar to form sentences, organizing sentences into a paragraph and paragraphs into an essay with appropriate organizational patterns, considering the writing purpose and intended readers, etc. (p. 1)

That's why students need their teachers' guidance and feedback throughout this learning process. It appears to be the building block that will help construct their writing skills.

However, there are different opinion questioning the effectiveness of teachers' written feedback for their development. Several researchers and practitioners have thoroughly

examined written Corrective Feedback's function within the context of L2 acquisition and L2 writing since Truscott (1996) asserted that it is ineffective in L2 development and should be abandoned (Ene & Kosobucki, 2016). Yet no definitive findings have been made. Sadler (2010) argues that the provision of comprehensive feedback to students, encompassing an assessment of their work's strengths and faults together with constructive ideas for enhancement, is becoming prevalent within the realm of higher education. Furthermore, it has been shown that a significant number of students do not perceive any substantial influence from feedback, despite the substantial investment of time and effort dedicated to its creation.

2.4.3.3 Teacher written feedback

The features of "written feedback" in general was explained in section 2.4.3. Yet, in this section more details are going to be mentioned when the source for the feedback is the teacher.

According to Cohen & Cavalcanti (1990), Fatham & Whalley (1990), and Ferris (1995, 2002), written feedback from teachers is an essential element of the writing process. Without their corrections, they wouldn't have the opportunity to fix their errors and the errors would be repetitive for the students. Konold, Miller, and Konold (2004) observed that written feedback from the teacher helped all students perform better and that feedback played a crucial part in learning. (as cited in Lange, 2011, p. 21)

The written form makes the feedback permanent and attainable for the learners. The way teachers give their feedback varies in many aspects. Teachers commonly highlight mistakes by underlining them, coding them to show the sorts of mistakes (e.g., vt for verb tense, p for punctuation, s/v for subject-verb agreement), and writing comments on the content and structure. It is equally significant how teachers react to students' writing. When commenting on papers to provide feedback, teachers should use the right language that tries to be informative, pedagogical, and interpersonal. (Leki, 1990, as cited in Şahan, 2012).

The necessity and specific techniques of teacher written feedback on student writing in English have always been a heated and challenging topic of improving student writing

proficiency. According to Wen (2013), "*in the areas of ESL and EFL writing, the effect of teacher written feedback has been studied to a large extent*" (p.427). Therefore, among different kinds of feedback, teachers' written feedback is supposed to be the most crucial one. "*Not only does it facilitate students' revisions, but it also assists them during the step to step learning-to-write process*" (Harmer, 2004; Peterson, 2010, as cited in Agbayahoun, 2016). Teachers also show great effort in the process of giving written feedback. Muicheartaigh (2000) reported "*the teacher takes on three very distinct roles in this process, that of a reader, a writing teacher and a language expert*" (as cited in Ismail ,2008, p.46). Ismail (2008) contributes to topic:

> A writing teacher read a piece of writing with an aim to help the students grapple with skills in writing as a whole; understanding writing genre, working on text organization and dealing with coherence. Or, most of the time, the teacher plays the hat of a language expert or a resource person who helps learners with lexis, grammar and spelling – identifying and correcting them. (p. 46)

In brief, teacher eye is needed for a student to have a deeper revision and comprehension of what he has written so far.

2.5 Students' Attitudes Towards Teacher Feedback

The way the feedback goes matters the most when it is looked from the viewpoint of a student himself. The students, the real receivers of what are taught,

Chandler (2003) found that when professors provided comments on students' grammatical and lexical errors, subsequent writing of the same kind improved significantly in correctness and fluency all through the semester. This data refutes Truscott's (1999) notion that error correction has a detrimental impact on fluency. (as cited in Liu, 2008, p.66) The efficacy level of the students' gain from written feedbacks is affected by various factors. It affects their performance during the lesson, as well. The relationship between learner expectation and feedback has a profound influence on what the student recalls from a class. (Kulhavy, 1977, p.226). Not only the extrinsic factors including the class environment and their classmates, also the intrinsic ones such as their background, their interest and the confidence level can easily have an effect upon their

perception towards the feedback they get from their teachers. Kulhavy (1977) states "*high confidence correct answers yield the shortest feedback study times, high confidence errors yield the longest time, and low confidence answers fall somewhere in between*" (p.226). When looking at the studies conducted to see the students' perception on the subject, Montgomery & Baker's (2007) state that students certainly have strong opinions on the amount and type of feedback provided by their teachers. (p. 83).

For example, Cohen (1987) investigated 217 respondents to surveys about the quantity and value of written feedback from teachers from a variety of university language courses. According to the study's findings, students believe that professors should and do give more attention to local writing issues—like grammar and mechanics—than to larger ones—like ideas, substance, and structure. Cohen's study was duplicated by Ferris (1995) in the setting of a product, and Ferris discovered identical findings to Cohen in her survey of 155 students. Additionally, it was shown that students pay greater attention to feedback offered while they are still composing a piece of work rather than after they have already turned it in. These findings shed insight on the extent to which students value and implement the provided feedback in order to enhance their writing.

It is clearly seen that students prefer great deal of comments especially on local issues. On students' perspectives, particularly grammar plays the important role of language learning and its reflection on writing. The findings of Montromery& Baker's own study (2007) suggest that students are content with limited input on global concerns, which might perhaps contribute to the observation that educators are less inclined to provide feedback in the manner they initially anticipated. (p. 93).

3 METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology of the study. It starts with the presentation of the description of Meta-analysis, the method which this study adopts. It continues with stating the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study. Literature search which comprises the searching process of the study is explained. Data gathered from 24 studies analysed and the frequencies and percentages are demonstrated in the tables.

3.1 Research Questions

The study is set to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the effects of teacher feedback on students' writing performance according to the studies conducted between 2008-2023?
2. To what extent is teacher feedback effective in students' writing according to the studies conducted between 2008-2023?

3.2 Meta-Analysis as a Research Area

This study adopts meta-analysis as a research strategy in order to comprehend the impact of teacher feedback on students' writing performance. A meta-analysis is the statistical collection of data from several research on a certain subject. Through the identification of impact sizes in the studies used in the analysis yields a crucial discovery within the existing body of research. According to FitzGibbon (1985), a technique for combining study findings is called meta-analysis. In terms of statistics, this type of analysis is implemented be reach to a general conclusion by combining the results of the studies conducted.

Glass (1976) defines meta-analysis as the analysis of the analyses. He adds:

> The need for the meta-analysis of research is clear. The literature on dozens of topics in education is growing at an astounding rate. In five years' time, researchers can produce literally hundreds of studies on intelligence quotient

> (IQ) and creativity, or impulse vs. reflective cognitive styles, or any other topic. In education, the findings are fragile, they vary in confusing irregularity across contexts, classes of subjects, and countless other factors. Where ten studies might suffice to resolve a matter in biology, ten studies on computer assisted instruction or reading may fail to show the same pattern of results twice. This is particularly true of those questions that are more properly referred to as outcome evaluation than analytic research. (p. 3)

According to Bangert-Drowns and Rudner (1990), meta-analysis has become a helpful tool for resolving key issues in educational research. These issues include the requirement to show that study outcomes are independent of chance, methodological flaws, or systemic variations in the nature of the study. (as cited in Akdoğan, 2021, p.21). As it is like a compile of the studies about a certain topic, it is easy to see related studies all together with their findings and results. So, it is also a helpful guide for researchers in academia. Higgins & Green (2011) outlined the benefits of using meta-analysis as a tool for research: (1) to enhance influence; (2) to increase exactness; (3) to respond to problems not addressed by the individual studies; and (4) to resolve conflicts or produce new ideas. (p. 290). Basically, it is an efficient method that promotes your development and enables you to advance in most aspects.

3.3 Inclusion & Exclusion Criteria

The well-known databases, whose applicability and usefulness have been evaluated and reported in research conducted beforehand, were consulted for the literature review in this present investigation. The key words used were feedback, teacher feedback, writing, writing ability, writing performance. While conducting searches, the phrases "the effect" and "language learning" were also put to use to provide contextualization for the searches and to find more relevant documents. 48 studies were found accordingly. The majority of the studies were disregarded because they failed to demonstrate how teacher feedback affects learners' writing abilities, which was the objective of this study. The studies which did not meet with the inclusion criteria were excluded from this research. These were;

Studies that were conducted before the designated time span which is last 15 years (e.g. Hayland, 2003; Montgomery, 2007).

Studies that focused on oral feedback rather than written feedback (e.g. Solhi& Eğinli, 2020; Connie Au, 2019).

Studies that focused on specific instruments which are out of research purpose (e.g. Fazilatfar,2014; Diab, 2016).

Studies that focused on online form of feedback (e.g. Saifu et al., 2019).

Studies that involved only students' perceptions about the topic (e.g. Vasu,2016& Vanlı, 2013).

Studies inquiring the effect of feedback in other languages (e.g. Turkish to native students, Özdeş, 2019) were excluded from the study.

Thus, 24 papers were suitable and accordingly selected for this meta-analysis. The criteria for inclusion were specified as;

The meta-analysis included the studies which were conducted in last 15 years.

The study that investigated the effect of teacher feedback on writing performance of the learners.

The study comprises teachers' written feedback rather than other forms.

Considering the criteria specified, 24 studies were found suitable to be used in this meta-analysis. The impact of teacher feedback was examined with the help of these studies using various settings and samples.

3.4 The Data Collection Tools

Data collection is the most important process of meta-analysis. Conducting a meta-analysis involves examining relevant studies. This is achieved by conducting an effective literature search. First, it was essential to construct a sufficient corpus of primary studies through the following procedure. Therefore, the researcher consulted the well-known online databases – Google Scholar, ERIC, ProQuest, JSTOR, Research Gate, Maltepe University Library, Yeditepe University Library, Council of Higher Education thesis center databases – using these terms or combinations of all these: feedback, teacher

feedback, writing, writing skills, the effect, the impact, peer feedback, written corrective feedback, error correction, types of feedback, writing improvement, foreign language, second language, L2 learners.

The reference sections of relevant book chapters, published meta-analyses were also used as additional sources. There was various research on the subject, but only those that dealt with teacher written feedback were included.

3.5 Data Analysis and Interpretation

This study's primary objective is to examine the cumulative efficacy of writing ability with the aid of teacher feedback. In other words, the main objective is to conduct meta-analysis research to determine the influence of teacher feedback on the students' writing skills. The criteria for identifying impacts of teacher feedback on writing improvement were determined to have been satisfied by 24 research papers, all of which were conducted between 2008 and 2023. Each of the 24 analyses involved in the study had its results investigated using meta-analysis.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents review of the articles and theses used in this meta-analysis. A total of 24 studies were presented in percentages related to their results. The data obtained and examined from these specific studies is described in the following part along with the results in percentages. The processed responses will range between positive, neutral and negative. Furthermore, this chapter emphasizes the level of efficacy of positive responses rated as “slightly effective”, “quite effective”, and “considerably effective”.

4.1 Review of The Studies Included in Meta-Analysis

In this meta-analysis, 16 articles and 8 master theses were reviewed in order to assist us in carrying out the research and the data collection necessary to answer our research objectives. These 24 studies were selected attentively among 48 related studies taking into account the inclusion and exclusion criteria (see Chapter 3.3, page 21). Each review includes introduction, thesis statement, hypotheses (if it has any), research questions, review of literature, methodology, participants, data collection, data analysis, findings and conclusion parts. All the studies included in this meta-analysis can be requested from the researcher.

4.1.1 Review of the articles in journals

Article 1: “The Effects of Error Feedback in Second Language Writing” by Liu, Y. (2008).

Introduction: One of the main problems in second language writing that both teachers and researchers deal with is error handling. Yet, there are controversial ideas on that topic. Truscott (1996, 1999, 2007) discussed that error correction techniques for L2 student writing have been regarded as being damaging and useless in general. On the other hand, by suggesting that, Truscott had neglected some favourable study findings on the impacts of grammar correction, Ferris (1999) refuted this assertion. Whether or not error correction ultimately proves successful is still an open subject in enhancing the correctness of L2 writing in the long run for students of all levels based on the data

currently available (Kepner, 1991; Chandler; Hyland, 2003; Bitchener, 2008). As a result, L2 writing teachers simply cannot ignore their students' intense demand for feedback on their errors.

Thesis Statement: The present study investigated the extent of teacher feedback on three error categories which aided L2 writers in composing new works with more precision.

Research Questions: This exploratory research answers three questions:

1- How do ESL students respond to direct and indirect feedback provided on a previous draft when writing another draft of the same essay? Do students make fewer errors in drafting a new essay?

2- Do direct and indirect feedback have different effects on the three error types (morphological, semantic, and syntactic)?

3- What type of feedback do students prefer?

Review of Literature: The question of whether providing L2 writers with corrective feedback may increase their written accuracy has been up for debate for more than 10 years.

Many studies on mistake correction in L2 writing classes have demonstrated that students' accuracy increases over time when they get feedback from teachers on their errors (Hyland, 2003; Chandler, 2003). The types of feedback are also distincted by some researchers. Direct feedback is when an instructor gives pupils the appropriate linguistic form (word, morpheme, phrase, revised sentence, deleted word[s] or morpheme[s]) (Ferris ,2002). On the other hand, "*indirect feedback occurs when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but leaves it to the student writer to solve the problem and correct the error*" (Ferris, 2002, p.19).

Methodology: The paper presents a quasi-experimental classroom study.

Participants: Twelve students participated in the study, which was conducted at a university in the southwest of the United States. They were all first-year ESL students taking the three-unit writing course ENGL108, which was designed just for them.

Data Collection: Data were gathered from the initial version of the second essay as well as the initial and second versions of the first essay. Students were given a survey at the conclusion of the semester to gauge their preferences for the kind of corrective feedback.

Data Analysis: On the initial versions, the instructor offered feedback on both the content and the errors. The majority of the teacher's feedback focused on use and grammatical mistakes. Only the final draft received a mark that took into account both quantity and quality, including previous draft adjustments, correctness, and writing flow. There were no adjustments made for the mistakes in the initial versions. It was crucial that all mistakes be marked uniformly by the same teacher-researcher. The researcher and a second rater who is a native English speaker and who teaches ESL in a college—graded the papers in order to determine the interrater agreement. In the end, in terms of the final sum of mistakes, there was 96% agreement.

Findings: The findings demonstrate that both kinds of feedback aided students in text-self-editing. Direct feedback did help students make fewer mistakes in the first draft, however; it had little impact on their accuracy in subsequent drafts. The pupils were able to decrease morphological errors more so than semantic errors thanks to indirect feedback. According to survey findings, pupils strongly favour emphasizing and description.

Overall findings suggest that corrected comments on students' writing is insufficient to increase their writing accuracy. To enhance pupils' capacity to self-edit, certain mini-lessons or workshops concentrating on various grammatical faults or elements are required.

Conclusion: It was demonstrated that rewriting after receiving direct feedback from a teacher led to roughly the same number of errors on a later assignment, even while students made fewer mistakes on revisions of the same assignment. On the other hand, revising an assignment based on a teacher's highlighting resulted in fewer mistakes. This demonstrates a potential benefit of emphasizing as an approach for constructive feedback. The outcomes of the study indicate that both groups possess the ability to rectify the majority of the mistakes found while rewriting the identical essay. Students who just received underlining in the most recent assignment had to figure out the correction on

their own, which probably helped them become better at self-editing. For Group A, the number of semantic mistakes The number of semantic mistakes decreased from the initial draft to the subsequent revision of Essay 1, but rose from Essay 1 to Essay 2. In Group B, both Essay 1 and Essay 2 included about the same amount of semantic mistakes. This demonstrates that the corrected input had practically little impact. According to the survey's findings, the majority of students preferred highlighting and an explanation of the writing errors they made since they wanted to know what type of errors they had done.

The findings of the second comparison show the impact of corrective feedback on a fresh piece of writing. It was demonstrated that even if students made less mistakes on revisions of the same assignment, rewriting after a teacher's direct corrections led to almost the same number of mistakes on a later assignment.

This study, together with the previously stated studies, reveals that certain writing errors are more difficult to correct than others, hence giving students feedback on their writing that needs improvement is insufficient on its own to increase students' writing accuracy. Students' capacity to self-edit might be enhanced by a few mini lessons or workshops focused on various grammatical mistakes or issues.

Article 2: **"**The Effectiveness of Standardised Feedback when L2 Students Revise Writing" by Louw, H. (2008).

Introduction: Writing feedback for students has generated much debate ever since the 1980s, as has the topic of its inherent value. (Zamel,1985& Truscott,1996). By a majority, most researchers have regarded feedback as useful and necessary tool. They appreciate it and support its presence in writing lessons. Therefore, Louw (2006) contends that the feedback principle is good while acknowledging that the practice need development. Writing feedback is a well-established component of instruction, so it won't just disappear. Utilizing research-based ideas from all perspectives of the debate in an endeavour to enhance present procedures is one way to advance the field of study. This article will describe how a collection of standardized feedback comments was developed, along with its impacts, potential flaws, and ultimate outcomes.

Thesis Statement: This article aims to provide a report on an experiment whose goal was to enhance a certain aspect of a specific feedback technique.

Hypotheses: The hypotheses for this study is that feedback principle is sound, but the practice needs refinement.

Research Questions: Research questions are not stated in this article.

1- When students are required to modify written texts, is standardized feedback more successful than conventional methods of marking?

Review of Literature: Even though there is still some disagreement on whether or not feedback is useful, it is still a crucial component of every day teaching. In light of this, Louw (2006) contends that the feedback principle is valid, though he also acknowledges that the practice may be improved. Drawing upon evidence-based concepts from various perspectives of the discourse in an effort to enhance present procedures is the key to answer this question.

Methodology: Quantitative method was adopted with the tests and experiments as tools in this research.

Participants: As it is not an experimental study, there is no active participants in this research.

Data Collection: To compile a comprehensive list (tag set) of commonly employed feedback types, the sorts of errors that the markers identified were analysed and classified. The first step was to establish a set of standardised feedback categories. The International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) tag set, developed at the Center for English Corpus Linguistics at the Université Catholique de Louvain (Granger 2003), was the first additional source. This tag set does not, however, include comments on the writing's actual basis, making a second extra source - data from a literature review on mistakes and the marking of errors - necessary. Three essays tagged in three distinct ways—tag set, hieroglyphics, and blank—were chosen to represent as many of the mistake tags as feasible in the standardised list for the experiment testing the efficacy of the standardized

feedback. On the testing session itself, students wrote their responses, and representative samples of these exams were selected at random for study.

Data Analysis: A four-part scale, signified by the alphabetic characters A, B, C, and D, was used to analyze the tests.

A. The student accurately identified the adjustment that needed to be made and carried it out.

B. The student accurately identified the adjustment that needed to be made, however it was made wrongly. Example: Correcting a spelling error by misspelling the word again, but doing it in a different way than before.

C. The student tried a revision even though they were unable to identify the adjustment that needed to be made.

D. The student made no effort at all to revise.

Findings: Based on a comprehensive analysis of several error classifications, as shown by an academic investigation, students do revisions more successfully on the tag set than on the other two assessments. It's interesting to observe that when the word's adjective form is used wrongly, the hieroglyphics are more potent than the tag set. (The tag set only received a score of 69.2%; the hieroglyphics received a score of 76.9%.) Unfortunately, students only frequently go beyond grammatical functions and consider revision to be superficial editing. They would rather fix 'absolutely incorrect' mistakes than improve a text. Students could consequently just be more accustomed to merely reviewing the surface parts and may not be responsive to additional modifications. Consequently, it can be claimed that a standard feedback is not considerably effective on making them revise and correct their papers in full measure.

Conclusion: With a standardized marking method, students try and complete more modifications, whereas with a minimum marking method, they avoid attempting revisions more frequently. The desire among students to edit their work appears to be low. Students appeared to prefer working on problems that had already been discovered for them and were hesitant to try to identify errors on their own. Students lack the ability to recognize

misuse of constructs and don't appear to be able to (or care to) attempt to improve a work. They seem unaware of the ideas of supported arguments and cohesiveness and instead concentrate on surface components, which they feel better capable of resolving on their own. As a result, standardizing comments will assist in addressing a specific aspect of the broader problem with feedback on writing in a general sense. Problems with instructor concentration (What is the specific content that we are required to mark?) learner focus (transitioning from a corrective approach to a revising approach), and strategies to actively involve students in using feedback are additional issues that need to be resolved.

Article 3: "An Investigation of Meta-Linguistic Corrective Feedback in Writing Performance" by Gholaminia, I., Gholaminia, A. & Marzban, A. (2013).

Introduction: The issue of whether and how teachers should offer feedback to students who are learning English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL) has generated a lot of discussion in the area of L2 acquisition. Several studies have looked at the effectiveness of different forms of written remedial feedback and combinations of multiple types. These studies have mostly divided input into two categories: explicit (direct) and implicit (indirect). A word, phrase, or morpheme that has to be removed or added, as well as the proper form or structure, are all examples of direct feedback. Indirect corrective feedback, on the other hand, uses code to pinpoint where and what kinds of mistakes have occurred. It may do this by highlighting or circling the error, noting in the margin how many errors are on a specific line, or any combination of these.

Thesis Statement: This research was done to determine the effect of meta-linguistic corrective feedback on writing performance of the learners.

Hypothesis: The following null hypotheses are developed in order to be on the safe side and also arrive at reasonable responses to the aforementioned study questions:

H0: 1. Paragraph writing skills do not increase in response to written meta-linguistic corrective feedback among Iranian EFL students.

H0: 2. Traditional forms of corrective feedback and meta-linguistic evaluations provide equivalent results.

Research Questions: The article aims to discuss the preceding research questions:

1- To what extent does the provision of meta-linguistic mistake feedback impact the development of paragraph writing skills among intermediate Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners?

2- Which type of error feedback is more beneficial: standard error feedback or meta-linguistic error feedback?

Review of Literature: Direct corrective feedback is described as the teacher giving the learner the appropriate language form or structure over the incorrect linguistic form (Ferris, 2002). As for the indirect feedback, students are left to fix the problem that has been brought to their notice without the teacher giving an explicit correction. The argument put forth by those who believe indirect feedback is superior to direct feedback is that it forces students to engage in guided learning and problem solving, which encourages the kind of reflection, noticing, and attention that is more likely to promote long-term acquisition (Ferrias and Roberts, 2001). In general, error identification may be valuable and important since it serves as a good place to start when discussing errors with students (Raimes, 1991).

Methodology: Quantitative method was used in conducting this research.

Participants: The research was carried out at an Iranian university's English Language Department, where all courses are instructed in the English language. A large number of students were selected; two classes as control and an experimental group with 91 students in total.

Data Collection: The Nelson exam was used, with the goal of eliciting 60 homogenous intermediate pupils out of 91. Two groups (the experimental and control) were chosen among the test takers. In the control group, the teacher edited the students' paragraphs using the traditional approach of error correction, which included highlighting the error and writing the proper form for the students. On the contrary, the teacher utilized code correction in the experimental group. Because the study is about writing, a writing exam was required as a pre-test and a post-test following the training sessions.

In the end, the study findings indicated that the individuals in the experimental group who were assessed and instructed via meta-linguistic code-correction did better in their post-test than the traditionally instructed control group. Meta-linguistic code-correction allowed students to review their initial draft numerous times and improved the quality of their paragraph, letting them to become more sensitive to the flaws and errors they make and grew quicker and more efficiently than before.

Data Analysis: A descriptive statistical analysis was conducted to examine the quantitative variables in the control and experimental groups, including the lowest and maximum scores, total scores, mean scores, standard deviation, and variance of the scores, as well as the mean performances in the pre-test and post-test. In the pre-test, the average performance of the control and experimental groups is essentially the same, but in the post-test, they perform differently.

Findings: Results from the two separate groups in the research corroborate the study's main assertion that adding meta-linguistic error feedback in Iranian EFL classes is effective in boosting students' writing abilities. Meta-linguistic error feedback assisted learners in being aware of and monitoring their own mistakes. Students learnt to take responsibility for their own mistakes and to become more self-sufficient learners. Corrective feedback, as this study shown, may be a useful tool for measuring students' correctness and assisting them in becoming more conscious of their mistakes, as well as making less mistakes in their work.

Conclusion: It can be concluded from this study that the learners can utilize writing assignments more effectively and actively by providing them with metalinguistic input on how to organize their paragraphs while they write. Moreover, through several revisions of their first drafts and focus on the quality of their paragraphs, learners who use meta-linguistic code-correction become more aware of their problems and errors, which allows them to advance more quickly and efficiently than they typically would. Finally, learners will be more driven to study and feel more accountable for their learning if they are aware that their writing will be evaluated, and they will be offered suggestions for improvement based on the correction codes.

The fundamental finding of this research, that including meta-linguistic error feedback is highly beneficial for enhancing students' writing skills, is supported by the aforementioned results for the two study groups. This study demonstrated how corrective feedback may help students identify their mistakes, learn from them, and most crucially, write their piece of writings more precisely in the future.

Article 4: “An Analysis of Written Feedback on ESL Students’ Writing” by Leng, K. (2014).

Introduction: Hyland argues that feedback may be described as making in-depth comments on students' works to provide readers feedback on their efforts while also assisting them in developing as writers (as cited in Leng, 2014, 390Leng (2014) argues that feedback is crucial for students since it is at the core of their learning process and one of the most commonly employed and regularly utilized ways that instructors implement to enhance learning. (p. 390). However, there hasn't been much focus on the precise sorts of replies teachers offer their pupils in regard to speech actions or how much students find them beneficial. This study claims that in order to deliver appropriate feedback to students, lecturers must first comprehend what sorts of feedback are beneficial to students' writing, as well as students' perceptions of various types of feedback. It investigates what sorts of feedback are useful to students and students’ responses to these feedback types in terms of their efficacy. This research also combines two frameworks for speech acts: Searle's Speech Act Theory (1969) and Holmes' Language Functions (2001).

Thesis Statement: This study aims to investigate different kinds of feedback that are useful to students and reveal their usefulness.

Research Questions: The following 2 questions of research were addressed in this paper:

1- What kind of feedback did the students' instructor provide them?

2- What were the pupils' responses to the various types of feedback provided?

Review of Literature: Feedback might be considered a vital step in the process of students' writing skills progress (Hyland, 1990; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). As feedback plays crucial role as stated, it is important as long as it is given effectively. Feedback that is

focused, clear, relevant, and motivating is considered effective. (Lindemann, 2001). The ability to think critically and control one's own learning is enhanced when students receive this kind of feedback (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Strake & Kumar, 2010). Hence, feedback can be seen as a map of the teacher's guidance and becomes a light for the students in the process of performing writing.

Methodology: By taking into consideration open, axial, and selective coding procedures (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), the study was directed by the constant comparative approach outlined by Glaser and Strauss in 1967. It follows a quantitative method.

Participants: 15 Malaysian students who were Malay, Chinese, and Indian made up the study's participants. The students ranged in age from 19 to 20 and were a mixed-gender group.

Data Collection: This study relied on two different types of research sources to compile its data: (1) written drafts, and (2) student interviews. In-text feedback and general feedback were also two different feedback formats.

Data Analysis: All comments the instructor penned for the text were incorporated in the in-text feedback, which usually had a note in the text's margin. The feedback supplied was seen as the lecturers' spontaneous ideas, and it served as a dialogue between the students and their teachers. Regarding the general feedback, it was presented in a text letter and both instructors outlined their primary problems and provided additional general feedback on the written copy. Word-for-word transcription of the in-text and general feedback was done in order to get a complete record of the lecturers' observations.

Findings: The data from the written drafts show that directive and expressive feedback were the most common types of feedback obtained by the students. In this study, students considered directive feedback to be the most valuable and preferred it above the other types of feedback. Directive-instruction feedback, which directs students to make adjustments that are required for the text, was the most common kind of feedback offered (52%) to students. Directive-clarification feedback, or comments seeking additional information from students, such as a more thorough explanation of ideas already addressed in the paper, was the second most frequent kind of feedback (24%) given to

students. Expressive-disapproval feedback, which emphasizes the shortcomings of their article, was the third most often given criticism (19%). Expressive-approval feedback was the least frequently given to students (5%), highlighting the effectiveness of the essay drafts.

Conclusion: Overall, this study's findings made it quite evident that the written feedback offered to students was beneficial and useful in the rewriting of their essays. The reason for this was that the response was concise, straightforward, and full of useful information. The students gained developmental experiences from the feedback since it helped them identify their writing talents and limitations and allowed them to edit their essays in response. Based on the perceptions of the students in this study about the helpfulness and absence of specific elements in written remarks, three conclusions came from the study. Firstly, instructors could provide sufficient information in their comments. Second, while giving feedback to students, lecturers could offer instruction feedback. Finally, lecturers could offer precise approval feedback. As this study demonstrates, written feedback aided students in revising their essays, and they desired explicit and information-rich written feedback.

Article 5: “Teaching and Learning Writing through Providing Teacher’s Feedback” by Boubekeur, S. (2015).

Introduction: The writing skills of EFL students in the classroom are extremely lacking, especially for second-year English language learners in Sidi Bel Abbes, Algeria. They view writing as a difficult talent that they are unable to fully grasp, which results in the production of unsatisfactory essays. Numerous things that affect the performance of students are the causes of the obstacles. In reality, giving students comments from the teacher may be a good way to improve their writing and help them see their errors.

Thesis Statement: This study aimed to see how successful delivering feedback is in a school setting where English is taught as a foreign language. The primary purpose was to demonstrate the significance of giving teachers with feedback on students' papers.

Hypothesis: Accordingly, the hypotheses for this study were that writing was a difficult skill and feedback might be essential in improving and fostering the students’ writing.

Research Questions: The subsequent research questions were discussed:

1- What lies behind the complexity of the writing skill?

2- Is the focus on feedback a good strategy that helps learners overcome their weaknesses and consequently improve their writing skills?

Review of Literature: Writing drew attention and was seen as a fundamental component of communication up until the 1960s. The ability to write is acknowledged as a fundamental skill for language learning, and Harmer (1998: 255) emphasizes this point particularly. He believed that English language learners should be taught composition with an emphasis on writing skill, language growth, reinforcement, and learning preferences. Writing, according to Tyner (2008), is a process of discovery and creativity in which a single word or sentence may spark an original thought.

According to Boubekekeur (2015), feedback is information given to a writer by either a reader or an instructor to help that writer make changes and giving pupils feedback on their written work is mostly done so as to aid individuals in enhancing their writing proficiency they produce. Students learn to understand the many elements of the writing process through feedback (Flower, 1994). According to Sommers (1982: 148), teachers give feedback on their students' written work to encourage revision.

In terms of teaching and learning writing, reacting to students' writing is seen as a crucial problem since writing is regarded as a tool for improving ideas, creating thinking, and learning from experiences. As a result, when writing, students are required to convey their views and beliefs in a sufficient and precise manner (Aridah, 2003: 6).

Methodology: Conducting a survey and a semi-structured interview, this study followed mixed method.

Participants: The participating students are 80 second-year License-Master-Doctorate (LMD) students in classes teaching English as a foreign language.

Data Collection: The questionnaires were presented to those enrolled in the Department of Languages of the Faculty of Languages and Arts; Section of English at Djilali Liabes University Sidi Bel Abbes in Algeria.

Data Analysis:

Question 1: is writing a complex skill to master?

The findings show that 75% of teachers agreed that writing is challenging and hard to master quickly; yet, additional practice is necessary. Additionally, it requires a lot of reading to grow.

Question 2: Does reading aid in the improvement of writing?

All of the instructors who were surveyed agreed that reading had a significant influence on how students produce and that it significantly advances writing ability.

Question 3: Does the teacher comment on the students' writing?

It is clear that teachers understand the value of giving students feedback. The majority of the teachers who were contacted believed that it is crucial to remark on the writing that students produce.

Question 4: When doing feedback, what aspect of the composition does the teacher focus on (you can tick more than one box) a- Grammar b- Vocabulary c- Ideas organization d- Punctuation e- Spelling?

All teachers (100%) emphasize grammar, vocabulary, and concept structure while providing feedback. 87.5% of the teachers place a strong emphasis on spelling and punctuation errors. Since grammar, vocabulary, and concept structure are the components that make up effective language and, consequently, the mastery of the goal skill, all teachers appear to focus on these aspects.

Question 5: Do the student use teacher's feedback?

The findings demonstrate that 81.25% of pupils use feedback. It is important to note that analysing student writing is quite important because many EFL students rely on it and consider it when making decisions.

Findings: Correspondingly, the findings reveal that the vast majority of students (81.25%) use feedback. It is worth noting that reacting to students' writings is really essential, since

so many EFL students rely on and consider it. However, 18.25 percent of students do not use their teachers' feedback because some pupils are uncomfortable receiving it. The research also showed that when delivering comments, all of the teachers (100%) emphasize grammar, vocabulary, and the arrangement of thoughts. 87.5 percent of teachers place an emphasis on mistakes in grammar and spelling. They appear to be focused on syntax, vocabulary, and concept structure, as these are the components that make up a competent language, and hence mastery of the target skill. Because they think that a flawless language is built on grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling, the instructors pay close attention to punctuation (writing mechanics) and spelling errors.

Conclusion: As a result, the majority of teachers place a high value on all areas of writing skill development. In other words, teachers should emphasize the early stages of the writing skill, making teacher feedback a focal point because his or her role is to guide students through the writing process, avoiding a focus on form, in order to assist them in developing strategies for generating, drafting, and organizing ideas. Thus, providing feedback on students' writings leads to better writing since it alerts the learner to flaws and mistakes. Furthermore, teachers as well as learners are aware of the value of giving helpful feedback during the writing process. Given that the latter comes at the end of any writing process, more emphasis may be placed on teaching writing as a process rather than as a final result.

Article 6: “The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct Vs Indirect Feedback on Students’ Writing” by Jamalinesari, A. & Rahimi, F. & Gowhary, H. & Azizifar, A. (2015).

Introduction: Since the 1970s, academics have been closely examining the classroom practice of providing feedback since it is a teaching strategy that is effective. It was discovered that when teachers use feedback techniques properly, they frequently have a favourable and significant impact on the academic performance of their students. There are controversial ideas on that topic. According to some academics, like Truscott (2007), WCF is an obvious and spectacular failure. (p. 271). However, a growing body of research suggests that WCF might enhance writing accuracy in some situations. Truscott (1996) argued that grammar check should be dropped from writing courses for a number of reasons. In the end, he came to the conclusion that there is little solid evidence that error correction ever increases student writers' writing correctness. He gave two main

explanations for why this result shouldn't be shocking. On the one hand, he said that mistake correction as it is usually used ignores L2 acquisition discoveries on the slow and difficult process of learning the patterns and structures of a second language. Besides, he outlined a variety of real-world issues including teachers' capacity and willingness to provide and students' desire to be corrected for mistakes. Although acknowledging that he presented several persuasive arguments on the inherent characteristics of the L2 acquisition process and the practical difficulties in providing corrective feedback, Ferris stated that the data Truscott cited in support of his claim was not always comprehensive.

Thesis Statement: This study's goal is to contrast the impact of direct and indirect, individually, written feedback from teachers on students' writing for English Language Learners (ELL) in Iran.

Research Questions: Their study aims at answering these three research questions:

1- Does direct teacher feedback on students' writing outperform indirect teacher feedback in terms of effectiveness?

2- Are there any connections between the direct and indirect forms of feedback that teachers write on their students' writing?

3- Do students prefer direct or indirect written feedback from teachers on their writings?

Review of Literature: According to Ferris (2002), teacher-written feedback is seen as a crucial component of the writing process. WCF literature (e.g., Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2003; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005; Polio et al., 1998]) demonstrates how L2 writing scholars and teachers have favoured the utilization of indirect forms of feedback (i.e., when faults are pointed up and students are invited to self-correct) and stressed the need of revision. Though most L2 writing teachers make an effort to provide constructive feedback to their students and are aware of how students perceive written feedback, they may not be fully conscious of the amount of feedback they provide on specific local (i.e., grammar, and punctuation and spelling) and global (i.e., ideas, structure and substance) problems or whether the kind of criticism they feel they should provide is consistent with their expectations for written feedback.

Many research has compared direct and indirect feedback systems and examined how much more accuracy is facilitated by each. One study, (Ferris et al., 2000) examined how various treatment scenarios affected both text revisions and brand-new works of writing. According to Ferris (2002), who discussed the study's findings, direct error correction resulted in 88 percent more correct revisions than indirect error feedback (77%). However, students who got indirect feedback significantly lowered their mistake frequency ratios compared to those who received direct feedback.

Methodology: This study qualifies as a quantitative study based on the techniques used for data gathering and analysis.

Participants: This study included two classrooms of lower-intermediate English language learners from a private language institute (each class had ten students). All of the students were teens, ranging in age from 13 to 17.

Data Collection: For ten consecutive class sessions, students in both classes were assigned essays as homework, and their mistakes were assessed and recorded separately. The outcomes were recorded and examined subsequently.

Data Analysis: One class was given was given direct written feedback, while another was given indirect feedback. For the class that received indirect feedback, the teacher marked and identified the mistakes by placing a line across the wrong sections or adding brief commentaries. The pupils were then instructed to edit their compositions and turn them in to the teacher at the following class. The corrected versions were later compared to the previously identified errors once the modifications had been confirmed and acknowledged. For the other group of students, the teacher highlighted the wrong forms in their writing and gave them the appropriate ones.

Findings: According to data analysis, in contrast to students who got direct feedback, those who received indirect remedial feedback did better. The statistics showed that the class that received indirect feedback improved more than the class that received direct feedback. Data analysis shows that using an indirect feedback technique as opposed to direct feedback helped students improve their linguistic precision on fresh writing assignments.

Conclusion: Upon the conclusion of the research endeavor, the importance of giving and receiving feedback was emphasized. It was found that delivering more feedback on a more frequent basis may improve students' writing competence levels in relation to the errors highlighted. Besides, rather of providing feedback on a large number of characteristics at once, the researchers propose that teachers deliver discriminatory, attentive feedback on certain kinds of language errors at once.

Article 7: "EFL Turkish University Students' Preferences About Teacher Feedback and Its Importance" by Kahraman, A. & Yalvaç, F. (2015).

Introduction: One of the best ways to fulfil the urge for thought and idea expression is through writing. As it is an important task writing both in native language (L1) and L2 teaching classes, teaching how to do it is a requirement. Because they struggle with L1 writing as well, many students have misconceptions about L2 writing. Since writing in an L2 is obviously more difficult and time-consuming than writing in an L1, these students may want their instructors' assistance in this regard.

Thesis Statement: This study examined the preferences of EFL Turkish university students regarding teacher feedback, as well as the effects on writing and it tries to find out whether the gender influence has a role on students' opinions.

Research Questions: Three research questions were assigned for this research:

1- How do EFL Turkish university students feel about receiving feedback from teachers in L2 classes?

2- Do the students' views toward teacher feedback differ depending on their gender?

3- Do gender differences exist in the students' opinions of instructor feedback?

Review of Literature: Improving students' writing abilities is a major issue in L2 writing lessons. Teachers face a variety of challenges in instructing students in a foreign language, some of which include the students' resistance to writing in the target language. Educationists, researchers, and methodologists have been examining writing skill for a very long time on account of these issues recognized as One of the contributing factors to the academic underachievement of students' to learn a foreign language (Cardelle &

Corno, 1981; Lalande, 1982; Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Truscott, 1996, as cited in Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015, p.74). The current study's objectives are to identify the preferences for and attitudes toward teachers' corrective feedback among EFL university students as well as to determine if these students' views toward this feedback are influenced by their gender.

Methodology: This study is a quasi-experimental study including two similar groups with the same level of English.

Participants: The research was conducted with two similar groups of students studying at Süleyman Demirel University in 2011 in Turkey. 93 first-year students at elementary level were the participants.

Data Collection: The researchers offered the participants two brief paragraphs with grammatical errors as part of the data collecting procedure to draw the participants' attention to specific English grammatical structures and they were required to find and correct the mistakes mentioned in the paragraphs. The following step was for the participants to write a brief paragraph describing the town or city they loved most, aiming to examine how students felt about writing and to get them ready for the process of giving feedback.

Data Analysis: The researchers used two copies of the students' aforementioned written works to offer instructor input in a two-step approach. After completing these processes and obtaining the necessary consent, a questionnaire created by Diab (2005) was split into pre- and post-test portions and participant interviews were then performed. Last but not least, the researchers interviewed 14 volunteer students on their opinions of and preferences for corrective feedback provided by teachers.

Findings: According to the surveys, 63.1 percent of participants strongly felt that having as few errors as possible in their written works is as significant to them as having good pre-test results. This score raised to 66.7 percent in the post-test questionnaire, according to data analysis. According to pre- and post-test findings, 48.8% and 64.3 percent of students strongly agreed that the instructor should point out grammar mistakes, respectively. Other than that, 35.7 percent of students in the pre-test and 48.8% of students

in the post-test strongly agreed with item 11 that the instructor should reply to a draft with a red pen. According to the Independent Samples T-test analysis of the pre- and post-test questionnaires, the values (.585 and .436, respectively) were higher than the standard value of.: .05. That is with a 95% degree of confidence (p 0.05), gender had no influence upon the responses of the t1_p and the t2_p.

Finally, the data analyses revealed that for 66.7% of the students the teachers' marks indicating grammatical errors are important, and for 67.9% the indication of errors in vocabulary is important. On the other hand, for less than half of the students the teachers' marks indicating errors in spelling (26.2%), the teachers' marks indicating errors in punctuation (11.9%), the teachers' comments on the ideas/content (22.6%), the teachers' comments on the writing style (7.1%), and the teachers' comments on the organization of the paper (3.6%) are important. Lastly, 4.8% of the students' state other ideas about the correction process of their written works. The results of this study's questionnaire suggested that students paid greater attention to feedback on grammatical errors than feedback on paper organization, writing style, or punctuation rules

Conclusion: Overall, taking into account the findings of the study, it is arguable that EFL university students have favourable opinions regarding teacher correction. It was quite understood from this study that learners care and love teacher feedback, yet they are more inclined to self-correction rather than teacher correction. To avoid typical teacher-centred classrooms and instead build a student-centred environment, self-correction should be encouraged and the chances should be increased. The more teachers encourage students to participate directly in L2 writing activities, the more students will participate actively in L2 writing practices. When the researchers looked at the preferences of EFL university students for teacher corrective feedback, they discovered that the majority of learners are eager to self-correct their first drafts. In the process of self-correction, they want their teacher to help them with self-correction by showing them where the error is and providing them a hint on how to fix it. Furthermore, gender does not influence learners' views toward corrective feedback from teachers

Article 8: "The Effect of Teacher's Feedback on Student's Writing Achievement" by Fitriana, R. (2017).

Introduction: Writing is a talent that is learned via study, according to Fegerson and Nickerson (1992). Thus, it is crucial for students of ESL to be conversant with writing rules. To produce quality writing, teachers of English should receive training on how to create a complete and coherent piece of writing as well as how to aid students step-by-step in developing effective structural sentences. (Fitriana, 2017, p.72). This suggests that instructors should provide students with stimuli to encourage them to investigate and arrange their ideas before writing. Skinner (1953) referred to the stimuli as feedback. The study tries to investigate the effectiveness of teacher feedback by analysing their progress from the first stages to the final as well as highlighted the students' perception about teachers' feedback.

Thesis Statement: The objective of this study was to ascertain whether there was a statistically significant improvement in students' writing achievement after receiving feedback during instruction and whether there was a significant difference between students who received feedback and those who did not.

Research Questions: In light of the significance of teacher feedback, the researcher performed the current study with the following questions in mind:

1. Was there any significant improvement in the writing achievement of the eighth graders of SMPN 3 Banyuasin 1 before and after being taught by using feedback?

2. Was there any significant improvement in the writing aspects of the eighth graders of SMPN 3 Banyuasin 1 before and after being taught by using feedback?

3- Was there any significant difference in the writing achievement between the eighth graders of SMPN 3 Banyuasin 1 who are given feedback and those who are not given feedback?

4- What did the students think about the use of feedback?

Review of Literature: Learning to write, according to Abdalla (2009), is crucial for communicating ideas and concepts in clear, succinct, and professional reports and papers that can be read by others. Abdalla (2009) further mentions:

> Effective writing should have the following characteristics. The first is clear objective. The second is good organization, which means that students should consider the logical sequence of the paragraphs according to their importance and relevance to the subject of the writing. The third is clear, brief, and concise writing. The fourth is appropriate language, the choice of words, and complexity of the grammar are tailored to suite the readers. The last is correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation (as cited in Fitriana, 2017).

Nafisah (2008) argues that ideal communication between a teacher and student would involve a two-way exchange so that both parties might gain knowledge from the conversation. According to Nafisah (2008), the student may instantly learn from the mistake, while the instructor can discover why it occurred and how to handle such situations in the future (as cited in Fitriana, 2017).

Methodology: In this study, a quasi-experimental research approach known as the pre-test and post-test non-equivalent groups design was employed.

Participants: This study included 40 students who were chosen based on their English proficiency test from among 94 eighth graders at SMPN 3 Banyuasin 1 in the academic year 2013/2014.

Data Collection: Students had to compose a descriptive paragraph (between 150 and 200 words) on a predetermined topic for the writing part of the exam. The test was administered to the students twice by the researcher: once at the start and once at the end of the study.

Data Analysis: The researcher performed an independent sample t-test to determine whether or not there was a significant difference in the students' writing between the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group students' average writing achievement scores on the pre-test were also compared to their average writing achievement scores on the post-test using a paired samples t-test with the help of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 17. Writing tests were used to gather the data for this study, and the t-test and percentage analyses were used to examine the data.

Findings: Quantitatively, the results of this research showed that the entire sample (N=20) who received feedback improved their writing abilities. There was also a substantial difference between the students who were provided feedback and that of those who were not. The results also demonstrated that students found their teachers' feedback to be of great value. The five components of writing—content organization, structure/grammar, vocabulary/word choice, and mechanics—were all improved by the teacher's feedback.

Conclusion: The results showed that after receiving teacher evaluation, students' writing performance significantly improved. T-test results demonstrated a significant difference between students who were provided feedback and those who were not in relation to their writing competence. When compared to pupils who did not get feedback, the former received higher grades. To sum up, this study demonstrated that teacher feedback was crucial in assisting students in enhancing their writing performance.

Article 9: "Effects of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback on the Writing Achievement of First-Year Ethiopian University Students Introduction" by Wondim, B. M. & Bishaw, K. S., & Zeleke, Y. T. (2023).

Introduction: According to Cole and Feng (2015), improving students' English language writing abilities is essential for success in language development. A significant amount of study on the subject of Corrective Feedback (CF) has determined that it is an important aspect in helping L2 learners. Although it is obvious that CF plays a crucial role in enhancing EFL learners' writing abilities, earlier studies presented conflicting results because of the researchers' differing perspectives on CF. A number of scholars and methodologists in the discipline have praised WCF for its significance. Yet, other factors including the sort of material provided, the learners' degree of skill and their ability to relate it to other linguistic knowledge, as well as the complexity of the language emphasis, have been predicted to have an impact (Bitchener,2016). In this study, persistent WCF was used because the majority of earlier studies used one-shot feedback, which did not have the intended impact on students' writing achievement and did not allow for the drawing of any meaningful findings. Thus, it could be stated that this study is seen to have filled the methodological and practical gaps left by earlier investigations.

Thesis Statement: The primary goal of this study was to establish the extent to which WCF contributes students' writing skills and determine whether there exists a statistically significant disparity in writing proficiency between groups that received direct and indirect WCF forms.

Research Questions: In this article, the following research issues were covered:

1- Is there any relationship between EFL learners' writing achievement and WCF in the Ethiopian University context?

2- Do EFL students who receive direct WCF along with a metalinguistic explanation and those who only receive indirect WCF show statistically significant variation in their writing performance?

Review of Literature: Along with changes in ways and procedures for teaching languages, there have also been considerable shifts in how people view the function of feedback in language lessons. According to evidence from the literature, there are still arguments and conflicts over the value of CF, and these disagreements and arguments are founded on a variety of studies that have methodological and practical problems in their conception. John Truscott is renowned for being at the centre of the controversy and holding the most extreme opinions about the minimization of the role of CF in classrooms. He argued against CF because of its potential psychological harm to students and because, in his opinion, feedback has a very small effect on how much they learn (Krashen, 1982). Contrary to the claims made by the aforementioned writers on the inefficiency and danger of CF, there are several ideas and hypotheses that identify CF's function in language training. The interaction approach to language acquisition and teaching, which emphasizes the necessity for error correction and eventually valued feedback to acquire a position in EFL classrooms, along with other theories that support the significance of CF, is primarily responsible for its relevance.

Methodology: A quasi-experimental research approach was adopted for this research.

Participants: There were a total of 128 people that took part in this investigation, making up of three full classes with 40 students in the direct group, 44 in the indirect group, and

another 44 in the comparative group. First-year university students in the 2021–2022 academic year at a university in Ethiopia's northwest made up the study's participants.

Data Collection: A pre-test and two post-tests were employed in this study to gather data. The study participants were consequently instructed to compose related self-descriptive paragraphs three times.

Data Analysis: In this study, the data collected from the pre-test, post-test one, and post-test two were subjected to analysis using a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 23.

Findings: Based on the findings, it can be said that WCF is a successful instructional method for enhancing students' writing abilities among Ethiopian first-year university students. The outcomes of this investigation demonstrate that if WCF is to ultimately help students improve their writing abilities, then learners must be given an explicit form of WCF. Based on the study's results, it can be stated that providing WCF is essential in the Ethiopian setting. In addition, learners could gain more from appropriately employing language structures if metalinguistic explanations are provided together with direct WCF. The results of the ANCOVA showed that WCF has a significant influence in improving students' writing abilities. Additionally, this research demonstrated that students in the direct WCF group did better in composing paragraphs than their counterparts in the indirect WCF group.

Conclusion: The researchers observed that the experimental groups that had received both direct and indirect WCF instructions outperformed both their pre-test test scores and their counterpart peers' results in the comparison group after completing the data analysis and getting the final results. The WCF had a considerable influence on the writing proficiency of Ethiopian first-year EFL university students, according to the study's findings. Offering WCF in all EFL classrooms can have a large impact on students' L2 writing development, which also has a major impact on other language acquisition abilities. This can also help students academically develop.

Article 10: “Investigating Learners’ Use and Understanding of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Writing: A Comparative Study in a Chinese English Writing Classroom” by Zhao, H. (2010).

Introduction: Peer feedback has been more prevalent in English as a ESL/EFL writing teaching during the past 20 years. This has sparked study, mostly through the eyes of socio-cultural theory, on whether and how peer evaluation helps ESL/EFL learners increase their writing skills. According to this theoretical model, human intellectual development, including language acquisition, may be socially and culturally influenced within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf, 2000; Villamil & Guerrero, 2006). According to the ZPD, ESL/EFL students may be able to assist their peers in improving their language skills. This idea has been supported by empirical analysis on the use of peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing, which mostly employed a comparison method between peer and instructor feedback. Tsui and Ng (2000) noted that the secondary ESL students in their study likewise employed more instructor than peer input in their redrafts, similar to college ESL/EFL students. Therefore, while editing their writings, ESL/EFL students prefer instructor comments over peer criticism.

Thesis Statement: This study highlights the importance of taking learners' comprehension of feedback into account as at least as equally essential element as learners' usage of feedback when comparing the relative worth of peer and instructor feedback for improving students' writing competency.

Research Questions: The three research questions in this research are as follows:

1- What type of written feedback did the students use more frequently in their revisions, peer feedback or teacher feedback?

2- Which type of written feedback did the learners understand better, peer feedback or teacher feedback?

3- What factors, if any, were reported to influence learners’ decision-making process of dealing with peer and teacher feedback?

Review of Literature: As Lantolf (2003) claims, successful internalization of a language is essential for efficient language development. No mental growth would be possible if internalization produced an exact copy of the external on the internal plane (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006, p.155). This is vital to the subject of writing and writing assessment since student comprehension of feedback from teachers and peers is crucial to the growth of ESL/EFL writing. Because of their emotive preference, students may use instructor feedback without fully comprehending it. Hyland (1998) reported that sometimes students rewrote their drafts with instructor input without fully comprehending the purpose of the feedback given. This was based on retrospective interviews on the use of teacher feedback in ESL learners' writing revisions. The ESL students in Goldstein's (2006) study similarly acknowledged in interviews that they occasionally used instructor criticism for their redrafts without realizing its importance.

Through interviews with six teachers and eighteen secondary school students in Hong Kong, Lee (2007) discovered that the students occasionally replicated teacher criticism into their revisions without considering the reasons behind it, which led to the students making the same errors in their subsequent writing assignments.

Methodology: Three research methods were adopted to answer these questions: (a) content evaluations of learners' first and revised drafts to examine learners' use of peer and teacher feedback, (b) stimulated recall interviews (SRIs) to investigate learners' understanding of peer and teacher feedback, and (c) interviews with the learners to look for factors that affected learners' responses to peer and teacher feedback. Learners' first and revised drafts, peer and instructor feedback on first drafts, student stimulated recall interview data, and semi-structured student interview data were all included in the overall data. Therefore, the study followed mixed method.

Participants: Eighteen second-year English majors in South China, ten of whom were female and eight of whom were male, made up the participants. According to the official data kept by the college, they received an average score of 120 out of 150 on the admission English exam, which generally equates to a score of 6-6.5 on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS).

Data Collection: SRIs were used in this study to assist students vocalize their comprehension of the feedback that was included in their revisions. According to Gass and Mackey (2000), SRIs are frequently used in educational research to examine what is going on in students' thoughts when they respond to a learning activity (such as an oral encounter, a piece to read, or the act of writing).

Data Analysis: In keeping with previous research, this case study research evaluated learners' first and revised papers in order to identify an instance of feedback that was integrated into revisions.

Findings: In this study, with a mean of 15.69, the students utilized 74 percent of teacher feedback instances while rewriting their writings. In contrast to teacher feedback, only 46% of peer feedback points (4.12 on average) were included in learners' revised writings. A paired-sample t-test found that the difference in the mean of the use frequency of peer and teacher feedback was significant: $t(25) = 5.55$, $p = 0.000$, with a mean difference of 11.57. This suggests that the students used teacher feedback significantly more frequently on average than peer feedback in the 26 assignments. 83 percent of the 107 peer feedback instances utilized in students' revisions were fully comprehended by the students. The small standard deviation (SD) value (2.16) also implies that the average quantity of peer input used and comprehended (3.42) changed little from assignment to assignment. Only 58 percent of teacher feedback instances (237 out of 408) were found to be employed with a true awareness of their usefulness. Despite the fact that the SD value of the mean of utilized and understood teacher feedback is higher than that of peer feedback, 4.63 indicates that most students comprehended less than 60% of the teacher feedback they included into their revisions. This study also gave place to inquisition of students' understandings of the given feedbacks. Students incorporated much more teacher feedback than peer feedback in their redrafts (74 percent vs. 46 percent in this research); nevertheless, they comprehended a higher percentage of peer feedback than teacher feedback in redrafts (83 percent vs. 58 percent). This was primarily because (a) compared to peer input, students appreciated teacher feedback higher and (b) L1 promoted mutual understanding in peer interactions.

Conclusion: The learners in this study assimilated a higher percentage of instructor feedback than peer feedback without fully comprehending it. This implies that if learners'

redrafts included equal amounts of teacher and peer feedback, learners would gain more information from peer feedback than from teacher feedback. Thus, this research suggests that the usage and comprehension of feedback by students should be considered as two equally essential elements in determining whether peer feedback should be included with teacher feedback in ESL/EFL writing classes. This study also highlights that when comparing the relative benefits of peer and instructor feedback for enhancing learners' writing competency, consideration should be given to learners' comprehension of feedback as at least as equally essential element as learners' usage of feedback.

Article 11: “Role of Teacher, Peer and Teacher-Peer Feedback in Enhancing ESL Students’ Writing” by Maarof, N. & Yamat, H. & Li, K. (2011).

Introduction: ESL writing is one of the core subjects covered in secondary schools teaching English as a second language in Malaysia. ESL writing, however, is a challenging ability to master since it entails more than just bringing together the proper grammatical forms (Chan, 2007). L2 writers frequently struggle with the L2, as well as writing skills in general, whereas first language (L1) writers have the luxury of time to strengthen their writing abilities. Therefore, it's crucial to comprehend what students think of feedback and how it may help writers create articles of higher quality. In writing classes, students frequently submit their first written drafts as their finished projects.

Due to time restrictions and the high student population, they seldom write many revisions of their essays. pupils' lack of enthusiasm, the presence of a large number of rural school students in the classroom, and the absence of process writing exercises. Shamsudin et al. (2010) points out that even though English is considered to be a secondary language in Malaysia, previous study has indicated that many Malaysian students' abilities to write in English is typically inadequate.

Thesis Statement: The study was conducted to see what students thought about the value of combining teacher and peer feedback in improving ESL writing, with the intention of using both types to assist students improve their writing skills.

Research Questions: The study identified the following questions:

1- What are the students' perception of the role of teacher feedback in enhancing ESL writing?

2- What are the students' perception of the use of peer feedback in enhancing ESL writing?

3- How do ESL students feel about the use of both teachers input and group feedback together?

Review of Literature: Feedback is essential to any type of learning in order to ensure efficacy (Duomont,2002). Mottet (2008) describes Teacher feedback is as information on the correctness, accuracy, or appropriateness of the receiver's prior performance provided by a source to the recipient. However, research indicates that most ESL writing teachers offer similar sorts of comments and are more focused on language-specific errors and issues than other forms and contents of teacher feedback. Therefore, it is not suprising that instructor remarks are frequently unclear, arbitrary, and difficult to understand (Zamel, 1985). As for peer feedback, In a different study (Zainurrahman,2010) including Indonesian EFL students, the findings showed that the students believed peer feedback to be a helpful technique to enhance their writing, even if the progress was only seen to be superficial. Peer feedback has several restrictions for three basic issues: Students frequently offer advise that does not help with rewriting, they tend to focus on surface problems rather than semantic or textual ones, and they struggle to evaluate the validity of their peers' criticism (Leki,1991). Overall, Maarof et al. (2011) summarizes that while the efficacy of instructor feedback in multiple-draft contexts seems to be well-established, the significance of peer feedback remains less certain, particularly in ESL writing. Jacobs (1998) adds, "*in more recent comparative studies, in terms of preference for type of feedback, many students showed preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback*" (as cited in Maarof, 2011, p. 31).

Methodology: To conduct the study, a survey research approach was adopted.

Participants: Students in Form Five from five of the 24 national secondary schools in a southern Malaysian state made up the study's participants.

Data Collection: The instruments included three open-ended questions, two multiple-choice questions, and 32 questions with a Likert scale of four options.

Data Analysis: The questionnaire's data were evaluated using percentages and frequencies.

Findings: Consequently of this research, only 3.3 percent (5 students) strongly disagreed that their teachers frequently emphasized the element of organization while providing feedback on their essay writing. Meanwhile, around 72 students (48.0 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that their classmates frequently emphasized the topic of grammar while offering feedback, while 78 students (52.0 percent) highly agreed or agreed. This demonstrates that the students appeared to respond positively to the importance of instructor feedback in improving ESL writing.

A total of 93.3 percent of the students (140 students) believed that using both sorts of feedback together was more useful for their ESL writing. Meanwhile, only 6.7% (10 students) thought the otherwise; preferring teacher feedback over student feedback for their ESL writing.

It was found out that the majority of students-roughly half believed their classmates did not offer favourable feedback on their essay writing as frequently as their teachers did. Among the pupils, more than half believed it was unnecessary for their classmates to correct all of their mistakes in writing. At the same time, they perceive peers to be beneficial in general since their peers may provide feedback on how to improve their writing. The findings suggest that the two sorts of feedback might complement each other and help ESL students improve their writing skills.

Conclusion: In general, students valued their instructors higher than their classmates in terms of providing feedback on their essays. In responding to their essay writing, the students felt teacher feedback to be a significant and required component. In comparison to teacher feedback, the data revealed that students had a generally favourable view of peer feedback in improving ESL writing. However, the students thought peer feedback was less helpful in improving their ESL writing. The students appeared to consider their peers to be on an equal level with them, and that their peers are less skilled at offering

feedback than their teachers. In comparison to their teachers, most students believe that their peers do not always point out or correct all errors while delivering written feedback. They also stated that their classmates simply offered general feedback on their papers. In other respects, the students had mostly positive thoughts about the combined use of teacher feedback and peer feedback in developing ESL writing. They appeared to feel that their teachers might support them in enhancing their ESL writing abilities. Also, the combination of both instructor and peer feedback together is more effective and plays a key influence in improving their ESL writing.

Article 12: "An Investigation of University EFL Students' Attitudes Toward Peer and Teacher Feedback" by Srichanyachon, N. (2012).

Introduction: A crucial aspect of writing development is receiving feedback. Since teachers possess a more advanced proficiency in the English language compared to their fellow learners, L2 students feel that teacher feedback is more accurate and reliable than peer input. However, Saito and Fujita (2004) examined the feedback given to EFL students at Japanese universities and discovered that instructors and classmates often graded students' work in the same way. Peer review performed less effectively with Chinese-speaking students, according to Nelson and Murphy (1993), since these students were less willing to acknowledge the right of other non-native English speakers to evaluate their writing. Peer comments have a number of issues, according to Leki (1990), including the fact that students frequently respond to surface faults rather than semantic or textual ones, offer suggestions that do not help with editing, and have trouble evaluating the validity of their peers' remarks. Therefore, although some students think that comments from teachers and peers may be helpful, opinions might vary.

Thesis Statement: The current study explores whether peer and instructor feedback may be helpful for improving writing competency. It is to sought to compare EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback and determine if one technique is more beneficial than the other based on the students' perspectives.

Research Questions: The purpose is to answer these two research questions:

1- To what extent do the students find the peer and teacher comments useful?

2- Which type of revision method do the students prefer?

Review of Literature: According to other studies on students' perceptions of feedback, L2 students used instructor input more frequently than peer feedback when revising their work (Zhang, 1995; Paulus, 1999; Tsui and Ng, 2000; Yang et al., 2006). Yet, in a number of comparative studies, peer comments have been shown to be helpful in L2 writing on the relative efficacy of teacher and peer feedback. Even while peer feedback has benefits, it can only be used if students are open to it. Chinese students studying English in Singapore were the subject of Hu's 2005 study, which revealed that the students valued peer feedback. However, L2 students from cultures where the instructor is the lone authoritative figure could believe that their classmates lack the information necessary to make intelligent judgments. According to the literature, teacher feedback is appreciated more highly than peer feedback, yet the peer assessor may gain from learning by seeing various instances or techniques.

Methodology: In the light of applied data collection and analysis methods, this research is a quantitative research.

Participants: 174 undergraduate students participating in a Fundamental English course were used as examples.

Data Collection: Data were gathered using face-to-face semi-structured interviews and student self-report questionnaires. Five-point Likert scale questions ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" made up the first section of the survey. Data were gathered by the written questionnaire and the interview in accordance to the study goal on the attitudes of students. For statistical analysis, the students' responses to the questionnaires were coded and entered into SPSS/Window 10. The qualitative data was from the students' replies to two open-ended questions.

Data Analysis: The criterion for statistical significance was established at alpha (α) < 0.05. Following the receipt of the completed surveys, the following procedures were taken to statistically analyse the data using SPSS/Window 10:

To determine average means, the data on attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback were employed.

Based on the criterion of X ±0.5SD, the means of attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback were divided into three categories and were given a range interpretation.

Through percentage and frequency analysis, the information from open-ended questions on students' views regarding peer and instructor feedback was examined.

At the conclusion of the study, semi-structured interviews were conducted to elicit the variables that influenced students' choices about the use of peer and teacher feedback in their revised writing.

Interviews were conducted with 18 student volunteers, or 10% of the participants. Analyses of the interviews were qualitative.

Findings: The findings of this study show that students preferred receiving teacher feedback because they knew their writing errors would be carefully and completely addressed. According to the majority of respondents (94.8 percent), the effectiveness of instructor feedback surpasses that of peer feedback. When asked which technique they would like to utilize in the future, the quantity of students who opted for instructor feedback (68.4%) exceeded the quantity of students who opted for peer feedback (31.6%).

Conclusion: Based on what the interviews revealed, the most significant drawbacks of peer feedback were a lack of language expertise and confidence in making comments and ideas. For students, teacher feedback was the most effective review approach since they had faith in the instructor's English knowledge and abilities. Some students, on the other hand, were stressed out by their teachers' criticisms and chose to discuss their difficulties with their peers rather than asking the teacher. Peer feedback aided in the development of writing skills. Reading the work of other students gave the pupils new ideas, inspiration, and drive to improve their own writing skills. Overall, teacher feedback was preferred by the majority of participants as a more effective and preferred revision method with the findings demonstrating that attitudes toward teacher feedback (4.39) were higher than attitudes toward peer feedback. This indicates that pupils had a more favourable attitude toward teacher feedback. Peer review, on the other hand, should be introduced as an important complementary source of feedback in EFL classrooms because it will provide students with additional benefits such as increasing their understanding of what makes

writing successful, developing critical thinking, and encouraging greater responsibility for their writing.

Article 13: “Effects of Teacher and Peer Feedback on Students’ Writing at Secondary Level” by Ghani, M. & Asgher, T. (2012).

Introduction: Ghani & Asgher (2012) believe that giving feedback is an essential part of developing writing skills and students become conscious of their areas for growth as well as the breadth and depth of their learning. Peer feedback is a relatively recent technique in Pakistan. Mostly, teachers merely offer feedback to students. However, it has been noted that at our government-run schools, groups are formed in the classroom and are supervised by group leaders. The usefulness of teacher and peer feedback in promoting writing revisions and enhancing students' writing abilities, as well as student attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback, need to be further investigated, particularly with a focus on the educational system in Pakistan.

Thesis Statement: This study worked on the effectiveness of teacher feedback together with peer feedback on the written performance of the students and also examined students’ attitude towards these feedback models.

Research Questions: The study has 5 research questions that are:

1- What is the effect of feedback on the writing performance of the students?

2- Which type of feedback do students value and incorporate more in their writings?

3- How do students feel about receiving comments from instructors?

4- How do students feel about giving and receiving comments from their peers?

5- Do peer and teacher feedback and revisions motivate the students and facilitate them in their writing practices?

Review of Literature: Peer feedback has been proven to have several advantageous effects on students' writing abilities in studies on the subject that have been conducted from a range of perspectives. Beaven (2012) noted that peer revision activities encouraged the

growth of interpersonal skills, encouraged students to take risks while they write their piece of writings, and gave them confidence in doing so. According to Hanson and Vogt (1987), the ESL students' writing benefitted from the peer feedback approach. They believed that it was crucial to get students involved in the writing process. Tsui and Ng (2000) discovered that when peer feedback is simple to comprehend and infer, students find it beneficial in improving their work. They also discovered that uncertainty is caused by feedback that is too generic, too imprecise, and has too many corrections.

The results of recent comparative research favour teacher feedback. The comparison study by Connor and Asenavage (1994) revealed that the impact of peer feedback was minimal. When Zhang (1995) looked at the distinction between peer and self-feedback, he discovered that there was no noticeable distinction.

The effectiveness of contextualized guided writing tasks in helping young non-native speakers comprehend grammatical principles and their attitudes toward peer and teacher assessment was investigated by Chen and Lin (2009). The students acknowledged the value of peer feedback even though they significantly preferred feedback from teachers to peer feedback. Although some students indicated that peer feedback was difficult, they both forms of input were appreciated by the learners.

Methodology: This study employed an experimental approach and is both qualitative and quantitative in design.

Participants: This research included 100 students. They were 14 years old on average.

Data Collection: As data collecting instruments, a survey questionnaire evaluating students' attitudes, pre-test and post-test, and written remarks from students regarding the entire activity were employed. There are 30 questions in the survey. The following items have replies on a 5-point Likert scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral/ undecided, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

Data Analysis: The pre-test and post-test findings reveal a substantial rise in scores from the pre-test (M= 8.33, SD= 2.425) to the post-test (M= 11.52, SD=2.181) t (99) = -11.951, p.0005 (2-tailed). With a 95 percent confidence interval of -3.720 to -2.660, the mean increase in scores was -3.19.

Findings: According to the findings, peer and instructor feedback aided learners in improving their English writing. The ESL learners' performance improved after getting peer and teacher feedback, and their performance was better in the post-test than in the pre-test. Learners were also enthusiastic about the entire exercise as well as both sorts of feedback, namely peer and teacher feedback. The researcher examined ESL learners' revisions in the revised drafts to observe their incorporation of peer and teacher feedback. The mean score for incorporating peer feedback was 4.13, and it was 4.61for incorporating teacher feedback. The number of peer feedback was found to be lower than the number of teacher feedback. It was contributing to see that peers picked up on problems in spelling, tense, subject-verb agreement, capitalization, and the use of vocabulary. The words were misspelled by the students. The teacher, in addition to these, identified several other surface and content-level mistakes and offered students with feedback on grammar and writing content, which ESL students incorporated into their revised drafts.

As for the preferences in general, students valued teacher feedback and preferred it over peer feedback with the mean score of 4.57 and SD=0.5847, which is higher than the middle point 3.00 in 5-point Likert scale. Overall, there was a noticeable distinction in students' attitudes towards peer feedback (M=3.915, SD=0.57662) and teachers' feedback (M=4.5717, SD=0.58472) t (99) = -12.135, p<.0005 (2-tailed). Overall, according to the findings of students' written remarks, 70% of the students preferred peer feedback and 90% of the students liked teacher feedback.

Conclusion: After the research, it was understood that students always regarded their instructor as the most knowledgeable individual who could point out and correct their errors. Peer feedback, like teacher feedback, grew in importance and it was also seen to be advantageous and useful for ESL students. Also, according to the findings, ESL students had a favourable attitude toward both sorts of feedback and incorporated both types of feedback into their writings, although they had a more positive attitude about teacher feedback.

Article 14: "Peer Review Versus Teacher Feedback in Process Writing: How Effective?" by Ekşi, G. (2012).

Introduction: The mental process of creating ideas, considering how to communicate them, and organizing them into phrases and paragraphs that will be more understandable to the reader is just as important as the physical act of writing, according to (Sokolik, 2003, as cited in Ekşi, 2012, p. 33). Prewriting, organizing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing are all interactive stages needed for successful writing. The language instructor serves as a facilitator, a guide, a source of feedback, and an assessor while instructing students on how to write in their second language. This study is done by working through teacher feedback by blending it with peer review to see their different effects in writing classes in which a process oriented approach is favoured. The starting point of this study is the burden on writing instructors' shoulders stemming from having to deal with two or more writing classes as instructors and many papers they had to return every week.

Thesis Statement: This study aims to determine how peer review and instructor feedback affect students' writing abilities in the setting of academic writing.

Research Questions: The research questions go as follows:

1- Will students be able to make helpful comments when they respond to a peer's paper?

2- Will the group that engages in peer review see more gains than the control group that got instructor scaffolding during the writing process?

3- Will the students be allowed to offer ideas for the written work's content rather than only concentrating on minor issues?

4- Will peer review ease the workload of the teacher?

5- What do students think about the value of peer review?

Review of Literature: Seow (2002) claims that an important method for fostering the writing process is the teacher's response to the students' writing. Because the teacher is the "expert" for students and their concerns about "grading" reinforce the instructor's authority, the input from the teacher may prevent the student writer from taking the initiative to accept or reject improvements. Peer review, however, may be beneficial since it provides student authors with extra alternatives to take into account while revising their

works. Kroll (2001) describes peer review as "*simply putting students in groups and then having each student read and react to the strengths and weaknesses of each other's papers*". Peer review is not designed to replace instructor input; rather, it is meant to supplement it. Students may become more detailed and helpful in their replies to a peer's essay with instruction, direction, and practice. It is a potent method for helping ESL/EFL students get better at writing (Min, 2006).

Writing is viewed as a nonlinear, iterative process that entails receiving feedback on several drafts in the process-oriented method. Feedback can be obtained from several sources, such as oneself, peers, or instructors. Patridge (1983) observed more advancements in the group that had teacher comments. Zhang (1995) investigated several feedback sources and discovered that instructor feedback was more effective than peer feedback, self-feedback, and other sources. On the other hand, Hedgcock and Leftwits (1992) discovered that students who heard oral input from peers performed much better than those who heard evaluation from teachers at the conclusion of the semester. (as cited in Ekşi, 2012, p. 35).

Methodology: In this study, a quantitative methodology was adopted.

Participants: The research investigation was carried out in the year 2012 with 46 upper intermediate English majors enrolled in freshmen Academic writing classes at a state university. They were divided into two groups of 23 people.

Data Collection: When composing their work, one group used peer revision and the other used teacher feedback. Frequency counts from 230 texts authored by two groups of students were used to compile the statistics. Peer replies to early drafts, changes, and instructor comments on the final versions were also evaluated and recorded in order to get student thoughts on the peer review process.

Data Analysis: Within the nine-week period, the two study groups completed five writing tasks (narrative, argumentative, cause-and-effect, process, and comparison). They also got writing training in rhetorical styles. Throughout the five writing tasks, the peer review group offered input on initial drafts to one another and only got teacher comments on the final document. The results of student reflections on journal peer review were also

examined. The other group, meanwhile, got feedback from their instructors to enhance their first drafts into the final versions. To be more specific, during individual conferences, the instructor read the first drafts and gave indirect feedback, recommendations for enhancement, and general, favourable remarks on the entire work.

Findings: When the research is complete, it was observed that the peer reviewing group did not improve more than the group that got instructor feedback on earlier drafts, but they did not do worse. Even though the instructors were hesitant that the peers wouldn't be able to go beyond surface level corrections, the student writers' performance appears to be unaffected by the source of feedback as a variable. They were able to provide both deep and surface level ideas. Regardless of who offered the feedback, both groups produced fairly comparable results during the study. As for the workload of the instructors, it can be said that students alleviate the burden of the instructors since peers completed 57.25 percent of all corrective work, while the instructor completed 42.74 percent. The peers were able to give useful criticism at both levels, while the teacher primarily dealt with the final manuscripts when students were creating the earlier drafts. The study's most notable finding is the remarkable resemblance in performance seen among the two groups; the peer reviewing group and the group that studied with teacher feedback. Also, the learners' reflection journals indicate that they loved the experience and that evaluating each other's drafts helped them better grasp the writing process. They believed it provided them with valuable insight into the writing process.

Conclusion: According to this study, the pupils demonstrated the capacity to independently initiate the process of revising and enhancing their own work without receiving feedback from the teacher by depending on themselves and their peers.

Overall, the outcomes of the research were nearly equal for both groups. Teacher feedback is an effective source of feedback for students. Yet, peer review looks to be a viable alternative to teacher comments during the essay writing process. It seems that the source of the feedback had a negligible impact on this investigation. In order to compare the outcomes, this research recommends that writing instructors employ peer review more in their seminars and communicate the data with other faculty members.

Article 15: “The Relative Effects of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Improvement in EFL Students’ Writing Ability” by Ruegg, R. (2014).

Introduction: The question of whether instructor feedback enhances L2 writers' abilities has generated a lot of discussion (e.g. Ferris 1999; Truscott 1996, 2007, as cited in Ruegg, 2014, p. 73). The process method, according to Keh (1990), entails prewriting and the creation of three or more drafts. By definition, creating more than one draft requires revising the ideas presented and/or altering the language used. Due to this, it is challenging to justify a control group that receives no feedback in between versions in studies on the impact of teacher feedback within the process approach to writing. Students in the two groups may grow differently in their writing competence resulting from peer and instructor feedback that focuses on various areas of writing. For instance, it has been proposed that instructors may concentrate on concerns that are on the surface, but peers may pay more attention to issues that are at the meaning-level (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006, as cited in Ruegg, 2014, p.74).

The forms of feedback provided by peers and the teacher were also examined in order to ascertain whether variations in these sorts of feedback may have caused noticeably different improvements in writing ability.

Thesis Statement: This study aims to assess how much influence teacher and peer feedback had on students' writing abilities.

Research Questions: Two research questions were assigned for this research:

1- Is there any distinction between the amount of improvement in writing ability achieved by EFL university students who receive systematic teacher feedback on their writing compared with those who give and receive systematic peer feedback?

2- Is there any distinction in the types of feedback students received from teachers compared to from peers?

Review of Literature: The most crucial distinction to be made is between improving a piece of writing through editing and improving a learner's writing competence, which can

only be assessed by later writing. According to several studies (Ashwell, 2000; Bitchener, 2008; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001), teacher feedback had a considerable impact on successive versions of the same piece of work. But in order to fully understand how written feedback affects students' capacity to write better, how it affects subsequent writing assignments must be also taken into account. A pre-test and a post-test must be performed to assess the impact of feedback on improvements in writing proficiency.

Pre-test and post-test study designs, however, have not frequently been employed in studies on written feedback in writing. Most written feedback studies that have employed a pre-test, post-test research design have been experimental studies where students only received feedback once before assessing its impact (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009, 2010a, 2010b; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Sheen, 2007; Sheen, Wright, & Moldowa, 2009; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2011).

Peer feedback has attracted a lot of interest, especially as an alternative to teacher feedback, in both first language and second language writing schools (Ferris, 2003). Leki (1990) notes that in general, peer feedback offers greater benefits compared to comments provided by instructors in research conducted in the L1 environment. Peer feedback encourages more meaning-level revisions, whereas teacher feedback encourages more surface-level revisions, according to several studies that looked into the revisions made by students after receiving either peer or teacher feedback (Ruegg, 2015).

Yang et al. (2006); Asenavage, 1994; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992). It is unclear, however, whether distinct revision types were brought about by various forms of feedback or by some other aspect, such as students giving peer feedback on rhetorical difficulties and instructor input on linguistic ones more weight.

Methodology: For this research, quantitative method was adopted.

Participants: The study was conducted with the participation of 51 second year students in four classes in the English department at the university. 28 of these students participated in the peer feedback group, while the remaining 23 participated in the instructor feedback group.

Data Collection: Over the course of an academic year, one group received teacher feedback on each preliminary draft, while the other group offered and received peer feedback on each preliminary draft. Gain scores were calculated by deducting the pre-test results from the post-test results to see if the feedback interventions had any impact on the students' writing skills.

Data Analysis: Gain scores were determined by subtracting the pre-test scores from the post-test scores to see whether the feedback treatments had any impact on the students' ability to write better. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was then carried out. Later on, a Mann-Whitney U Test was carried out to see whether there were any appreciable differences between the sorts of feedback provided by peers and the teacher.

Findings: Upon the conclusion of the study, it was seen that there was no statistically significant disparity in the degree of improvement for organization, vocabulary, content, or total essay scores, the teacher feedback group outperformed the peer feedback group in grammar scores. As a matter of fact, providing pupils with feedback from their teachers may improve their writing and help them recognize their errors. Teacher feedback can be more beneficial than peer feedback in terms of improving written grammar when students are given the opportunity to choose the type of feedback they want. The findings imply that while writing in English, teacher feedback outperforms peer feedback in terms of improving students' grammatical competence.

Conclusion: According to the conclusions of this study, it has been demonstrated that teacher feedback alone can improve students' written skills, but peer feedback alone may not be able to do so. In instances where students are afforded the autonomy to select the preferred kind of feedback, it has been shown that instructor feedback yields more advantages compared to peer feedback in terms of improving written grammar. Additionally, students should get both peer and teacher comments on their writing, with instructors concentrating on both grammar and content and peers focusing on other characteristics such as organization and academic style.

Article 16: “The Effect of Combined Peer-Teacher Feedback on Thai Students’ Writing Accuracy” by Nguyen, T. (2018).

Introduction: Thai students learn English as a foreign language and they are claimed to have persistent trouble in writing since writing is not systematically taught as a topic (Chamcharatsri, 2010; Pawapatcharaudom, 2007; Puengpipattrakul, 2013; Srichanyachon, 2011). The research on Thai students' writing in English revealed that these students were unclear about or lacked comprehensive awareness of the norms of the target language, which resulted in their incorrect application, just like EFL students from other nations (Wu & Garzar, 2014). Nguyen (2017, 2018) created a combined peer-teacher feedback approach based on Rollinson's (2005) recommendations for doing peer feedback in her paragraph writing classes in an effort to aid Thai university students in improving their writing. According to Nguyen's (2017, 2018) findings, this combined feedback approach is successful because of the students' favourable views about it, the value of peer comments, the high percentages of feedback assimilation, and the good overall writing scores. These Thai university students were discovered to actively participate and engage in this interactive learning exercise and subsequently enhance their English writing, despite their claimed passive learning styles and ingrained teacher-centred pedagogies. This study specifically examined how the students rectified each error, how challenging each error was for them, and what methods they use to address each one of them. It will first adopt this feedback model to teach another group of Thai students in the same context to validate its efficacy.

Thesis Statement: This study examines how the combined peer-teacher feedback model created by Nguyen (2017, 2018) impacted the number of writing errors university students made and how and also partially reflect how in-service instructors modify their teaching strategies and instructional resources to improve the writing proficiency of EFL learners.

Research Questions: Thus, the study's research questions were as follows:

1- Does this combined peer-teacher feedback model still work with another group of Thai students?

2- How does this feedback model help the students reduce their writing errors?

3- How do this group of students respond to each error in this feedback model?

Review of Literature: One of the most challenging skills to master is writing in English, especially for EFL learners as it requires them to possess expertise in several language-related domains, as well as their potential to effectively convey their ideas via the use of suitable language and communication techniques. (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Hyland, 2003). Language appears to be the most challenging aspect for EFL writers out of the three components of writing—content, structure, and language. Their inadequate language expertise, according to Silva (1993) and Weigle (2002), is the root of their unsuccessful writing.

Although errors were once the undesirable issues that teachers worked to avoid, they are now seen as indicators of the learning progress made by students as they employ different learning strategies to test their hypotheses regarding the underlying rules of the target language (Brown, 2007). In order to help EFL students successfully learn how to write in English, several studies have looked into the error types and sources that they make (Abushihab, EL-Omari, & Tobat, 2011; Camilleri, 2004; Chan, 2004; Khanlarzadeh & Nemati, 2016; Kim, 2001; Liu, 2013; Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007; Zheng & Park, 2013). The majority of research revealed that inter-lingual and intralingual interferences are the two primary causes of the writing errors that EFL learners make, in addition to the various frequencies of grammatical, lexical, semantic, and mechanical errors they commit. The former refers to learners' interference in their L1 when they meet a new language because they have a tendency to consciously or subconsciously transfer their L1 knowledge to the performance of the target language (Ellis, 2008). On the other hand, intralingual interferences refer to developmental sources of mistakes such overgeneralization, insufficient application of norms, and incorrect analogies of language equivalency. It is, in essence, the outcome of learners' insufficient proficiency in the target language (Ellis, 2008; Ferris, 2002).

Methodology: As the research used a survey and a semi-structured interview, it followed a mixed method.

Participants: This research was done in a small institution in Thailand with 48 Students majoring in English who gathered on a weekly basis for a 14-week academic semester for 150 minutes each. Upper elementary or pre-intermediate English competence was required of the participants.

Data Collection: A survey on the difficulty levels of each error, what strategies they employed to fix each error, and their evaluation of the revisions were conducted with the entire class at the end of the course, and a focus group semi-structured interview was conducted with twenty volunteering students to learn more about how these students responded to each error.

Data Analysis: In the first five weeks of the course, the researcher taught the students the fundamental elements of an academic paragraph by utilizing the feedback model created by Nguyen (2017, 2018). For seven themes selected from the course book, students were required to write seven full paragraphs (W1–W7) of 150 words each from weeks six through fourteen. Three classmates and the writer reviewed the first drafts in class, and the teacher evaluated their second and third drafts at home using the same instructions and symbols. These lessons were provided during the 45-minute follow-up exercises that were conducted at each session's opening through the experiment period In an attempt to assist the students in rectifying their own errors (weeks 6-14). Once the course finished, the frequencies of each error in the total were calculated and reviewed for each draft and assignment. Additionally, the overall amounts of each sort of error were contrasted with those from their final exam.

Findings: Although an entirely new group of Thai students were taught using this mixed feedback methodology, its efficacy was consistent with that shown in Nguyen (2017, 2018). Despite being associated with teacher-centred pedagogies and passive learning styles (Chamcharatsri, 2010; Kewara & Prabjandee, 2018; McDonough, 2004; Root, 2016), the students in this study also demonstrated favourable attitudes toward and active engagement in the feedback activities. Additionally, over the course of seven compositions, this study discovered a consistent and striking decline in mistakes committed by these pupils (Table 3). Only 9.1% of the overall mistakes (23.3% of the total) were discovered in the writers' subsequent writings (W6-7). Additionally, from 4.2% to 1.7% in W1, the percentages of their incorrect corrections decreased substantially.

Conclusion: At the end of the study, the frequent follow-up activities and the teacher's regular editing of their work helped these students' writing develop. Moreover, students displayed favourable attitudes toward and active participation in the feedback activities.

Furthermore, there was a consistent decline in the total number of errors made by these Thai students over the course of seven compositions, which was due to a persistent decrease in the frequency of practically all errors noted in the study. The combined peer-teacher feedback strategy was successful in Nguyen's study in engaging Thai pupils. Ferris (2002) argues, in particular, that students whose errors are regularly corrected engage in a more profound kind of language processing when they self-edit their work, leading to higher long-term increase in accuracy. In fact, as stated in the interviews with the students in this study and those in Nguyen (2017), they reported that this combined peer teacher feedback model not only lessened their pressure but also maintained their enthusiasm for writing and performing peer review as they knew that their writing and comments would be checked and verified by the teacher, respectively. Additionally, it was discovered that this progress was mostly due to the regular instructor explanations, clarifications, and discussions, as well as the teacher's feedback after that of peers. These students' preferred method for resolving errors of all degrees of difficulty was also consulting with the teacher.

4.1.2 Review of the master's theses

Thesis 1: "EFL University Students' Attitudes Toward Teacher Feedback and its Significance" by Yalvaç, F. (2014).

Introduction: The capacity to express oneself through writing in a second language is both crucial and demanding competence that should be learned while in the process of studying English. Because writing in an L2 is more demanding and challenging than writing in one's L1, kids who are learning to write in an L2 may require a teacher's undivided attention throughout this time. Methodologists and education experts have been studying instructor feedback and students' attitudes toward getting error correction for many years in order to draw conclusions. Some of them, like Lalande (1982) and Ferris and Roberts 4 (2001), asserted the necessity of teacher assistance and feedback as well as the possibility for students to develop their L2 writing through instructors' corrective comments. According to certain studies, such as Truscott (1996), teacher feedback in L2 is ineffective and detrimental to pupils, and should be abandoned as a result. In other words, there is disagreement among scholars as to the appropriateness of teachers' remedial feedback in L2 writing classes. In this study, the effect of teacher feedback on

EFL university students along with their preferences and attitudes towards teacher feedback are discussed.

Thesis Statement: The purpose of this study is to determine if EFL students, regardless of gender, have favorable views toward instructors' corrective feedback. It also seeks to determine whether they prefer various forms of teacher feedback depending on their L2 writing skill and the timing of the feedback.

Hypotheses: The hypotheses of the study are as follows:

1- Students are open to receiving criticism from teachers since most L2 students believe they require direction while writing in English.

2- There is no distinction in how male and female university students feel about receiving helpful feedback from their instructors.

3- Students could favour particular types of instructor feedback.

Research Questions: The study was guided by the following 3 research questions:

1- How do Turkish EFL university students feel about lecturers giving them constructive criticism in writing classes?

2- Are there any distinctions in how Turkish university students who identify as male and female feel about receiving feedback from instructors?

3- What kind of error correction do Turkish university students prefer in L2 writing classes?

Review of Literature: Writing is one of a language's abilities, and similar to other languages, it plays a significant role in the curriculum for teaching English. It is important to note that the urge to communicate with others serves as an inspiration for writing. People should consider their attitudes and sentiments about writing because, according to Greenberg (1988), their writing habits and practices are frequently influenced by their views about writing. In general English courses, they are able to write whatever is needed

for the course activities, but they may struggle to complete an academic writing assignment (Glendinning and Mantell, 1983).

According to Greenberg (1988), people should consider their attitudes and sentiments regarding writing since they frequently influence their writing habits and practices. Writing is a result of tactics used to carry out the composing process, which entails producing a text piece by piece, in accordance with Hedge (2001, p.302). In addition, Harmer (2004) said that even writing in one's first language is difficult and that students rarely write in their first language. Therefore, students do not frequently engage in L2 writing. As a result, there are inequalities in the students' perspectives on English writing. Accordingly, it is hypothesized that teacher-student cooperation in L2 writing classes will increase the students' success in producing error-free written texts. The researcher assumes that EFL university students have some challenges in the process of learning writing skills in L2 learning classes, which inevitably affect students' achievements in L2 writing.

Methodology: This research is a quasi-experimental one that determines whether there is the intended outcome of an intervention on the participants of the study.

Participants: 93 freshmen who took a two-hour English course each week throughout the 2011–2012 academic year were the individuals involving in the research.

Data Collection: It was carried out via two questionnaires in which some parts were composed of five point Likert-type items and an interview which includes three questions. To introduce the students to specific English grammatical structures and draw their attention to them, the researcher offered them two brief texts the initial stage of this research that had errors. Since it was a quasi-experimental research, the aim was not comparing the two groups, so the study did not include a control group. Instead, she studied on two groups which showed the same characteristics (they were both A2 level students). The students were then given instructions on how to fix the problems in these writings. The second phase required students to compose a brief statement on the town or city that they preferred. In the third section of the post-test questionnaire, the researcher included the fourth section of Diab's (2005) questionnaire, in which she said a phrase that had an English grammatical error and was assessed in various ways by several teachers.

After the post-test questionnaire, the researcher conducted 14 interviews with students from the aforementioned classes. These interviews served to increase the validity and dependability of the responses the students supplied on the questionnaires.

Data Analysis: First, the researcher looked over the few paragraphs that were handed out to the class to realize whether they could accurately identify any grammatical problems. The written data, which consisted of the students' written texts (both first and final drafts), was then examined. The researcher then translated the questions she asked and the students' responses into English after transcribing the interviews she had with the students. Finally, SPSS was used to evaluate all the data acquired from the surveys.

Findings: The findings of the study revealed that a large percentage of participants had a good perception of writing in L2 and obtaining corrective feedback from professors in L2 writing sessions. In the pre-test assessment, 48.8% of the students strongly agreed that the teacher should specify grammatical errors. According to the post-test results, this percentage is 64.3% As for the preferences, the data analysis of the pre-test questionnaire revealed that 32.1% of the participants opted for direct feedback, 51.2% of them opted for indirect feedback with some clues, and 16.7% of them opted for their teachers only to indicate the place of the error in their written works. According to the results of the present investigation, students wished to get implicit (indirect) feedback in order to correct their errors through self-editing on the first draft. The results confirm the third hypothesis of our study, which states that students might prefer several types of teacher feedback, including explicit teacher feedback and implicit teacher feedback, according to the descriptive statistics collected from SPSS analysis and student interviews.

Conclusion: The majority of the participants in the survey had good attitudes regarding teacher feedback, according to the findings. Additionally, by offering instructors' corrective feedback, students will be more responsible for their own self-correction, resulting in active involvement in L2 writing classes. As a result, students can benefit from teacher feedback in L2 writing classes by using it to help them get better at writing. Also, it was concluded from the research that both male and female participants favoured the same kind of feedback model. Therefore, it is unnecessary to be hesitant while offering feedback in writing classes. Overall, it may be argued that corrective feedback from teachers is a crucial component of L2 writing classes.

Thesis 2: “Video Inclusive Portfolio(VIP) as a New Form of Teacher Feedback in Teaching Writing” by Özkul, S. (2014).

Introduction: Learners must be able to "*produce grammatically accurate sentences, connect and punctuate those sentences, select and maintain an appropriate style, signal the direction that the message is taking, and anticipate the readers' likely questions so as to be able to structure the message accordingly*" (Thornbury, 2006, p. 248) in order to successfully complete a writing task. Whether the feedback may come in a variety of forms such as negative, positive, explicit or implicit, correction is the main goal of all.

With the development of computer technology and its current impact on language acquisition, numerous tools are in our lives to improve the efficiency, enjoyment, and favourableness of teaching and studying language. In this way, video capture systems could provide possibilities for language learners to develop their writing abilities through films that are captured and in which their teachers remark on or correct any flaws or errors/mistakes the students make.

Thesis Statement: This study aims to investigate how students interact with video inclusive writing portfolios (VIPs) and what impact the VIPs have on students' writing improvement. It was aimed to see how students use teacher feedback in two distinct formats: video feedback and traditional feedback and to see their impacts on learners.

Research Questions: The study sought answers to the following research question:

1- Can video feedback replace traditional feedback for EFL writers?

2- Is video feedback more effective than standard feedback in helping students make corrections to their following drafts?

3- Do learners' future drafts of their work reflect explicit, simple mechanical, complicated mechanical, and organizational input more accurately depending on whether they received it via video or conventional feedback?

4- How do students perceive video feedback for EFL writing?

Review of Literature: Feedback, according to Keh (1990), is "*input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision*" and she explains that because it is a crucial part of multiple-draft writing environments, "*feedback is a fundamental element of a process approach to writing*" (p. 294). Both the quality of feedback and the way in which students use it are crucial. In order to better understand the two feedback channels—teacher and peer feedback—researchers and theorists have also looked into their nature and efficacy. Mendonca and Johnson (1994) wanted to find out how L2 non-native speakers of English use the feedback from their peers and how they see it. Peer reviews were integrated into learners' written papers in 53% of cases, according to examination of peer reviews, written papers, and post-interviews. Peer feedback may potentially have disadvantages as well. Rollinson (2005) examines three issues with peer feedback:

> 1) peer feedback may consume a lot of time which can be used for learning activities, and training the learners to provide peer reviews also requires some considerable time; 2) some students may need persuasion to get them value peer feedback, some others may feel uncomfortable due to their personalities or cultural backgrounds, and/or the age or the language proficiency level of learners may also outweigh the benefits of peer feedback; and finally 3) the teacher may feel uncomfortable to leave such an important and demanding. (p.14)

Methodology: Over the course of five weeks, an experimental design was used to investigate the responses to research questions.

Participants: The study was carried out at Kadir Has University's English Preparatory School in Istanbul, Turkey. To discover whether computer technology might be used as a new method, two groups of learners were constituted by the researcher: an experimental group and a control group. 24 students made up the control group, referred to as BP3, of whom 14 were male and 10 were female. On the other side, there were 23 pupils in the experimental group, referred to as BP1, of which 14 were female and 9 were male. The participants in the study were individuals in the young adult age group, with ages spanning from 17 to 23 years old. Their socio-economic and educational backgrounds were all diverse.

Data Collection: The data was gathered in three stages. To begin, the amount of total correction used by the experimental and control groups was computed and assessed using the Mann-Whitney U test. Video feedback enabled learners to incorporate more corrections into their future versions, according to the findings. Second, the study looked at whether video feedback helped learners incorporate more correction for different types of input (e.g., explicit feedback, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback). A second Mann-Whitney U test investigated how two groups of students used input from different categories. While there was no statistically significant difference in the kind of feedback (video feedback vs. traditional feedback) for the explicit feedback category, video feedback allowed learners to absorb more correction in terms of basic mechanical, complicated mechanical, and organizational input. Finally, at the conclusion of the investigation, a questionnaire was given to the experimental group to explore their perceptions.

Data Analysis: The questionnaire and the student drafts served as the two sources of information for this study. The descriptive and inferential statistical analysis program SPSS 18 was used to evaluate the data from these two data sources. To determine which treatment—VIPs or conventional feedback—performed better, two Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted as the first stage in the study. Two Mann-Whitney U tests were run as part of the analysis's first phase to determine whether approach—VIPs or conventional feedback—was more effective. To investigate the perspectives of the students in the experimental group, a more qualitative analysis of the questionnaire data was conducted (sub-research question c).

Findings: The results of the survey also indicated that video feedback might be a feasible option as a feedback in teaching writing skills. It was discovered that the form of feedback had no impact on how well learners absorbed explicit teacher feedback into subsequent drafts.

Conclusion: Overall, the findings suggest that any type of feedback received, whether VIPs or conventional, has an impact on how correctly input from different categories is incorporated into learners' subsequent drafts. On top of that, it was concluded that VIPs assisted student writers more since the researcher was conversing with them, describing where the errors originated and hinting how they could be fixed. In all forms of feedback

as explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical and organizational, VIPs were shown to be more productive in motivating learners to include more correction into subsequent drafts when the quantity of teacher feedback and learner correction were assessed.

Thesis 3: “An Investigation of two Teacher Feedback Procedures in EFL Classes: Form-Focused and Content-Focused Feedback” by Abdioğlu, M. (2019).

Introduction: One of the most crucial main language skills is writing, which is essential for academic achievement as well. Effective writing is a talent that is important for both native speakers of a language and non-native speakers who are learning that language as a second or foreign language. In EFL writing classes, teacher written feedback is crucial to the learning process of the students. Teacher feedback aids students in many ways. Students might identify their strengths and weaknesses, and as a result, they are given advice and training on how to write more effectively (Bitchener, 2018: 1). There are numerous problems concerning how to provide appropriate feedback, and it continues to be difficult for many writing teachers in a variety of circumstances (Hyland, 2009: 72). Through a quasi-experimental approach, the current study seeks to identify which of the aforementioned feedback strategies improves students' writing ability generally, their attitudes toward writing, and their level of writing anxiety.

Thesis Statement: This study compares the impacts of traditional form-focused written feedback versus content-focused written feedback on student papers in order to investigate the efficacy of getting two different forms of written instructor feedback on EFL students' overall writing ability.

Research Questions: The study attempts to answer one major, five minor research questions:

1- What is the role of form-focused and content-focused written teacher feedback on improving EFL preparatory school students’ writing abilities?

2- Is there a statistically significant difference between writing performance of students receiving form-focused feedback and those receiving content-focused feedback based on the type of feedback they receive?

3- Are there any attitudinal differences between form-focused feedback group and content-focused feedback group towards writing in English based on the type of feedback they receive?

4- Are there any differences between control group and experimental group in terms of writing anxiety experienced by students based on the type of feedback they receive?

5- What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of form-focused written teacher feedback?

6- What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of content-focused written teacher feedback?

Review of Literature: Writing and writing ability are given a lot of attention in academic settings where an international language is employed since written texts are markers of student performance in tests, papers, and assignments (Cumming, 2006: 10). Teaching writing has always been a substantial topic in academia. Since ESL/EFL writing emerged as a field of study in education in the 1980s, theories regarding writing in L2 have been around, and they are regarded as complementing one another to understand students' learning needs and teachers' obligations to provide effective writing instruction (Hyland, 2003: 2). Being not separated, these theories have made a great contribution while they follow each other. According to Hyland (2009: 7), there are three main approaches to writing: theories about texts, ideas about the procedures used to produce texts, and beliefs about readers who give writing a social dimension.

Methodology: By design, this study combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, or mixed methods, to assess the efficacy of two types of written feedback from teachers: form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback, as well as students' perceptions of the type of feedback they received. The study is conducted using a quasi-experimental non-equivalent control group design, which includes both a control and an experimental group.

Participants: Two introductory level classes at the Department of Foreign Languages, Karadeniz Technical University (KTU), were used for the study. For this quasi-experimental study, convenience sampling was used to enlist a total of 35 students

enrolled in English as a Foreign Language at the Department of Foreign Languages of KTU, Trabzon, during the autumn semester of the 2018-2019 academic year.

Data Collection: The data was gathered using a variety of qualitative and quantitative data gathering approaches for this study, including writing tests, a writing attitude questionnaire, a second language writing anxiety assessment, and semi-structured interviews. A writing pre-test was used during the first week of the research to evaluate students' writing abilities and see whether there were any notable differences between the two groups. Both groups were given the writing attitude questionnaire once again at the end of the eight weeks of therapy with various written instructor feedback in order to compare the findings of the pre-test and post-test in order to observe changes in the students' attitudes toward writing. The last step in gathering data was conducting semi-structured interviews with each participant in the study, from the experimental group to the control group, to see how they felt about the two types of written instructor evaluation.

Data Analysis: SPSS version 18 was used for the statistical analysis of the quantitative data. Whitney Mann The U test was used to determine whether there were already existing disparities in the groups' attitudes about writing. The writing pre-tests and post-tests were evaluated using Tribble's (1996) analytical scoring scale for writing.

In order to identify recurrent and consistent themes among the instances, the qualitative data was first evaluated using descriptive analysis and then content analysis. In a descriptive analysis, questions, topics, or themes are drawn from observations, interviews, and documents to guide the examination of the data. All of the interview questions were included in a comprehensive transcript that was obtained.

Findings: The study's findings indicated that both groups improved greatly in new pieces of writing, with no significant differences in writing attitudes or anxiety levels among students. The qualitative study revealed that students still see writing as a tool for improving grammar, that they strive to improve their grammatical accuracy, and that they are committed to the feedback method that focuses on information exchange in their writings. When the students in the experimental group were asked to report on the positive effects and the advantages of receiving content-focused written teacher feedback, the overall response to this question was positive. They especially argued that receiving

feedback on grammar was more important than receiving feedback on content. The students in the control group broadly agreed on the idea that they liked the writing activities in the class. All of the students agreed that receiving feedback was critical for raising awareness of their flaws and motivating them to edit their papers.

Conclusion: The teachers' feedback was crucial to the students' learning, and they saw it as a helpful tool for identifying mistakes. The study overall showed that EFL learners may benefit from any form of written teacher feedback, both corrective feedback and comments on content. Then, it can be argued, EFL instructors must be attentive to students' needs for feedback in writing classes and both forms of feedback need to be employed in EFL contexts. By doing so, EFL learners can have the chance to improve their writing performance in EFL programs.

Thesis 4: "The Role of Teacher Feedback in Improving Tertiary Level EFL Learners' Writing Ability" by Köksal, S. (2022).

Introduction: People will inevitably require this language at some point in their life, whether emotionally or professionally. Although Spanish and Mandarin have the greatest number of native speakers, The Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey report (2013) states that English is mostly utilized as the lingua franca of communication among non-native speakers around the world. English is more than just a need, particularly in academia, and as such it serves as a teaching and/or learning aid, which calls for much effort and research. According to Kirkgoz (2007), the government has taken a more proactive approach to educate its kids in the hope that they would be able to learn new languages that will benefit both their academic careers and social environment. In order to succeed academically, the majority of students must be able to communicate their thoughts in writing. In this vein, the importance of writing proficiency is brought to the fore, especially for university students. Students must therefore improve their writing abilities. Poulos and Mahoney's (2007) reminder that feedback is an essential and beneficial aspect of teaching and learning emphasizes that, in particular, university students, should be aware of the impact that comments have on their writing and receive instruction accordingly.

Thesis Statement: This study intends to investigate any potential similarities and/or discrepancies among learners' perceptions regarding the importance of teacher feedback in enhancing EFL students' writing abilities.

Research Questions: The study sets out to answer the following research questions:

1- What are EFL instructors' perceptions regarding the role of teacher feedback in improving EFL students' writing ability at the tertiary level?

2- What are EFL students' perceptions regarding the role of teacher feedback in improving EFL students' writing ability at the tertiary level?

3- What are the similarities and/or differences between the EFL instructors' and students' perceptions regarding the role of teacher feedback in improving EFL students' writing ability at the tertiary level?

Review of Literature: Since speaking and writing are essential components of communication in all languages, they play a crucial role throughout the process of learning a second language. They are important for instructors to have actual artifacts and benchmarks that demonstrate the skill level of their pupils. The ability to write well encourages pupils to develop their self-expression, communication, and academic performance (Graham, 2006). The key point made is that teachers must build a philosophy that takes into account the benefits that students receive from the feedback process. In a recent study, Trabelsi (2019) also found that students are satisfied with the instructor's feedback since the teacher explained how to use it and discussed the sort of feedback that they wanted to use. Vanlı (2012) investigated the expectations of EFL students and instructors for teacher feedback in a research carried out in the Turkish setting, looking at teacher feedback from both the students' and the instructors' viewpoints at a tertiary level institution. It demonstrated a strong relationship between students' judgments of the usefulness of instructor feedback and their ideas about their writing self-efficacy.

Methodology: The research design for this explanatory study included a mixed-methods. While the qualitative information was gathered through open-ended questions and interviews, the primary data was quantitative and was gathered using questionnaires.

Participants: The search was carried out at a foundation university's English language preparatory school with the participation of 497 students and 62 instructors in total.

Data Collection: The quantitative data for this mixed-methods study was gathered via a survey from 497 students and 62 instructors. The data collecting tools were modified from Plonsky and Mills (2006), who primarily focused on the instructors' and students' views of written feedback in the second language writing process. All participants received surveys from the students and the instructors during the first round of data collection through quick-response (QR) codes placed in their class packets of data. Following the quantitative questions, there were also open-ended questions that gave participants the chance to openly express their expectations and experiences with written comments in their own words.

Data Analysis: The data analysis procedure involved the utilization of statistical analysis for quantitative data and content analysis for qualitative data, which were obtained by the administration of questionnaires and conducting interviews. All survey responses were imported into SPSS 20.0, a statistical package for social sciences, for descriptive and inferential statistical analysis. In the following stage, audio recordings of semi-structured interviews were verbatim transcribed using an audio transcription program named Trint to achieve a thorough comprehension. Four distinct sheets were made in Excel to make the data analysis process easier. The snippets from their interviews were placed in a column after the numbers in the columns were noted and colour coded; there was really more than one line for each teacher since the data was grouped by themes. The transcriptions were reread by the researcher, and to ensure that the research was legitimate and the correctness of the data, the transcriptions were forwarded via email to the participants for member verification.

Findings: The study's findings revealed some similarities and differences between instructors' and students' perspectives. Teachers assert that while providing feedback, they consider both meaning and grammar equally important. On the other side, students claimed that they generally received feedback that was grammar-focused, despite the fact that they anticipate written feedback to be more meaning-focused. Other than that, demotivation was viewed as a significant issue in feedback by both teachers and students.

Conclusion: The study came to the conclusion that teacher feedback is a big advantage to learners' writing since it helps them develop as English writers. Teachers also mostly claimed that they are aware of the need of encouragement and motivation in providing feedback. Praise for good work is seen to be important for boosting a student's self-esteem, especially for those who are less gifted. The study's conclusions showed that while giving comments, teachers often take their students' skill level into account and give comments in accordance with that level.

Thesis 5: “An Investigation of a Complementary Feedback Model for L2 Writing: Peer and Teacher Feedback Versus Teacher Feedback” by Demirel, E. (2009).

Introduction: Due to the audio-lingual approach's influence, writing was seen as secondary to speech in the 1950s and 1960s (Raimes, 1983). Because the majority of concept communication in projects, reports, and test papers takes place in writing, having developed suitable writing abilities has become a necessity of the academic environment for today's university students. Writing in second language is a tough issue. In addition to learning the rules of writing in a second language, individuals must also deal with issues with language, content, and structure due to the complexity of writing. Yet, in time the process approach to L2 writing was introduced and the significance of feedback has increased concurrently.

Writers utilize some form of feedback to raise the calibre of their work from the minute they put pen to paper until they finish their final draft. This feedback may be given by a teacher, a classmate, or even by the student themselves. Among these types, peer feedback activities may aid L2 writers in a number of ways if they are carried out effectively, despite the difficulty of creating a productive setting for it. First of all, the student writer would develop a sense of audience if they knew that their work will be read by someone outside the teacher, making the writing exercise feel more real. According to White and Arndt (1991), another advantage of providing and receiving feedback from peers is that it will ultimately assist students in growing their ability for self-evaluation. (p. 117).

Thesis Statement: This study aims to develop a complimentary peer-teacher feedback model, in which instructors and students are both responsible for giving feedback in a structured manner and evaluating its efficacy.

Research Questions: Following research questions were looked into in the study:

1- Which feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, creates more revisions on student drafts?

a) Which type of feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, creates more form changes?

b) Which type of feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, creates more content changes in student writing?

c) Which type of feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, creates more organizational changes in student writing?

2- Is there a relationship between number and types of revisions and achievement in writing?

a) Is there a relationship between total number of revisions and achievement in writing? b) Is there a relationship between the number of revisions on form and achievement in writing?

c) Is there a relationship between of revisions on content and achievement in writing? d) Is there a relationship between the number of revisions on organization and achievement in writing?

3- If there is no relationship between number and types of revisions and achievement in writing, then is there a relationship between the quality of revisions and achievement in writing?

4- Which type of feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, affects overall writing quality more positively?

5- Which type of feedback model, full teacher feedback or complementary peer-teacher feedback, creates more positive attitudes towards feedback and towards writing?

Review of Literature: Traditionally, the teacher often assumes the role of the writing classroom's foremost authority and is alone responsible for giving students feedback on

their work. Ashwell (2000) investigated how student writing in a multiple draft composition classroom was affected by content feedback, followed by form feedback. The conclusion was reached that offering content and form feedback concurrently as opposed to separately had no detrimental effects on student revisions and that a mixed pattern of feedback was preferable to feedback models in which content and form feedback are given separately and then in succession. What second language writers anticipate from teacher feedback and what they believe about the impact of such input on their work are revealed by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz's (1996) survey research on student expectations and attitudes regarding expert feedback. Student performance and attitudes might also be impacted by the feedback's form. Silver and Lee (2007) looked into how instructor feedback affected students' writing by gathering data from a student survey, written teacher evaluations, and student essays, which are three separate sources. The study's findings imply that when utilized in tandem, all three sorts of feedback—advice, praise, and criticism—can be effective in encouraging students to rewrite. As for the peer feedback, contrary to widespread belief, research demonstrate that peer feedback may be valid and valuable. Yet, its effectiveness in the writing classroom will mainly rely on how it is administered. According to Holt (1992), the use of peer feedback, not the feedback itself, is the issue.

Methodology: The study was structured as an experimental study in which the control group students received complete instructor input while the experimental group students received feedback from a complementing peer-teacher feedback model.

Participants: 57 students from preparatory classes at KTU's Department of English Language and Literature participated in a multiple draft writing course that used a process approach. This test was designed to determine the effectiveness of the developed feedback model in helping students improve their writing skills.

Data Collection: Through revision coding, a pre- and post-test on writing proficiency, two surveys, and student responses, both qualitative and quantitative data were gathered. To put a finer point in it, while quantitative information was gathered through revision coding of student writings and grading the essays using scoring rubrics, qualitative information came through student questionnaires, student reflections, and instructor interviews.

Data Analysis: Descriptive statistics were used to examine the data gathered from the student questionnaire, student reflections, and instructor interviews. One Likert Scale item was included in the student survey; all other items were open-ended. The frequency counts of the replies were shown for the Likert Scale question. This study was conducted using the SPSS 13.00 program. On the other hand, statistical techniques were applied in order to examine the collected quantitative data. The researcher created scoring rubrics (see Appendix J) by looking at the categories from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Test of Written English (TWE) section rubrics and applying them to all seven student essays (Weigle, 2002).

Findings: The findings showed that while the conventional complete teacher feedback approach produced more revisions overall, there was no difference in revision quality or writing development between the two groups when comparing the two methods. The complementing peer-feedback approach also was discovered to be more effective in developing favourable attitudes toward peer feedback and self-correction, but no changes were identified in the students' views of the difficulty of writing skill.

Conclusion: This finding demonstrates that students in the control group, who got content feedback from the teacher, made noticeably more content adjustments than students in the experimental group, who received content feedback from their peers. These findings show that both the experimental and control groups have quite improved their writing abilities as a result of the writing course's multiple draft process approach and the feedback conditions they experienced—full teacher feedback for the control group and complementary peer-teacher feedback for the experimental group. They discovered that the improvement in writing quality was the same for both feedback circumstances, and there was no discernible difference between them. Both groups' assessments of the value of teacher feedback focused on the instructor's subject matter competence, and students reported that the teacher is more knowledgeable and would aid students in improving their writing by pointing out their errors.

Thesis 6: “The Comparison of the Effect of Peer Feedback and Teacher Feedback on the Written Performance of EFL Students” by Uymaz, E. (2019).

Introduction: Due to the fact that L2 learners frequently lack the advantage of already-ingrained language knowledge that L1 learners possess, they frequently encounter unique language constructions that have never been offered to them and work to generate accurate utterances and discourse, or output, that are considered to be right. Giving feedback on written texts seems to be a necessary component of teaching and learning in L1 and L2 writing, regardless of the genre of a specific piece of writing (Ferris, 2003; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Pearce, Mulder, & Baik, 2009).

In L2 writing settings, teachers are seen as the primary and most significant source of feedback (Hyland, 2004; Lee, 2017). However, if the instructor is the only source of feedback, the process may resemble a coin with the teacher on one side and the student on the other; having the power balance in favour of the teacher, ending up being the passive recipient of the feedback as a student. The researcher was motivated to evaluate peer feedback and teacher feedback methods in an experimental study because better changes may result from receiving feedback ffrom peers than from teachers and may boost students' desire for L2 writing. By introducing peer evaluation activities for their students' writing, the research seeks to offer an option for university level preparatory schools and other foreign language teaching institutions.

Thesis Statement: The objective of this study is to assess how peer and instructor feedback affects tertiary level EFL students' writing performance.

Research Questions: The study included 6 basic research questions which are:

1- Are the pre-test scores of the two groups (experimental group with peer feedback; control group with instructor input) statistically different from one another?

2- In terms of the quantity of feedback points and appropriate adjustments in the second drafts, are there differences between peer and instructor feedback?

3- Is there a statistically significant variation in the experimental group's perceptions between before and after treatment as a result of peer feedback?

4- Does teacher feedback result in a statistically significant difference between the control group's perceptions before and after treatment?

5- Do the post-test results for the experimental and control groups differ statistically significantly?

6- Is there a statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group's pre- and post-test results?

Review of Literature: Feedback, in the words of Hattie and Timperley (2007), is information on specific areas of one's performance or knowledge that is offered by an agent (such as a teacher, peer, book, parent, self, or experience. With the aid of specific remarks and recommendations, the agent anticipates that the feedback recipient will achieve the targeted level of performance (Boud & Molly, 2013; Glower & Brown, 2006; Wiggins, 1993). In order for feedback to be formative, according to Glower and Brown (2006), "*it should involve not only identification by the learner of the gap between desired goal and the present state, but also provide information needed to close the gap with sufficient explanation to enable students to use this information*" (p. 14). This implies that teachers should provide more details regarding the text's significant aspects.

As for the peer feedback, it may appear that several definitions and interpretations of it have been developed thus far, inspiring both scholars and second language teachers in the classroom. The concept of peer feedback offered by Liu and Hansen (2002) states the following:

> The use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing (as cited in Liu, 2012, p. 1).

Peer feedback might be given verbally, in writing, or as a combination of both. It could also incorporate the use of rubrics and ratings to augment or take the place of a qualified teacher (Cho & MacArthur, 2010, p.328). Despite possible disadvantages such lack of confidence in students' evaluation skills and little inclusion of peer feedback in later revisions, peer evaluation is a common procedure in L2 environments. According to process approach writing proponents, writing is an adaptive and socially constructed

endeavor including the generation of ideas, the construction of meaning, and the transformation of knowledge, and learning is most effective when students take chances and attempt to create meaning (Berg, 1999; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Susser, 1994; Zamel, 1983).

Methodology: This study is an experimental pre- and post-test design with a control and experimental group. While conducting, a mixed methods design was followed in gathering data and in terms of usefulness and validity of the results, triangulation was assured.

Participants: Students who took the English preparation course at a public university make up the study's population. Initially, there were fifteen students in each of the two groups, but only eight from the experimental group and eight from the control group agreed to take part in the research in its entirety. At the time of the study, the participants were intermediate-level students who were randomly assigned to the experimental group or the control group.

Data Collection: The researcher applied four different methods of evaluating in the research. Originally created a 38-item Likert type questionnaire to evaluate students' opinions of peer feedback, instructor feedback, and producing an essay, the researcher implemented a pre-test to examine the participants' performance and determine if there is a statistically significant distinction between the experimental group and the control group. Participant students' essays in both experimental and control groups were practiced in the sequel. Semi-structured interviews followed the essay writing in order to analyse their perspectives on the use of peer and instructor feedback.

Data Analysis: For statistical analysis, the quantitative information acquired by the questionnaires, pre- and post-tests, and semi-structured interviews was entered into the SPSS program. As the semi-structured interview questions relate to the qualitative questionnaire, a content analysis approach was developed. The student responses were captured and converted into textual data for the content analysis of semi-structured interviews.

Findings: The study's conclusion revealed that students' attitudes about using peer feedback in writing assessments and writing skills had improved; it had a positive effect on students. The findings suggest that there is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group's pre- and post-test outcomes. Students in the peer feedback group properly answered 278 (69%) of 402 feedback points, compared to students in the control group who correctly answered 236 (45%) of 520 feedback points.

Conclusion: Based on the obtained overall data, it was seen that feedback was critical in the development of students' writing performances, and the effectiveness of peer feedback surpasses that of teacher input in increasing students' proper changes in second drafts and altering their perspectives favourably. Peer feedback did not differ statistically significantly from instructor feedback in the post-test despite having a beneficial impact on the proper amount of edits in second drafts. Both groups improved in terms of organization, content, grammar, and vocabulary when we compare the student gains between the pre- and post-tests, but the experimental group made greater improvements overall, with organization being the biggest one. It can be stated that feedback, regardless of the source, feedback is quite effective and it has a critical impact on pupils' written performances.

Thesis 7: “Peer Feedback vs Teacher Feedback: A Comparative Case Study on Improving Discourse Markers in Learners’ Writing Skills” by Kılıç, M. (2019).

Introduction: Because it is visual, writing fundamentally differs from oral and receptive skills, and because it is productive. It also differs from reading and from both oral and receptive skills regarding the manner in which it is executed and communicated (Ur, 2012, p. 150). Writing differs significantly from other productive language abilities due to its permanence and distance, focus on the audience and the language that is required correspondingly, and unique rhetorical patterns. Writing must be deliberately taught because it is clear that writing cannot be learned intuitively (Ur, 2012, p. 151). Therefore, it should be strengthened with the approaches by teachers by paying attention on editing and rewriting. Peer feedback, on the other side, is a more collaborative way of editing, so it is more flexible. In both ways, whether it is provided by teachers or peers, feedback on writing is considerably significant.

Thesis Statement: The primary objective of this study was to examine the varying levels of efficacy between instructor feedback and peer feedback, as well as their distinct impacts on the use of discourse markers in the written texts of Turkish learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This was achieved through the use of a comparative case study design.

Research Questions: The following are the four research questions:

1- Does peer feedback affect the discourse markers employed in writing by students at the pre-intermediate level?

a) Can discourse marker-related mistakes be detected via peer feedback?

b) To what extent do the pupils take in the feedback from their peers?

c) To what extent will mistakes be corrected as a result of peer review?

2- Does the usage of discourse markers in writing by students at the pre-intermediate level change as a result of teacher feedback?

a) To what extent do the pupils take in the input from the teacher?

b) To what extent will the mistakes be corrected after receiving input from the teacher?

3- Can peer feedback help pre-intermediate students' writing at the same rate as teacher feedback in light of improving discourse markers?

4- How do EFL students feel about receiving comments from peers and teachers during the writing process?

Review of Literature: Writing empowers students to focus more intently on the precision of the text they will generate. Harmer (2008) states that in writing even if it appears that it can result in the same text being repeated, the issue might be resolved by giving students a range of examples with unique variances so that they can focus more on the variety of the language rather than mindlessly repeating the sample similar language. Here, feedback carries a crucial role. Feedback allows exams to become formative and raise the level of students' comprehension and learning techniques when they are used in

conjunction with assessments (Askew, 2000). According to Brookhart (2008), many educational scholars have noted the cognitive benefits of feedback and highlighted that effective feedback enhances learning for both the provider and the recipient. So, there is not always only one source of giving it; peer feedback is another source. Peer feedback is particularly helpful in overcrowded courses where the available time for feedback is constrained (Ur, 2012). Overall, this study compared and examined the efficacy of peer and instructor feedback on writing.

Methodology: In order to evaluate student writing performances and assess the efficacy of peer and instructor feedback, the current study uses a mixed-methodologies case study design that blends quantitative and qualitative methods.

Participants: This research was conducted at Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages with the participation of 21 students whose language level was pre-intermediate.

Data Collection: Five distinct technologies were used to acquire the data for this investigation. The first type was punctuation marks, which were used to both the process of receiving and delivering feedback (Harmer, 2008).

The second was a placement exam, the third was a field note assignment, the fourth was a paragraph assignment from the students, and the last one was an interview question assignment.

Data Analysis: Two qualified teachers, together with the research teacher, examined the students' papers for the purpose of data analysis. Discourse marker-related errors are classified by instructors as deletions, insertions, choices, and rankings for the purpose of inter-rater reliability using Corder's error analysis (1982).

Findings: The study found that peer feedback had minimal influence on increasing discourse indicators in students' writing texts since it is of lower quality than teacher feedback. Overall, 42 percent of conjunction mistakes, 62 percent of pronoun errors, and 33 percent of phonic adverbs errors were rectified after peer feedback. As a result, the overall correction of all mistakes is 40%. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that a mere 30% of the adjustments were conducted based on peer feedback, while a significant portion of

10% of the alterations were carried out by the writers themselves. Conversely, the majority of students demonstrated accurate comprehension and implementation of teacher feedback. Specifically, the teacher's feedback resulted in a 71.42% reduction in conjunction-related errors, an 83.33% reduction in pronoun-related errors, a 92.85% reduction in definite article-related errors, and a 100% reduction in phonic adverb-related errors. Finally, teacher feedback corrected the papers to an average of 80% in terms of discourse markers. Therefore, peer feedback is considered to be less advantageous than teacher feedback in improving discourse markers in learners' writing processes.

Conclusion: At the end of the study, students preferred teacher feedback because it is accurate and dependable; yet, they had no negative feelings about peer feedback and wished to include it into their writing learning process. They expressed their opinions positively about teacher feedback as well as peer feedback. In the writing learning process, all students find teacher feedback essential and invaluable. They believe that instructors are knowledgeable about the subject and are adept at providing useful feedback. Only a very small percentage of students' dislike teacher feedback. They claim that when their faults are discovered by the teacher, they feel irritated, frustrated, and agitated, which makes them even more anxious for the upcoming writing tests. Moreover, the majority of students believe that peer feedback is helpful. Some believe it is beneficial preparation for writing tests, particularly in terms of increasing grammar and vocabulary. Nearly all students agree that peer feedback plays a crucial role in the process of learning writing because they assume that it helps them remember grammatical rules and text organization. Some students have said that peer feedback is ineffective because peers are not knowledgeable enough.

Thesis 8: "The Effect of Teacher and Peer Feedback on Students' Writing" by Bakhtiyarova, D. (2020).

Introduction: Writing is typically seen as a process and a product in an EFL setting. However, there has been a recent shift away from the conventional approach to writing, with a greater focus placed on writing as a process. Pre-writing, organizing, drafting, receiving feedback, and rewriting are all phases in the writing process that take place in a process writing classroom (Varaprasad, 2016). As a result, feedback plays a crucial function in producing the best writing results. Although instructor feedback still

predominates in the majority of EFL writing classes, the value of peer feedback cannot be understated.

Thesis Statement: The purpose of this study is to investigate how EFL students at Aydin University in Turkey see various sorts of feedback and how it affects their modifications when writing in numerous versions.

Research Questions: This study addressed 3 research questions:

1- How do student modifications to their work after going through numerous drafts respond to instructor and peer feedback?

2- How do students see writing comments from teachers and peers?

3- How do students feel about using Google Docs as a platform for feedback?

Review of Literature: It is a common educational practice to provide written corrective feedback in L2 writing classes in order to rectify grammatical faults. The impact it has over time on learners' writing correctness is questionable, despite its widespread use. Truscott (1996) carried out one research that received a lot of criticism in the literature. In his essay titled “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”, the author makes the case that grammar correction in L2 writing is unnecessary and, in some cases, detrimental, and should be stopped. Similar findings were made by Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990), who discovered that teacher-provided feedback could only address around half of the problems that could have been resolved.

Contrarily, an extensive amount of research argues that corrective feedback may be helpful and that students do in fact evaluate it. Chandler (2003) discovered that students' writing correctness and fluency were significantly affected over time by instructor comments on grammatical and lexical mistakes.

The value of peer feedback in L2 writing is another important issue. Peer revision and better writing performance have been linked in a large amount of empirical studies. For instance, in a research by Diab (2011) on Lebanese students, the group that used peer feedback created drafts that were noticeably higher quality than the group that did not.

Furthermore, giving feedback to peers has been shown to have various advantages, including better vocabulary and sentence structure (Zhao, 2014).

Methodology: To investigate how students' writing revision processes are impacted by teacher and peer feedback, a mixed method approach was adopted. A questionnaire was used to conduct surveys and gather quantitative data. Semi-structured interviews which were conducted online were used to gather qualitative data.

Participants: 16 students who were at B2 (upper-intermediate) level and who were enrolled in the English Preparatory Program through the School of Foreign Languages Department at Aydin University in Turkey participated in the study.

Data Collection: Two questionnaires were undertaken to gauge how the students felt about receiving feedback from peers and teachers. Semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions were done at the end of the course to give a more thorough perspective on how students observed the function of peer and instructor feedback and the effects each type of feedback had on their writing.

Data Analysis: A questionnaire that was presented to participants twice, at the start and conclusion of the course, was used to gather quantitative data. Using the SPSS software (version 24), the quantitative data was gathered and analysed. The interviews as a qualitative data were held at the conclusion of the course, voice-recorded, and then transcribed.

Findings: In this current research, 8 students replied as “agree”; 8 students replied as “strongly agree” when asked whether teacher feedback is beneficial in writing. Only 1 student changed his idea to a more neutral reply- “not sure” in the second questionnaire. These stats might perhaps be explained by the fact that students in Turkey are extremely reliant on teachers and place a high importance on teacher feedback. Furthermore, students reported their pleasure that peer input included praise, and that many individuals found getting positive feedback from their peers to be stimulating.

Conclusion: The results indicate that learners responded more positively to instructor input, however peer feedback was also highly appreciated. Finally, the study also aimed to introduce a way of delivering feedback, in accordance with this purpose, students in

this study were exposed to computer-mediated feedback (through Google Docs) in order to assess their perceptions of its efficacy. After the study, it showed up that all of the participants believed using Google Docs to deliver feedback was an effective and useful method. Students' perspectives on both forms of feedback were also considered and the findings revealed that their perspectives were for the benefits of teacher feedback in writing. It's noteworthy to note that all of the participants agreed that receiving feedback from a teacher is valuable, which indicates that teacher feedback is an invaluable way of editing writing papers.

4.2 Research Findings

In an attempt to access the efficacy of teacher feedback on students' writing performance, the data was collected from 24 studies in total. Out of these 24 studies, 16 (66,7%) were published journal articles, whereas 8 (33,3%) were published Master's Theses. Table 1 and Table 2 show the overview of all the articles and theses analysed in this study. Both tables indicate all these studies according to their content; 9 of the articles focused on merely teacher feedback effect while 7 of them combine teacher feedback research with peer feedback and were analysed in that way. Similarly, the focus of first 4 of the theses is just on teacher feedback while last 4 is about the combination of teacher and peer feedback. Hence, the sequence of the studies is not chronological, but content-based.

Table 1. Overview of the Analysed Articles

Articles	Content	Date	Methodology	Participants
Article 1	Teacher Feedback	2008	Quantitative method	12 university students
Article 2	Teacher Feedback	2008	Quantitative method	No participants. (It was not an active research.)

Articles	Content	Date	Methodology	Participants
Article 3	Teacher Feedback	2013	Quantitative method	91 university students
Article 4	Teacher Feedback	2014	Quantitative method	15 students aged from 19 to 20
Article 5	Teacher Feedback	2015	Mixed method	80 License-Master-Doctorate (LMD) students
Article 6	Teacher Feedback	2015	Quantitative method	20 teen English language learners aged from 13 to 17
Article 7	Teacher Feedback	2015	Quantitative method	93 university students
Article 8	Teacher Feedback	2017	Quantitative method	40 eight-graders students
Article 9	Teacher Feedback	2023	Quantitative method	128 university students
Article 10	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2010	Mixed method	18 university students
Article 11	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2011	Quantitative method	Students from five out of 24 national secondary schools

Articles	Content	Date	Methodology	Participants
Article 12	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2012	Quantitative method	174 undergraduate students
Article 13	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2012	Mixed method	100 students aged 14 on average
Article 14	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2012	Quantitative method	46 university students
Article 15	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2014	Quantitative method	51 university students
Article 16	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2018	Mixed method	48 university student

Table 2. Overview of the Analysed Theses

Theses	Content	Date	Methodology	Participants
Thesis 1	Teacher Feedback	2014	Quantitative method	93 university students
Thesis 2	Teacher Feedback	2014	Quantitative method	47 university students
Thesis 3	Teacher Feedback	2019	Mixed Method	35 university students
Thesis 4	Teacher Feedback	2022	Mixed Method	497 students and 62 instructors

Theses	Content	Date	Methodology	Participants
Thesis 5	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2009	Quantitative method	57 university students
Thesis 6	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2019	Mixed Method	16 university students
Thesis 7	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2019	Mixed Method	21 university students
Thesis 8	Teacher & Peer Feedback	2020	Mixed Method	16 university students

Different synonyms may have been chosen by the participants or researchers when they processed the replies to measure the results. As a result, the researcher in this study chose to gather and examine the responses in a way they were mentioned in the studies. In other words, the responses were shaped according to the general perception and findings of each study.

Table 3 and Table 4 demonstrate the terms used for the effect of teacher feedback in this study. The terms for the responses were specified as “positive”, “neutral” and “negative”. The studies which ended with a conclusion that students’ writing success has a positive correlation with teacher feedback were specified as “positive”. The studies which ended in a conclusion that students’ writing success has a negative correlation with teacher feedback were specified as “negative”. According to the conclusion of the studies, if students’ writing success is irrelevant with teacher feedback, these studies were labelled as “neutral”. For the detailed phase, which is measuring the efficacy level of the teacher feedback, the positive answers were rated as “slightly effective”, “quite effective” and “considerably effective”. For this phase, only positive answers were evaluated to measure the efficacy level. Out of the 21 positive studies (14 for articles and 7 for theses), the ones resulting in a slight effect of teacher feedback were named as “slightly effective”. However, if it was clearly seen at the end of the studies that teacher feedback plays an

effective role in students' writings they were stated as "quite effective". If the studies end up with a huge effect of teacher feedback on students' writing performance were named as "considerably effective".

Table 3. Effects and Effectiveness of Teachers' Feedback Obtained from Articles

Articles	Date	Effects	Effectiveness	Content
Article 1	2008	Neutral	-	Teacher Feedback
Article 2	2008	Neutral	-	Teacher Feedback
Article 3	2013	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 4	2014	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 5	2015	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 6	2015	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 7	2015	Positive	Slightly effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 8	2017	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 9	2023	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher Feedback
Article 10	2010	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Article 11	2011	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Article 12	2012	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Article 13	2012	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback

Articles	Date	Effects	Effectiveness	Content
Article 14	2012	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Article 15	2014	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Article 16	2018	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback

Table 4. Effects and Effectiveness of Teachers' Feedback Obtained from Theses

Theses	Date	Effects	Effectiveness	Content
Thesis 1	2014	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Thesis 2	2014	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Thesis 3	2019	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Thesis 4	2022	Positive	Quite effective	Teacher Feedback
Thesis 5	2009	Neutral	-	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Thesis 6	2019	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Thesis 7	2019	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback
Thesis 8	2020	Positive	Considerably effective	Teacher & Peer Feedback

As for the first variable (the effect of teacher feedback), after analysing the findings of the 16 articles, it is quite evident that the positive effect of teacher feedback prevails regarding students' success in writing. In Table 5, it is unambiguously stated that the response of 14 (87.5%) studies is positive. The processed response of only 2 (12.5%) studies is neutral. None of the articles result in negative outcome.

Table 5. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effect Obtained from Articles

Effect of teachers' feedback	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	14	87.5%
Neutral	2	12.5%
Negative	0	0%

As for the theses, Table 6 clearly shows that among 8 theses in total, 7 (87.5%) of them are positive. Only 1 (12.5%) of the theses results in neutral response. None of the theses result in negative outcome.

Table 6. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effect Obtained from Theses

Effect of teachers' feedback	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Positive	7	87.5%
Neutral	1	12.5%
Negative	0	0%

Table 7 demonstrates the response frequency regarding the effectiveness of teachers' feedback in the analysed articles. While the "quite effective" responses make up 64.3% of the total, the percentage of "considerably effective" responses constitutes 28.6%, and finally, the "slightly effective" ones are only 7.1%.

Table 7. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effectiveness Obtained from Articles

Effectiveness of teachers'	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Slightly effective	1	7.1%
Quite Effective	9	64.3%
Considerably effective	4	28.6%

Table 8 apparently demonstrates the response frequency regarding the effectiveness of teachers' feedback in the analysed theses. While the "quite effective" responses make up

57.1% of the total, the percentage of "considerably effective" responses constitute 42.9%, and finally, there is no slightly effective response in theses.

Table 8. Percentages of Teachers' Feedback Effectiveness Obtained from Theses

Effectiveness of teachers'	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Slightly effective	0	0%
Quite Effective	4	57.1%
Considerably effective	3	42.9%

4.3 Discussion for Research Questions

4.3.1 Research question 1

Regarding the first research question: *"What are the effects of teacher feedback on students' writing performance according to the studies conducted between 2008-2023?",* we can draw a conclusion that receiving feedback from teachers is useful and valuable for students' writing based on the data gathered after the meta-analysis of the selected 24 studies, with a percentage of 87,5% positive replies of all articles and theses evaluated. Only a small quantity (12,5%) of the studies concluded with the result of being neutral, stating that it doesn't have a considerable influence. None of the studies resulted in negative response.

4.3.2 Research question 2

In respect to the second research question*: "To what extent is teacher feedback effective in students' writing according to the studies conducted between 2008-2023?"* the efficiency of teacher feedback on writing performance was concluded to be quite effective. All of these 21 studies highlight the value and importance of the teacher feedback. Yet, it is concluded to be a quite effective method, rather than being considerably effective. It is clearly seen in the tables that only 33.3% of the studies result in "considerably effective", while the percentage of the ones concluding that teacher feedback is "quite effective" is 61.9%. Only 1 of the 24 studies (4.8%) resulted in a

conclusion asserting that teacher feedback is “slightly effective” on learners’ writing performance.

4.4 Discussion

With this meta-analysis, recognizing the effect of teacher feedback on writing performance has been aimed. It was conducted through meta-analysis, the method of collecting related studies by doing an extensive literature search. The data results were categorized, analysed and conclusion was drawn. According to the data evaluations, for the majority of the studies in this meta-analysis, teachers’ feedback is an effective way of improving learners’ writing performance in broad terms. As these processed studies claim, students feel more confident and secure when they get correction from their teachers. They find teachers as an authoritative figure and they care and rely on their opinions most. Most of these researches emphasize giving and receiving feedback. Most students view instructor feedback as crucial and priceless during the writing learning process. We conclude from the conclusions of the studies that teachers are not only direct correctors of their writings, but also the ones who reveal the potential inside the students. They may be great facilitators when they implicitly canalize their students to find out their mistakes at times.

Analysis of results and percentages for both research questions show that Table 3 and Table 4 confirm the research question 1, ending in positive result. This result enables us to establish strong connections between the two investigated criteria (perception and efficacy of teacher feedback). While the result of the research is 87% positive, the positivity rate is neither too much, nor too little; was at a moderate level (shown in the research as “quite effective”). Its rate is 61.9% as shown in the Table 3. Apparently, teachers are good mentors for students’ writing lessons, but also reliable sources for error correction. According to the conclusions of the studies, teachers pave the way for students to realize their mistakes while writing (they can be grammatical or lexical, etc.), and this makes students be more self-confident and try to find the right way to correct their mistakes. This also enables them to improve their writings more since this process leads to thinking over their writing passages and notice them on their own. This is also what modern teaching desires nowadays.

Among all the studies reviewed, 11 of them worked on teacher feedback along with the peer feedback. These studies compare and contrast both sources of feedback in terms of their efficacy on writing besides highlighting the effect of teacher feedback. On those studies, it is especially understood that teacher feedback predominates peer feedback Students express that they care teacher feedback more explaining that they can't rely on their peers as they lack the knowledge needed to make sensible choices. The minority who want peer feedback express their opinions as they don't feel pressure since they don't see their classmates as an authority, so they feel relaxed and they learn from their correction. Yet, this preference belongs to a small group. Moreover, students also can't trust themselves as they state that they lack the capacity to identify the misuse of constructs and don't seem capable of or interested in attempting to improve a work.

Although teacher feedback is accepted as constructive and helpful in general manner, there are also negative thoughts and comments checking up on the effectiveness of teacher feedback as mentioned in particular in Section 2.4.3. John Truscott is known to be the leading person who has negative thoughts about the ineffectiveness of this feedback type. He states that teacher feedback is useless for L2 development and ought to be stopped. He also claims WCF is a failure. Similarly, according to Kepner (1991), Semke (1984), and Sheppard (1992), there is very little proof that feedback from teachers ever improves student writers' writing accuracy. These controversial ideas gave rise to this study. The researcher would like to reveal whether these negative ideas are true or not with this study. In the end, contrary to those who opposed, it has been clearly come into light with this study that teacher feedback is a quite effective way of improving students' writing abilities indeed.

5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study attempted to thoroughly review the literature on teacher feedback and its effect on writing performance of the learners and analyse it through meta-analysis. The researcher intended to examine not only the importance of teachers' feedback on students' writing abilities thoroughly but also to what extend their feedback might be helpful and effective in the process of teaching writing. Throughout the literature review, many studies were found on teacher feedback. However, they didn't focus on the effectiveness of teacher feedback but instead studied strategies, conversation analysis, curriculum relations. Moreover, the studies that place more emphasis on other aspects of teacher feedback, such as how it affects syntactical and lexical complexity, grammar precision, language errors, or idea development, had to be all eliminated because they failed to generate statistical information that could be used for the research's intended purposes in terms of how it affects writing. The researcher intended to categorize, analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of teacher feedback studied on different sources carried out by different people in different circumstances. As a result, 24 appropriate articles and theses were selected in total. The data from these articles attentively categorized and analysed and later evaluated.

The majority of the studies, as determined by a meta-analysis of the 24 studies that were chosen, resulted in having a positive attitude toward teacher feedback, which also allows us to reply to the research's first question. Not surprisingly, no study found a negative attitude toward written feedback from teachers. Regarding the second question, it was proven that offering students constructive feedback on the quality of their writing was concluded to be quite effective.

According to the findings, the vast majority of participants in the analysed studies were optimistic with respect to receiving teacher feedback for their writings. A decent number of the participants in the studies found teacher feedback considerably effective, which highlights the cruciality of including it in the writing process.

Overall, the majority of the investigated articles and theses indicate that students have a positive perception of receiving feedback from their teachers. In the studies which contain both teacher and peer feedback, ESL and EFL students accept both forms of input and used both types of feedback in their work. However, they showed a more favourable attitude toward teacher feedback, stating that it is more accurate and constructive.

Teacher feedback in all forms are regarded as a helpful guide for students in all skills in ELT, yet its effect is still questionable as in every field. In this study, particularly its effects on learners' writing performance was discussed. The research findings revealed that teacher feedback is viewed as an essential way of reacting students' performance in improving their writing skill and correspondingly other related sub-skills of writing: spelling, indenting and punctuation. From the perspective of a student, getting constructive feedback from a teacher is the construction of one of the fundamental pillars around which the entire process of learning is built. The first implication for ELT seems to maintain teacher feedback in writing classes; during students' first, second and final draft writings. It has been observed in studies conducted that they need teacher or peer support at each stage of writing (it could be the first draft or the final draft). Peer support is preferred by the minority of students in the studies, stating that it is a more stress-free way of getting correction as they don't feel pressure while getting feedback from their peers. Although peer support works to some extent, it should be considered that it is not as effective as teacher support as a result of the research. Overall, teacher feedback has proven to have a quite positive impact on students, and ELT teachers should look for ways to use and improve it. They can provide the provision of instruction on writing assessment with an effective feedback inside the language skills departments of education faculties for the students. By implementing this, it is possible to enhance their understanding and knowledge regarding this particular topic.

At this juncture, the discourse of giving feedback to students is not sufficient on its own. If conveyed correctly, feedback in writing can be seen as a map, leading you to the success at the end of the process consisting of small stages. To achieve this success part, as several of the articles mentioned, feedback given to students should be clear and constructive. Effective feedback is regarded as being focused, clear, pertinent, and inspiring (Lindemann, 2001). Receiving this form of feedback helps students enhance their

capacity for critical thought and for learning self-management (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Strake & Kumar, 2010). Undoubtedly, teacher should reflect on the feedback while conveying it to the student and make an effort to make it effective. A simple and random feedback only makes the student feel inadequate.

At the conclusion of some articles, especially those with peer feedback comparison, students stated that they were hesitant about teacher feedback as they felt pressure on them, while they felt more relaxed while getting feedback from their peers as they don't see their peers as authoritative figures. This statement signals ELT teachers to be less authoritative and more empathetic. Like in every aspect of English language teaching, teachers shouldn't be the constrainer but the understanding side of the process in writing lessons as well. This facilitates the learning process, enhancing its efficacy and quality.

Last but not least, considering that the first way to provide effective feedback is through the teacher, all teachers should have sufficient knowledge and awareness in this regard. Organizing trainings and workshops may provide teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to deliver accurate and impactful feedback. Typically, educators possess theoretical knowledge on this matter, however it is possible that a majority of instructors may lack awareness. In order to enhance awareness, it is necessary to arrange and implement training sessions.

The scope of this study is confined to examining the impact of teacher feedback. During the period of the investigation, the researcher encountered many studies that included comparing the use of peer feedback. These studies were also included to see the impact size better. However, as the main focus is on the teachers in this research, further studies may be conducted based on only peer feedback or self- assessed feedback. Similarly, the focus of this study revolved around the provision of written feedback. However, it is worth noting that other forms of feedback which are oral, direct and indirect feedback can be more comprehensive in nature, allowing for in-depth analysis of their efficacy through rigorous research studies. Researchers should delve further into the subject matter and focus their efforts on various sorts of feedback.

The studies which have emphasis on other aspects of teacher feedback such as its effect on syntactical and lexical complexity, on grammar accuracy, on language errors or on

idea development had to be excluded since they failed to provide any quantitative data that could be worked on in the manner intended by the research in terms of its impact on writing. These specific topics can also be analysed by other researchers and the content can be enriched. Even, incorporating these parts could yield intriguing results.

Furthermore, this study also revealed an intriguing result. Considering all the studies reviewed, we see that the oldest of these studies had neutral results. (Liu, 2008; Louw, 2008 & Demirel, 2009). The value of the effect of teacher feedback is assumed to be improved and become more crucial in time. It is predicted from the findings that there have been more positive effects than older years. However, in this meta-analysis only 3 studies were found between the years 2008-2023 coming up with neutral results. This quantity is not enough to claim a fact and should be increased to obtain more reliable results. Therefore, future studies on the current topic but with older dates than 2008 are recommended to examine whether it has a negative correlation with the teacher feedback or not.

REFERENCES

Abdioğlu, M. (2019). *An investigation of two teacher written feedback procedures in efl classes: form-focused and content-focused feedback* (Publication No. 562326) [Master's Thesis, Karadeniz Technical University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Altay, A. (2018). *Exploring the effects of feedback types and wiki on EFL learners' writing performance*. (Publication No. 514548) [Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University]. tez.yok.gov.tr. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Bakhtiyarova, D. (2020). *The effect of teacher and peer feedback* (Publication No. 666944) [Master's Thesis, Istanbul Aydin University] tez.yok.gov.trhttps://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, C.-L. C., Kulik, J. A., & Morgan, M. T. (1991). The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research, 61*(2), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543061002213

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (2014). Knowledge building and knowledge creation: One concept, two hills to climb. *Education Innovation Series*, 35–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-047-6_3

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Boubekeur, S. (2015). Teaching and learning writing through providing teacher's feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 4*(6). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.6p.16

Brookhart, S. M. (2018). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Virginia: ASCD.

Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), Learner strategies in second language learning (pp. 57–69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Demirel, E. (2009). *An investigation of a complementary feedback model for L2 writing: peer and teacher feedback versus teacher feedback.* (Publication No. 250800). [Master's Thesis, Middle East Technical University]. tez.yok.gov.tr. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Dujsik, D. (2008). *The effects of pre-writing strategy training guided by computer-based procedural facilitation on ESL students' strategy use, writing quantity, and writing quality.* (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis), University of South Florida, USA. Retrieved March 8, 2023 from https://www.proquest.com/docview/275653898?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true

Eksi, G. (2012). Peer review versus teacher feedback in process writing: How effective? *IJAES.13*(1), 33-48.

Fazenbaker, C. K. (2018). Teacher feedback practice: Understanding high school teachers' experiences with providing feedback to students. (Publication No. 13422789) [Doctoral Dissertation, Northeastern University]. Proquest Dissertation Publishing. https://doi.org/10.17760/d20316448

Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, *29*(1), 33–35.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing,* Second edition. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Fitriana, R. (2017). The effect of teacher's feedback on students' writing achievement. *The Journal of English Literacy Education, 4*(7). 71-84.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(4), 365-387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600.

Gagné, R. M., & Briggs, L. J. (1974). *Principles of instructional design* (2nd ed.). Florida: Rinehart & Winston.

Ghani, M., & Asgher, T. (2012). Effects of teacher and peer feedback on students' writing at secondary level. *Journal of Educational Research, 15*(2), 84-97.

Gholaminia, I., Gholaminia, A., & Marzban, A. (2014). An investigation of meta-linguistic corrective feedback in writing performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116*, 316–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.214

Glass, G. (1976). Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. *Educational Researcher, 5*(10), 3-8.

Golkova, D., & Hubackova, S. (2014). Productive skills in second language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 143*, 477-481. https://doi.org/10.1016 /j.sbspro.2014.07.520

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

Hayes, J., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes, Gregg, L. W. & Steinberg, E. R.(Ed.), *Cognitive Processes in Writing*, London: Routledge.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0346-251x(03)00021-6

Ismail, N., & Maulan, S., Hasan, N. H. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Academic Journal of Social Studies, 8*(1), 45-54.

Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The effects of teacher-written direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018

Kahraman, A., & Yalvaç, F. (2015). EFL Turkish university students' preferences about teacher feedback and its importance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences, 199*, 73–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.489

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294–304. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294

Kılıç, M. (2019). *Peer feedback vs teacher feedback: a comparative case study on improving discourse markers in learners' writing skills* (Publication No. 592360) [Master's Thesis, Gazi University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Konold, K. E., Miller, S. P., & Konold, K. B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to enhance student learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *36*(6), 64-69.

Köksal, S. (2022). *The role of teacher feedback in improving tertiary level EFL learners' writing ability* (Publication No. 758819) [Master's Thesis, Bilkent University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 47*(2), 211–232. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543047002211

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x

Lange, K. (2011). *Scientific explanations peer feedback or teacher feedback*. (Publication No. 1497125). [Master's Thesis, Arizona State University]. UMI Dissertation Publishing. Retrieved March 26, 2023 from https://www.proquest.com/docview/884964438?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true

Leng, K. T. (2014). An analysis of written feedback on ESL students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 123*, 389–397. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1437

Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona Working Papers. 15*. 65-79.

Louw, H. (2008). The effectiveness of standardised feedback when L2 students revise writing. *Language Matters, 39*(1), 88-110.

Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Li, K. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 15*, 29-35.

McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: the key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational Horizons, 87*(1), 40-49.

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(2), 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Nagode, G. & Pižorn, K. & Juriševič, M. (2014). The role of written corrective feedback in developing writing in L2. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries, 11*(89), 89-98.

Newell, A. (1980). *Reasoning, problem solving and decision processes: The problem space as a fundamental category*. Pennsylvania: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2018). The effect of combined peer-teacher feedback on Thai students' writing accuracy. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 6*(2),117-132.

Nicol, D., & Macfarlane, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice. *Studies in Higher Education,* 31(2), 199-218. Doi. 10.1080/03075070600572090

Oscarson, A. (2009). *Self-assessment of writing in learning English as a foreign language*. Göteborg: Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences.

Özkul, S. (2014). *Video inclusive portfolio (VIP) as a new form of teacher feedback in teaching writing* (Publication No. 356887) [Master's Thesis, Bilkent University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Ratminingsih, N. M., Marhaeni, A.A., Vigayanti, L. P. (2018). Self-assessment: the effect on students' independence and writing competence. *International Journal of Instruction, 11*(3), 277-290.

Ruegg, R., O'Connor, A. C., & Loomis, R. J. (2014). *Evaluating realized impacts of Doe/EERE R&D programs. standard impact evaluation method*, Lawrence Berkeley National Lab. (LBNL). https://doi.org/10.2172/1336538

Ruegg, R. (2015). The relative effects of peer and teacher feedback on improvement in EFL students' writing ability. *Linguistics and Education*, *29*, 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.12.001

Sadler, D. R. (2010). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 535–550. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541015

Smith, K. U., & Smith, M. F. (1966). *Cybernetic principles of learning and educational design*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Solhi, M., & Eğinli, I. (2020). The effect of recorded oral feedback on EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *16*(1), 01-13. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.712628

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). An investigation of university EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback. *Educational Research and Reviews, 7*(26), 558-562.

Şahan, Ö. (2012). *The effectiveness of written and oral feedback on EFL writing performance* (Publication No. 328725) [Master's Thesis, Ataturk University]. tez.yok.gov.tr. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Taşkıran, A., & Göksel, N. (2022). Automated feedback and teacher feedback: Writing achievement in learning English as a foreign language at a distance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *23*(2), 120–139. https://doi.org/10.17718 /tojde.1096260

Truscott, J.(1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *A Journal of Research in Language Studies, 46*(2), 189-376.

Uymaz, E. (2019). *The comparison of the effect of peer feedback and teacher feedback on the written performance of EFL students* (Publication No. 537957) [Master's Thesis, Gazi University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Venables, A., & Summit, R. (2003). Enhancing scientific essay writing using peer assessment. *Innovation in Education and Teaching International, 40*(3), 281-290.

Wahyuni, S. (2017). The effect of different feedback on writing quality of college students with different cognitive styles. *Dinamika Ilmu, 17*(1), 39-58

Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher writing feedback on L2 student writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(2), 427-431. doi:10.4304/jltr.4.2.427-431

Wondim, B. M., Bishaw, K. S., & Zeleke, Y. T. (2023). Effects of teachers' written corrective feedback on the writing achievement of first-year ethiopian university students. *Education Research International, 2023*, 1-13.

Yalvaç, F. (2014). *EFL university students' attitudes toward teacher feedback and its significance* (Publication No. 375743) [Master's Thesis, Dumlupinar University] tez.yok.gov.tr https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15*(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002

CURRICULUM VITAE

Bahtiyar Merve TULGAR

Education

Degree	Year	University, Institute, Department
Master	2023	Maltepe University, Social Sciences Institute, English Language Teaching with thesis
Bachelor	2012	Gazi University, Faculty of Foreign Language Education, English Language Teaching

Experience

2013	English Language Instructor- Gebze Technical University, Department of Foreign Languages

Scholarship/Prize (If any)

2020	Maltepe University, Postgraduate Education Scholarship