

## **Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?**



**Ayça BAKINER**

Dr. Ayça Bakiner, Department of Foreign Languages, Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University, Turkey

**ABSTRACT:** This study focuses on types of feedback provided in second language writing in higher education and their evaluation in the light of students' opinions. Data were gathered from 55 students who took English writing classes for 3 hours a week in an English preparatory program at a college in Turkey. Semi-structured interviews were used as data collection tools. Findings revealed that vast majority of students found meaning-focused feedback more motivational than form-focused feedback. Additionally, they preferred self-assessment to peer-feedback. The paper presents a discussion on feedback types in second language writing.

**KEYWORDS:** Second language writing, feedback, feedback types, assessing writing, higher education.

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

One of the main methods of communication is the written word. People make their words permanent thanks to writing. Since writing is an important skill of modern life, there are writing classes in schools. Being one of the most required skills to develop in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, writing ability is not an innate one. Because writing can be the hardest skill to develop (Allal, 2018; Ataman, 2009; Byrne, 1988; Karafil and Oğuz, 2019; Karatay, 2015; Raimes, 1983), it is considered to be an important skill to acquire in foreign language teaching programs. Responding effectively to students' written work has been a hotly debated issue, and foreign language teachers have combined different approaches and forms of feedback to develop learners' writing skills. Regardless of the adopted approach, feedback plays a pivotal role in the development of students' writing skills. This paper presents a discussion on different feedback types in the light of college students' opinions in Turkey.

### **II. LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### ***Feedback Types in ESL Writing***

Feedback is simply any information provided in different sorts to improve students' drafts in English language teaching classes. It can be used to diagnose strengths and weaknesses in students' writing (Elbow, 1998; Ferris, 2003; Keh, 1990; Wahyuni, 2017; Zaman and Azad (2012). Feedback is generally regarded as an integral part of writing in foreign language teaching classes. There are various types of feedback used to assess a written task. Each of these feedback types has its place in enhancing student learning (Alshammari, 2020; Göçer, 2016; Göçer and Şentürk, 2019; Hedge, 2005; Oruç and Demirci, 2020; Williams, 2001; Zamel, 1982).

#### ***Teacher-Feedback***

Writing is a process, so students need teacher feedback to prepare the last version of their writing (Vyatkina, 2011). To Hyland (1998: 255), "Giving effective feedback is a central concern for any teacher of writing and an important area for both L1 and L2 writing research." Teacher feedback is considered to be a fundamental aspect of writing education. As teachers are more knowledgeable than students in subjects, be it language structure, grammar rules, writing style and techniques, and text types- they should guide students in their writing journey (Coşkun and Tamer, 2015: 340). According to Ocağ and Karafil (2020: 287), the effective use of teacher feedback fosters learning. Teacher feedback can be any formal and/or informal information on students' written work.

The ability of the teacher to build empathy while evaluating writing can have a positive effect on understanding the meaning learners try to convey in their work. Destructive teacher feedback discourages students from writing and learning. Therefore, teachers should be constructive with their evaluation. Furthermore, it is vital to remember that even if students receive and understand teacher feedback, they may need a discussion on their work with the course teacher once in a while in order not to continue to make the same mistakes.

## **Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?**

### ***Peer-Feedback***

When it comes to peer-feedback, students exchange drafts with a classmate, read each other's written products, and they make some suggestions to improve their peers' drafts. At this point; students should not be expected to make perfect corrections of their classmates' English. While giving feedback, it is better to inform students on the importance of discussing a point with their peer; however, without causing hurt feelings.

Peer review is an interactive process. While it is a process, it is also a product (Chang, 2016) - "as it also refers to the tangible feedback provided by peers on various aspects of writing in the form of error feedback and/or commentary on content, organization be it in the verbal, written, or computer-mediated form (Lee, 2017, 83)." This can be considered to be a tall order to some; however, it can be effective when guided correctly. It can be useful when there is a supportive and secure learning environment. (Ammores, 1997; De Smedt and Keer, 2017; Hu, 2005; Kong, 2013; Lam, 2010; Min, 2005; Nixon and Topping, 2001; Yarrow and Topping, 2001).

### ***Self-Feedback***

Another feedback type includes students' editing their own written work. They use guided questions or checklists to do so. When doing self-check, which can also be called self-revision or self-correction, students review their own writing. Because self-feedback requires attention to every aspect of one's own writing, students develop an awareness of their own progress.

Self-feedback contributes to learners' autonomy as well. As Creswell states (2000, 235), "The student self-monitoring technique increases autonomy in the learning of writing by giving learners control over the initiation of feedback." In a study conducted by Cahyono and Amrina (2017), the effectiveness of peer-feedback and self-correction was investigated. Based on the results of the study, the students who conducted self-correction based on a guideline sheet significantly improved the ability in writing essays.

### ***Direct Corrective Feedback-Indirect Corrective Feedback***

It is a very common thing for writing teachers to provide students with the written corrective feedback in their classes. With direct corrective feedback, teachers directly write the correct form of the mistake in written products. Students' confusion can be reduced with this type of feedback because the teacher shows her students exactly what to do with the mistakes they make. It can be considered to be a more desired type to receive for students of low level of proficiency as, more often than not, self-correcting can be more difficult to them. This type of feedback has been criticized by some researchers, however (Semke, 1984; Robb et al., 1986; Takashima, 1987). According to Truscott (1996), direct corrective feedback is ineffective or even harmful since it requires minimal thinking. When teachers give indirect corrective feedback, they indicate an error instead of writing directly what the error is or ways to correct it. It fosters independent thinking because learners try to solve the problem on their own. This involves a code list, which should be shared with the class at the beginning of the course in order not to cause any confusion. It can also be in the form of circling, underlying, or comments. Some studies claimed indirect corrective feedback to be more effective in ESL writing (Ellis, 2008; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982; James, 1998).

### ***Written Feedback-Verbal Feedback***

Written feedback can be anything that teachers evaluate on students' texts to make them better. Whether teachers give written feedback using a code list or not; students make use of this feedback, and they develop their essays. It is important to write clear and instructive comments/notes so that students see the weak points in their writing and understand the ways of strengthening them. According to some studies in the literature; students prefer written feedback from their teachers (Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1987; Fathman and Whalley, 1990; Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Verbal feedback, on the other hand, eliminates the one-way communication in the written sort given on assignments. This type of feedback is interactive, and it can be given in the classroom, over the phone, face to face in office hours, and in virtual classrooms. Teachers should not neglect the advantages of verbal review because some students learn more when they have the chance to discuss their writing with their teachers. As it enables to provide information to large groups, it saves time.

### ***Meaning-Focused (Content-Focused) Feedback-Form-Focused (Language-Focused) Feedback***

When writing teachers give meaning-focused feedback, the focus is on the message being conveyed in students' writing rather than grammatical rules of the target language. It is safe to say that meaning-focused feedback is more interactive because it allows students to respond to their teachers' comments. It provides a genuine channel for communication in the classroom. Meaning-focused feedback works great when it comes to reviewing students' journal entries. However, teachers should also give form-focused feedback as it focuses on the structure of the language. This type of feedback is widely used to evaluate students' assignments in writing classes. Even though it is not as interactive as meaning-focused feedback, teachers can save this type of feedback from monotony by having discussions on students' mistakes during office hours.

### ***Formal Feedback-Informal Feedback***

Feedback can be formal or informal. When feedback is formal, it is planned and systematically scheduled. It is given on students' writing, exams, and assignments. For example, this includes comments on students' essay submissions, peer review, and

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

filling out a rubric. When the feedback is informal, on the other hand, it can occur spontaneously. When done correctly, informal feedback fosters a good rapport and better communication between teacher and students. With informal review, teachers have the chance to give place and time-independent feedback. Like verbal feedback, it can take place in the classroom, over the phone, in a virtual classroom, and during office hours.

### *Formative Feedback-Summative Feedback*

Formative feedback is an ongoing process, and this type of review is given to learners during the course of an assessment. When course instructors give formative feedback, students have the opportunity to correct their written work and improve their performance. It actually prepares students for summative feedback. Summative feedback is a total evaluation of students' writing. Exams and portfolio scores are perfect examples to summative feedback because they are graded assessment.

Whatever type is given, effective teacher feedback should be clear, descriptive, non-judgemental, varied according to the development of students, and suitable for language skills, in a form that can be understood by learners (Beach and Friederich, 2006, 222). That does not mean that teachers should give positive feedback constantly; however, if they do give a negative one, they should frame it as constructive.

## III. METHOD

### *Course Context and Practice*

The study took place in a school of foreign languages at a college in Turkey. Before starting the program, non-English major students took a language placement test, and they were placed into classes according to the levels specified in the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages). They were classified into three levels of English proficiency. 55 students participated in the study; 11 of these students were B1 level, 24 of them were A2 level, and 20 of them were A1 level. Students' ages ranged from 17-20. They had 28 hours of English classes per week, and writing classes constituted 13 % of the lessons of the program.

Longman Academic Writing Series 1 for A1 level, Longman Academic Writing Series 2 for A2 level, and Longman Academic Writing Series 2 and 3 for students at B1 level were studied in English writing classes. These books offer a structured approach that focuses on writing as a process. Students wrote a journal entry and an assignment at the end of each chapter. That added up to two pieces of written products every other week in the syllabus. Students submitted their homework as a portfolio file to the teacher (the author) at the end of both semesters. The effect of these portfolios on passing grade was 6% for each semester.

I benefited from the writer's self-check worksheets in the text book in order to develop awareness in the writing process of the students. Because becoming a better writer requires self-editing, I asked the students to check their own work before submitting. Self-editing involves proofreading, and by doing so, students check for and correct their errors in format, mechanics, grammar, and sentence structure. The writer's self-check worksheets contain questions about specific elements-a clear topic sentence, coherence, cohesion, and so on. By answering the questions in the worksheets, students can recognize the strengths and weaknesses in their writing.

I introduced peer review worksheets and trained students to utilize them at the end of each chapter in the course books for each assignment. Students were asked to use these worksheets for each assignment and answer each question. They exchanged rough drafts, read each other's writing, and gave feedback for improvement. Students focused only on content and organization when giving feedback. With this, I aimed to make writing an interactive process.

Writing assignment scoring rubric at the end of each chapter was hung on the classroom wall, and by doing so, students did their homework with the awareness of the evaluation criteria of the given assignment. Students wrote their drafts knowing the scoring of each section for their assignments. "Comments" part in the rubric allowed the teacher to give detailed written feedback to the students.

There is a correction symbol list in the course books. I did not correct the mistakes made in students' assignments directly. Instead, I used this code list so that learners find out their own mistakes and think of the possible ways to correct them. Assignment topics were given at the end of each chapter in the course books, and students wrote about the same topic for their assignments. In addition to their assignment, students wrote journal entries. They chose the journal topics from the list at the end of the course books. I did not provide any kind of form-focused (language-focused, corrective) feedback for the journals.

### *Data Collection and Research Questions*

In the study, I held semi-structured interviews with each student at the end of the academic year. I asked students about their opinions on feedback provided in writing classes and completed the interviews in 21 days. Each interview lasted about 25 minutes, and they were conducted in my office at the department. All interviews were audio-recorded with my mobile phone. The medium of the interviews was Turkish, which is the mother tongue of all participants.

I prepared an interview guide for semi-structured interviews. This approach includes a list of questions to be asked or topics to be addressed during the interview. It helps carry out interviews with a large number of people more comprehensively by limiting

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

the topics in advance (Patton, 2002). The opinions of the students are presented in the findings of the study with fake names as some participants were not comfortable with their names being shared in the study.

This paper sought answers to the following questions:

1. What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their assignments?
2. What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their journal entries?

### *Analysis of the Interview Data*

I followed content analysis (Corbin and Strauss: 2012) to be able to interpret the data I collected from the interviews. The first step I followed was to go through transcript of every interview multiple times, and I deductively analyzed the transcripts of the interview data. I coded them under the following seven themes: (1) willingness in participating in the feedback activity; (2) motivation to write in English; (3) improvement in English writing skill; (4) evaluation of the value of peer-feedback; (5) evaluation of the value of teacher-feedback; (6) evaluation of the value of meaning-focused feedback; and (7) evaluation of the value of form-focused feedback.

## IV. FINDINGS

### *Research question 1: What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their assignments?*

In the study, students wrote assignments at the end of each chapter, and they submitted their assignments to the teacher as a portfolio at the end of both semesters. First, students wrote their initial draft. They edited their first draft utilizing the writer's self-check worksheets in the course books. These worksheets include guided questions or checklists. After making necessary changes in their writing, they exchanged drafts with a classmate for peer-feedback. Students used guided peer-review worksheets in the course books to evaluate their peers' writing. Then I provided indirect form-focused written feedback. After my feedback, students wrote their final draft for their portfolios. In the portfolios, I asked my students to have all the drafts of each assignment.

In the semi-structured interviews, 100 % of the students expressed that teacher-review is a necessity in writing classes. Regarding written corrective feedback, 17 out of 20 A1 level students expressed how they wished they had received direct form-focused feedback in writing classes. As to the three students, they stated that they learned more with indirect corrective feedback.

In her interview, Ela (one of the students in A1 group) explained that though she was initially confused by the codes and how to correct her mistakes based on those codes, she then realized that this type of feedback improved her linguistic accuracy in the long run.

*Excerpt 1: I didn't realize the purpose of it at first because I had never taken English writing classes in high school. I mean we had English classes, but there was never a writing class. I have always loved writing, though, even in Turkish. Maybe that's why I worked hard in the classes. At first, it was a hardship for me to comprehend the codes even though we had the code list in our books. Then it was like the fifth or sixth assignment that I realized; I was like I am a better thinker at writing. Now I can easily say that I know the ways of correcting my mistakes better (Ela, interview).*

Yasemin (one of the students in A1 group), who would not prefer indirect feedback, told in the interviews that this type of feedback was in fact was not beneficial at all.

*Excerpt 2: I don't think that these codes helped at all in our writing classes. I would have learned better if I didn't have to think for hours sometimes trying to figure out how to respond to those lines or codes. Some of my friends would ask each other to correct their mistakes, but I didn't want to. My English wasn't very good to begin with. This was so demanding for me (Yasemin, interview).*

In the interviews, 15 out of 24 A2 level students expressed their positive evaluation towards indirect corrective feedback they received for their assignments. 9 students did not favour indirect feedback, and 3 of these students added: whether it is provided directly or indirectly, corrective feedback (grammar correction) was not effective.

In his interview, Kerem said that the indication of errors helped him improve his written articulacy because he felt involved. He went on to explain that:

*Excerpt 3: ...thinking on the mistakes I've made definitely made a difference in my writing skill. I had more interaction with my friends because I sometimes asked them how to correct some of my mistakes. We learned a lot from each other this year. If you had provided us with the correct form directly, I wouldn't have spent any time on my paper. I would have written the last draft for the portfolio, and that would have been it (Kerem, interview).*

Melike, one of the three students who particularly referred to the corrective feedback, said that corrective feedback made her feel like stigmatized although that was never my intention.

*Excerpt 4: I would feel bad every time I saw my paper all lined up because I was doing the best I could actually. On top of it all, I had to work on the paper to give you back a better one. It could have been less difficult (Melike, interview).*

I had 11 students in my B1 group. 9 students in the group believed indirect feedback to be helpful. 2 students thought that indirect form-focused feedback made no difference in the development of their writing skills. Mert described how it was beneficial for him as follows:

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

Excerpt 5: *When you introduced us the code list and showed us other possible ways of indicating our errors, I was a bit confused and nervous to be honest because I had never seen anything like this before. I had Turkish writing classes in high school, but we didn't get any feedback for our essays in those classes except for the exam scores. Even though it took time to understand it fully, it helped me be more careful when I was writing. I tried to remember my mistakes and avoid them next time* (Mert, interview).

Ezgi, one of the two students who saw no difference between indicating errors and directly correcting errors explained that:

Excerpt 6: *I took it as a valuable opportunity to get feedback on my each assignment. I don't think it would have changed anything in my writing skills if you had given different type of feedback because that would have been corrective, too. Maybe this is because I didn't have a hard time comprehending your feedback at all. To me, the important thing here is to get feedback on our work and see our mistakes so that we don't do them again* (Ezgi, interview).

Students did self-assessment after they wrote their first draft. Vast majority of the students stated in the interviews that they enjoyed and benefited self-review way better than peer-review. 18 out of 20 students in the A1 group, 22 out of 24 students in the A2 group, and 9 students in the B1 level group uttered the words “self-awareness,” “more conscious,” and “autonomous” in the interviews.

Excerpt 7: *I liked the fact that I was able to correct my mistakes on my own. The checklists helped me a lot. I noticed my mistakes, and I corrected them, too* (She smiles proudly). *Exercising this for every assignment really helped me be more aware as I wrote* (Büşra-A1 group, interview).

Excerpt 8: *I was able to evaluate the progress of my own writing, and this didn't involve any other people, which is better for me. I like studying and learning by myself. This type of feedback suits my personality* (Kaan-A2 group, interview).

Excerpt 9: *I can easily say that the more I self-corrected my paper; the more I developed a critical attitude towards my own writing. If you asked me the hardest skill in English at the beginning of the semester, I would have said writing. I was intimidated. This changed because I saw my own improvement* (Merve-B1 group, interview).

As to peer-feedback, 16 out of 20 students in the A1 group, 20 out of 24 students in the A2 group, and 8 out of 11 students in the B1 level group did not enjoy it because as they stated, “They weren't comfortable with it, and they trusted the teacher more.”

Excerpt 10: *I was never comfortable with my classmates seeing my writing. I mean what's the point? We have our teacher, and my friend can't do it better than her* (Mehmet-A1 group, interview).

Excerpt 11: *I was so glad that we didn't do peer-review for our journal entries because I wouldn't have been totally honest when I wrote them then. I think this was unnecessary, and I didn't feel good when I was the feedback provider, either* (Sibel-A2 group, interview).

Excerpt 12: *I was really careful when I provided peer-review for my friends. I never wanted to cause any hurt feelings, but I don't think some of my classmates were as sensitive as me. That's why I never liked it* (Can-B1 group, interview).

While many students did not favour this type of feedback, Meryem saw it as an opportunity to learn from others. She went on to explain why she found it valuable:

Excerpt 13: *If we didn't have guidelines to follow, I would have a hard time reviewing my friend's paper. But we knew what to do. I loved this because it made me feel like a teacher actually* (She smiles). *Of course I know my friends are not teachers, but I mean we got feedback from you also. And another thing, when I saw that my friends were doing the same mistakes, it helped me. Peer review allowed me to be more careful with my own writing because to be honest, I was afraid to make too many mistakes* (Meryem-A2 group, interview).

*Research Question 2: What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their journal entries?*

In addition to the assignments, students wrote journal entries both semesters. The course books had a list of topics they could choose from to write their journal entries. I did not provide any kind of corrective feedback for students' journals. I ignored errors and avoided grading based on accuracy. I wrote comments on their journals, shared something from my life, and asked some questions to create a meaningful communication environment with my students. The communication was not one-way because students wrote back their comments and answered my questions when they submitted their portfolios. Journal grades were based on the number, length, and diversity of entries.

Based on the opinions of the students, the most favoured feedback type was meaning-focused, which didn't take me by surprise given that I observed it in the classes as well. Every time I gave their journal back in the classed, they seemed so excited to read my comments, and most of them expressed that even before the interviews. 49 of the students in the study stated that they loved writing journals. They provided descriptions, such as “motivational,” “exciting,” “fun,” “love it.” They found meaning-focused feedback more motivational than form-focused feedback. The comments below illustrated this:

Excerpt 14: *I absolutely loved writing journals. It didn't feel like I had to write them. I wanted to write them, and I think mostly the reason was because it felt like I was talking to you. I didn't worry about my mistakes. I loved reading your comments* (Emre-A1 group, interview).

Excerpt 15: *Without a doubt, my favourite thing in our classes was writing journals. I don't think I would have loved it this much if you focused on my mistakes. This was so motivating to me* (Gülsüm-A1 group, interview).

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

Excerpt 16: *I feel that of all my teachers in the prep school, I have the best rapport with you, and I believe the journals and your feedback for them were the reason for this* (Çağla-A2 group, interview).

Excerpt 17: *I was so psyched to read your comments. This motivated me to write more. It felt like you were my friend* (Ali-A2 group, interview).

Excerpt 18: *You didn't correct my mistakes in my journals. I loved it because it wasn't academic writing. I was honest with you in my journals. It was valuable for me when you focused on what I shared with you instead of subject-verb agreement, for example* (Özgür-B1 group, interview).

Excerpt 19: *The communication we had felt so natural and genuine thanks to journals. You made me feel so valuable with your comments, and I thank you for that* (Dilay-B1 group, interview).

4 students in the A1 group and 2 students in the A2 group stated in the interviews that they wished they had received corrective feedback for their journals, too. They didn't find meaning-focused feedback to be beneficial or motivational. One of these students particularly referred to the topics for their journal entries:

Excerpt 20: *I am an introverted person. I don't like sharing my personal stuff even with my friends. Most of the topics in journal-writing were personal. That's why it wasn't fun for me* (Gülizar-A1 group, interview).

## V. DISCUSSION

This study explored two major research questions: "What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their assignments," and "What are students' opinions on feedback types provided for their journal entries." Regarding meaning-focused feedback, 89 % of the students found meaning-focused feedback more motivational than form-focused feedback. It is apparent that students are more enthusiastic to write their journal entries than assignments. Therefore, I highly suggest journal writing in addition to assignments in writing classes. Students highly emphasized how they enjoyed writing journals and reading my feedback because I didn't focus on their mistakes. In line with this study, Cahyono et al. (2017) investigated the effect of meaning-focused and form-focused feedback on EFL students' writing. Based on the findings of the study, the group who were provided with meaning-focused feedback for their journal entries achieved better in their writing classes. Zahida et al. (2014) investigated the impact of three feedback types of written feedback on the motivation and writing skill of English major students at Hebron University. According to the results of the study, there were statistically significant differences in the post treatment questionnaire and the post test in favour of the meaning-focused feedback group. Shobeiry (2020) probed the effect of meaning focused and form-focused feedback on writing improvement. The results showed a higher effectiveness of meaning-focused feedback. By contrast, in Zohrabi and Rezaie's study (2012), which aimed at finding out the role of form-focused feedback on developing writing skill, students who received form-focused feedback improved considerably.

As to direct corrective and indirect corrective feedback, the findings from the semi-structured interviews revealed that 53 % of the students in the study stated they found indirect corrective feedback more improving and beneficial. 75 % of A1 level students, however, believed that indirect corrective feedback did not help them improve their writing accuracy. As low-level learners are affected more deeply by teacher's practice, it can be suggested that writing teachers should use indirect feedback for more proficient students. These findings are close to Nazlı and Göksoy's study (2016), which included 60 first grade English Language Teaching trainees to examine the role of written corrective feedback. The findings showed that most of the first grade students managed to correct their errors after receiving direct corrective feedback. Saukah et al. (2017) conducted research to investigate the effects of Coded Correction Feedback (CCF) and Non-coded Correction Feedback (NCCF) on senior high school students' writing quality. The findings of the study revealed that students' writing improved more with CCF than with NCCF because CCF promotes awareness with noticing as well as understanding. In Westmacott' study (2017), most students claimed that indirect feedback was more useful, and it prompts deeper cognitive processing and learning. Findings also showed indirect feedback reinforces grammatical knowledge and encourages autonomous learner behaviour. According to Eslami's study (2014), the group who were provided with indirect feedback outperformed the direct feedback group on both immediate post-test and delayed post-test (Ferris and Helt, 2000; Hosseiny, 2014).

The findings of the study suggest that vast majority of students prefer self-feedback to peer-feedback. 90% of the students in the A1 group, 91% of the students in the A2 group, and 81% of the students in the B1 group claim that self review help learners develop error awareness and become independent writers. These findings are corroborated by Amelia's study (2020), which shows students' positive perception towards self-directed feedback (Akmilia et al., 2015). Regarding peer-feedback, 80 % of A1 level students, 83 % of A2 level students, and 72 % of B1 level students didn't find peer-feedback beneficial or necessary. They did not feel happy to receive from peers. These findings challenge common beliefs about peer review (Amores, 2008). They conflict with some studies in the literature. Curtis et al. (1998) collected anonymous questionnaire data on whether second language learners prefer to get feedback as one type of feedback on their written products. Peer, self, and teacher feedback types were used in the study. A statistically significant percentage of participants (93%) indicated that they preferred to receive feedback from their peers as one type of feedback on their writing. Huisman et al. (2018) investigated students' peer-feedback perceptions. Students expressed

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

positive opinions for both receiving and providing peer-feedback in the study. Results also showed that both providing and receiving this type of feedback led to improvements of writing performance (Gielen et al., 2013; Jacobs and Zhang, 1989).

### CONCLUSION

Error treatment in second language writing is a salient issue, and it requires ongoing scrutiny. With that in mind, this study addressed types of feedback in second language writing with a literature review and students' opinions. As can be seen from the studies in the literature, there is no clear-cut answer to what sort of feedback works best in EFL classes; however, teachers can help learners develop a sense of ownership of their own written product when the feedback is given according to the needs of them. Even though I would like to believe that this study shed some light on feedback in second language writing, I should acknowledge some limitations. Firstly, because B1 level group was too small, findings here may lack generalizability. Also, the fact that I was the writing teacher of students in the study may have affected the objectivity to some extent although I took some measurements to minimize this. Nonetheless, I hope this study helps second language teachers develop strategies for different feedback types that will be helpful in writing classes.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to my students for sharing their thoughts and feelings in the interviews.

### REFERENCES

- 1) Akmilia, T., Purnawarman, P. and Rodliyah, R. 2015. "Self-Directed Feedback: An Attempt towards Learner Autonomy in Writing." *Indonesian EFL Journal* 1 (1): 48-57. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v1i1.613>
- 2) Allal, L. 2018. "Learning to Write: Observation, Modelling, and Interaction in the Classroom." *Educational Studies in Language and Literature* 18: 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2018.18.03.02>
- 3) Alshammari, S. 2020. "Writing to Learn or Learning to Write." *Research in Education and Learning Innovation Archives* 24: 1-22. <https://ojs.uv.es/index.php/realia/article/view/15867/15594>
- 4) Amelia, R. 2020. "Students' Perception on Employing Self-Directed Feedback in Writing." *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature* 5 (1): 60-70. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.10151>
- 5) Amores, M. 2008. "A New Perspective on Peer Editing." *Foreign Language Annals* 30 (4): 513-523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1997.tb00858.x>
- 6) Ataman, M. 2009. *Türkçe dersinde kullanılabilecek yaratıcı etkinlikler ve yaratıcı yazma örnekleri*. Ankara: Kök.
- 7) Beach, R. and Friederich, T. 2006. "Response to Writing." In *Handbook of Writing Research*, edited by C. A MacArthur, S. Graham, J.Fitzgerald, 222-234. New York: The Guilford Press.
- 8) Byrne, D. 1988. *Teaching Writing Skills*. New York: Longman. [https://www.academia.edu/5542884/49860749\\_Byrne\\_Teaching\\_Writing\\_Skills](https://www.academia.edu/5542884/49860749_Byrne_Teaching_Writing_Skills)
- 9) Cahyono, B. and Amrina, R. 2017. "Peer feedback, Self Correction, and Writing Proficiency of Indonesian EFL Students." *Arab World English Journal* 8 (1): 178-193. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no1.12>
- 10) Cahyono, B., Widiati, U., Rodliyah, R. and Prayogo, J. 2017. "The Effect of Meaning-Focused Feedback As Well As Language-Focused Feedback in Journal Writing on Indonesian EFL Students' Writing Ability." *International Journal of English and Education* 6 (4): 103-113. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325245613\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Meaning-focused\\_Feedback\\_as\\_well\\_as\\_Languagefocused\\_Feedback\\_in\\_Journal\\_Writing\\_on\\_Indonesian\\_EFL\\_Students'\\_riting\\_Ability](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325245613_The_Effect_of_Meaning-focused_Feedback_as_well_as_Languagefocused_Feedback_in_Journal_Writing_on_Indonesian_EFL_Students'_riting_Ability)
- 11) Chang, C. 2016. "Two Decades in L2 Peer Review." *Journal of Writing Research* 8 (1): 81-117. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2016.08.01.03>
- 12) Cohen, A. and Cavalcanti, M. 1987. "Giving and Getting Feedback on Compositions: A Comparison of Teacher and Student Verbal Report," *Evaluation and Research in Education* 1 (2): 63-73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500798709533221>
- 13) Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. 2012. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. USA: Sage Publications. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452230153>
- 14) Coşkun, E. and Tamer, M. 2015. "Yazma eğitiminde geri bildirim türleri ve kullanımı," *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 12 (32): 337-372. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/183481>
- 15) Cresswell, A. 2000. "Self-Monitoring in Student Writing: Developing Learner Responsibility," *ELT Journal* 54 (3): 235-244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.3.235>
- 16) Curtis, A., Jacobs, G., Braine, G. and Huang, S. 1998. "Feedback on Student Writing: Taking the Middle Path," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7 (3): 307-317. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90019-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90019-4)
- 17) De Smedt, F. and Keer, H. 2017. "Fostering Writing in Upper Primary Grades: A Study into the Distinct and Combined Impact of Explicit Instruction and Peer Assistance," *Reading and Writing* 31: 325-354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-017-9787-4>

## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

- 18) Elbow, P. 1998. *Writing with Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 19) Ellis, R. 2008. "A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types," *ELT Journal* 63 (2): 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- 20) Eslami, E. 2014. "The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing," *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 98: 445-452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438>
- 21) Fathman, A. and Whalley, E. 1990. "Teacher Response to Student Writing: Focus on Form Versus Content." In *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, edited by B. Kroll, 178-190. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524551.016>
- 22) Ferris, D. and Roberts, B. 2001. "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10 (3): 161-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- 23) Ferris, D. 2003. "Responding to Writing." In *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*, edited by B. Kroll, 115-140. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524810>
- 24) Gielen, S., Tops, L., Onghena, P., Dochy, F. and Smeets, S. 2013. "A Comparative Study of Peer and Teacher Feedback and of Various Peer Feedback Forms in a Secondary School Writing Curriculum," *British Educational Research Journal* 36 (1): 143-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920902894070>
- 25) Göçer, A. 2016. *Yazma eğitimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- 26) Göçer, A. and Şentürk, R. 2019. "Türkçe eğitiminde yazma becerilerini geliştirmeye yönelik kullanılacak geri bildirim türleri," *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 43: 123-149. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/681495>
- 27) Hedge, T. 2005. *Resource Books for Teachers: Writing*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- 28) Hosseiny, M. 2014. "The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill," *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 98: 668-674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466>
- 29) Hu, G. 2005. "Using Peer Review with Chinese ESL Student Writers," *Language Teaching Research* 9 (3): 321-342. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr169oa>
- 30) Huisman, B., Saab, N., Driel, J., and Broek, P. 2018. "Peer Feedback on Academic Writing: Undergraduate Students' Peer Feedback Role, Peer Feedback Perceptions, and Essay Performance," *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 43 (6): 955-968, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- 31) Hyland, F. 1998. "The Impact of Teacher Written Feedback on Individual Writers," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7 (3): 255-286. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90017-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90017-0)
- 32) Hyland, K. 2006. *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742>
- 33) Jacobs, G. and Zhang, S. 1989. "Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing Instruction: Boon or Bane?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, March 27-31. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED306766.pdf>
- 34) James, C. 1998. *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. Essex: Longman.
- 35) Karafil, B. and Oğuz, A. 2019. "İngilizce hazırlık sınıfı yazma dersi öğretim programına ilişkin okutman görüşleri." *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 18 (71): 1025-1039. <https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.429071>
- 36) Karatay, H. 2015. "Süreç temelli yazma modelleri," In *Yazma eğitimi*, edited by M. Özbay, 21-40. Ankara: Pegem Akademi. <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/2712016170719yazma.pdf>
- 37) Keh, C. 1990. "Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation," *ELT Journal Volume* 44 (4): 294-304. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294>
- 38) Kong, Y. 2013. "Peer Review: Exploring Training and Socio-cultural Influences on Activity Theory." PhD diss., The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- 39) Lalande, J. 1982. "Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment," *The Modern Language Journal* 66: 140-149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06973.x>
- 40) Lam, R. 2010. "A Peer Review Training Workshop: Coaching Students to Give and Evaluate Peer Feedback," *TESL Canada Journal* 27 (2): 114-127. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v27i2.1052>
- 41) Lee, I. 2017. *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Springer.
- 42) Min, H. 2005. "Training Students to Become Successful Peer Reviewers," *System* 33 (2): 293-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003>
- 43) Nazlı, P. and Göksoy, A. 2016. "The Effect of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing." Paper presented at the Middle East Technical University English Language Teaching Undergraduate Students Conference, Ankara, June 5-6. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/349051>
- 44) Nixon, J. and Topping, K. 2001. "Emergent Writing: The Impact of Structured Peer Interaction." *Educational Psychology* 21 (1): 41-58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410123268>



## Feedback Types in Second Language Writing: Are They Really Effective?

- 45) Ocak, G. and Karafil, B. 2020. "Development of Teacher Feedback Use Evaluation Scale," *International Journal of Progressive Education* 16 (1): 287-299. [https://ijpe.penpublishing.net/makale\\_indir/1266](https://ijpe.penpublishing.net/makale_indir/1266)
- 46) Oruç, E. and Demirci, C. 2020. "Yabancı dil sınıf kaygısı ölçeğinin faktör yapısının incelenmesi," *LATER* 3 (1): 76-93. <https://doi.org/10.35207/later.729713>
- 47) Patton, Q. M. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. USA: Sage.
- 48) Raimes, A. 1983. "Anguish as a Second Language? Remedies for Composition Teachers." In A. Freeman, I. Pringle, and J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to Write: First Language/Second Language* (pp. 258-272). Longman.
- 49) Robb, T., Ross, S. and Shorteed, I. 1986. "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on Writing Quality," *Tesol Quarterly* 20 (1): 83-95. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586390>
- 50) Saukah, A., Dewanti, D. and Laksmi, E. 2017. "The Effect of Coded and Non-Coded Correction Feedback on the Quality of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing," *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7 (2): 247-252. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8127>
- 51) Semke, H. 1984. "Effects of the Red Pen," *Foreign Language Annals* 17 (3): 195-202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1984.tb01727.x>
- 52) Shobeiry, M. 2020. "The Effect of Form-Focused and Content-Focused Feedback on Writing Improvement of Online EFL Learners," *Journal of Critical Reviews* 7 (17): 3548-3553. <http://www.jcreview.com/fulltext/197-1609116231.pdf>
- 53) Takashima, H. 1987. "To What Extent Are Non-Native Speakers Qualified to Correct Free Composition," *British Journal of Language Teaching* 25 (1): 43-48.
- 54) Truscott, J. 1996. "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes," *Language Learning* 46 (2): 327-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- 55) Vyatkina, N. 2011. "Writing Instruction and Policies for Written Corrective Feedback in the Basic Language Sequence," *L2 Journal* 3 (1): 63-92. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2319070>
- 56) Wahyuni, S. 2017. "The Effect of Different Feedback on Writing Quality of College Students with Different Cognitive Styles," *Dinamika Ilmu* 17 (1): 39-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.649>
- 57) Westmacott, A. 2017. "Direct vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: Student Perceptions," *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje u Cultura* 22 (1): 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- 58) Williams, D. 2001. *Writing Skills in Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- 59) Yarrow, F. and Topping, K. 2001. "Collaborative Writing: The Effects of Meta-Cognitive Prompting and Structured Peer Interaction," *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 71: 261-282. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709901158514>
- 60) Zahida, R. Farrah, M. and Zaru, N. 2014. "The Impact of Three Types of Written Feedback on the Motivation and Writing Skill of English Major Students at Hebron University." *Humanities* 28 (5): 1275-1297. [https://journals.najah.edu/media/journals/full\\_texts/9\\_1.pdf](https://journals.najah.edu/media/journals/full_texts/9_1.pdf)
- 61) Zaman, M. and Azad, A. 2012. "Feedback in EFL Writing at Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions," *ASA University Review* 6 (1): 139-156.
- 62) Zamel, V. 1982. "Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning," *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (2): 195-2. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586792>
- 63) Zohrabi, M. and Rezaie, P. 2012. "The Role of Form-Focused Feedback on Developing Students' Writing Skill," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 2 (7): 1514-1519. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.7.1514-1519>