

**TEACHER COGNITION ON WRITTEN FEEDBACK: NOVICE AND
EXPERIENCED TEACHERS' BELIEFS, ATTITUDES AND
PRACTICES**

GÜL KARAAĞAÇ

JULY 2014

**TEACHER COGNITION ON WRITTEN FEEDBACK: NOVICE AND
EXPERIENCED TEACHERS' BELIEFS, ATTITUDES AND
PRACTICES**

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

BY

GÜL KARAAĞAÇ

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

JULY 2014

Approval of the Board of Graduate Programs

Prof. Dr. Tanju Mehmetođlu
Chair Person

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Scott H. Boyd
Program Coordinator

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

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Yigitoglu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Yigitoglu	(METU NCC, TEFL)	_____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Sonu Dimililer	(GAU, ELT)	_____
Dr. Alev zbilgin Gezgin	(METU NCC, TEFL)	_____

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

Name, Last name: GÜL KARAAĞAÇ

Signature:

ABSTRACT

TEACHER COGNITION ON WRITTEN FEEDBACK: NOVICE AND EXPERIENCED TEACHERS' BELIEFS, ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES

Karaağaç, Gül

M.A., Department of Foreign Language Education

Supervisor: V. Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Yiğitođlu

July 2014, 195 pages

Written feedback has in recent years attracted the attention of an increasing number of researchers. While much research on written feedback has focused on students' and/or teachers' preferences of written feedback (e.g. Zhu, 2010), teacher beliefs and practices regarding written feedback (e.g. Clements, 2006; Min, 2011), very few, if any, explored the influence of teachers' experience on feedback practices. In an attempt to address this gap in literature, this study investigates the impact of experience on ESL teachers' written feedback practices. The purpose of

this research is to explore the relationship between novice and experienced teachers' experiences and perceived beliefs about feedback practices, analyze the motives behind their written feedback practices and compare the teachers' beliefs about written feedback to see whether they are congruent with their observed practices. The study adopted a case study approach. One novice and one experienced teacher working at the preparatory school (Hazirlik) of a private university in Northern Cyprus were asked to participate in the study.

Data were collected across 15 weeks. A preliminary questionnaire for biographical data of the participants was administered and then semi-structured interviews with stimulated recall sessions and observations were conducted to explore these teachers' general attitudes and beliefs about written feedback, the challenges they encounter and the way they respond to students' writings. Analysis of writing papers was also carried out to compare teachers' stated beliefs with their actual practices. The findings reveal that both the experienced and novice participant have a positive attitude towards written feedback and consider providing feedback their duty as a teacher no matter what the institutional policies require. Moreover, the teachers' main focus while responding to students' writings was found to be mainly on grammar due to varying reasons, and they experience several challenges during the process of giving written feedback. The study also displays the sources behind teachers' practices to be their beliefs, the education they received and the institution's policies. Finally, the study uncovered some (mis)matches between teachers' beliefs and actual written feedback practices.

Keywords: writing, experienced and novice teachers, feedback preferences, teacher beliefs, written feedback challenges.

ÖZ

YAZILI GERİ BİLDİRİM HAKKINDA ÖĞRETMEN BİLİŞİ: YENİ VE DENEYİMLİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN İNANIŞ, TUTUM VE UYGULAMALARI

Son yıllarda geri bildirim, giderek artan bir araştırmacı kitlesinin dikkatini çekmiştir. Konu üzerine yapılmış araştırmaların çoğu öğrencilerin ve veya öğretmenlerin geri bildirim tercihleri (Zhu, 2010), öğretmenlerin geri bildirim hakkındaki tutum ve uygulamaları (Clements, 2006; Min, 2011) üzerine yoğunlaşmasına rağmen, çok azı veya hiçbiri öğretmenlerin deneyiminin geri bildirim uygulamaları üzerindeki etkisini incelemiştir. Araştırmalardaki bu açığı kapatmak amacıyla bu çalışma, deneyimin ingilizce öğretmenlerinin yazılı kompozisyonlardaki uygulamaları üzerindeki etkisini araştıracaktır. Bu çalışmanın hedefi, deneyimli ve yeni öğretmenlerin geri bildirim uygulamaları hakkındaki deneyim ve gözlemlenebilir düşünceleri arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek, geri bildirim uygulamaları ardındaki sebeplerini analiz etmek ve öğretmenlerin bu konudaki düşüncelerini gözlemlenebilir uygulamalarıyla uyumlu olup olmadığını açığa çıkarmak için karşılaştırmaktır.

Bu çalışma örnek durum inceleme metodu kullandı. Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta özel bir üniversitenin hazırlık okulunda çalışan bir deneyimli ve bir yeni ingilizce öğretmenin araştırma yer alması istendi. Data 15 haftalık bir zamanda toplandı.

Katılımcıların temel bilgilerini elde etmek için ön bir anket uygulandı ve sonra bu öğretmenlerin geri bildirim hakkındaki genel tutum ve düşüncelerini, karşılaştıkları zorlukları, öğrencilerin kompozisyonlarına nasıl geri bildirim verdiklerini, ve ayrıca öğretmenlerin geri bildirim konusunda belirttikleri düşüncelerini gerçek uygulamalarıyla karşılaştırmak ve gelişimi gözlemlemek amacıyla öğrencilerin kompozisyonları incelendi. Bu bağlamda, anımsamayı sağlayan görüşmelerle yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler, ve ders gözlemleri ve öğrenci portolio incelemeleri yapıldı. Sonuçlar yeni ve deneyimli öğretmenlerin geri bildirim konusunda olumlu bir tavra sahip olduğunu ve kurumsal yaptırımlar ne olursa olsun, geri bildirim öğretmen olarak görevleri olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Ek olarak, öğretmenlerin geri bildirim verirken ana odak noktalarının çeşitli sebeplerden dolayı grammer olduğu ve bu geri bildirim sürecinde öğretmenlerin pek çok zorlukla karşılaştığı bulunmuştur. Çalışma ayrıca öğretmenlerin geri bildirim uygulamaları arkasındaki sebeplerin kendi düşünceleri, aldıkları eğitim ve kurumun yaptırımları olduğunu göstermiştir. Son olarak, çalışma öğretmenlerin düşünceleri ve gerçeğe geri bildirim uygulamaları arasındaki uyum ve uyumsuzlukları ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: yazı, deneyimli ve yeni öğretmenler, geri bildirim tercihleri, öğretmen inançları, geri bildirim zorlukları.

To the memory of my mother,

For her perpetual love...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a great pleasure to thank those who guided me through this long journey and made this thesis possible. I firstly would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Yiğitođlu for her patience, sound professional guidance, quick feedback and continuous support during this long process.

I also would like to thank Assist. Prof. Sonuđ Dimililer and Dr. Alev Özbilgin Gezgin for their willingness to contribute to this thesis, their constructive feedback and suggestions on various aspects of the study.

I am also indebted to my colleagues who accepted to be the participants in the study and spend a lot of time and effort for a whole semester. Without their patience and contribution, I could not have completed the data gathering process. I also would like to thank our teacher trainer, Dorinda Jane Drury who helped me during the proofreading of my thesis.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my family and especially my mother, Bedia Karaađaç, who always supported me in my academic life and will always be in my heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ETHICAL DECLARATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
CHAPTER I	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0. Presentation.....	1
1.1. Background to the study	1
1.2. Aim of the study	5
1.2.1. Research Questions.....	5
1.2. Significance of the study	6
CHAPTER II	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
2.0. Presentation	9
2.1. Studies on the place and foci of written feedback in ESL and EFL contexts	9
2.2. Studies on teacher beliefs and practices regarding written feedback.....	13

2.2.1. Studies on teacher written feedback and student revision	19
2.3. Studies on the sources behind teachers’ practices.....	23
2.3.1. Influence of pre-service writing teacher education	23
2.3.2. Influence of institutional policies, experience and intention on written feedback practices.....	28
2.4. Summary of the chapter.....	30
CHAPTER III	
METHODOLOGY.....	32
3.0. Presentation.....	32
3.1. Participants	32
3.2. The setting	35
3.3. Data collection	37
3.4. Data collection instruments and procedures	39
3.4.1. bio-data questionnaire.....	39
3.4.2. Semi-structured interviews.....	40
3.4.3. Stimulated recall interviews.....	41
3.4.3.1. Written feedback analysis.....	42
3.4.3.2. Class observation.....	43
3.5. Portfolio analysis.....	43
3.6. Data analysis procedures.....	44
CHAPTER IV	
RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS	48
4.0. Presentation	48
4.1. Research question 1: The beliefs which experienced and novice writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback to learners’ writings	52
4.1.1. Beliefs regarding the purpose of written feedback and teachers’ role in writing.....	53
4.1.2. Beliefs concerning the effectiveness of written feedback	55

4.1.3. Beliefs regarding written comments and their effectiveness ..	61
4.1.4. Beliefs on best practices for responding	63
4.1.5. Beliefs concerning the reasons for student failure in writing	65
4.2. Research question 2: how do experienced and novice teachers respond to learners' writings and what are the challenges they encounter in the process.....	68
4.2.1. Feedback practices	68
4.2.1.1. Foci when giving written feedback	68
4.2.1.2. Practices in the second draft	72
4.2.1.3. Practices in the final draft	80
4.2.1.4. Practices regarding comments	84
4.2.1.5. Written feedback preferences	91
4.2.2. Challenges which teachers face when responding to students' writings	97
4.3. Research question 3: the factors which may have influenced university preparatory school writing teachers' feedback practices	104
4.3.1. Attitudes towards writing, errors, teacher role in writing and students.....	104
4.3.2. The impact of teacher education and experiences on teachers' beliefs and practices.....	110
4.3.3. Beliefs about school policies	117
4.4. Research question 4: to what extent are the novice and experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback congruent with their observed practices.....	127
4.4.1. Comment length, number, distribution and characteristics.....	128
4.4.2. Comparison of beliefs and practices	142
CHAPTER 5	
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	150
5.0. Presentation	150

5.1. Summary and discussions of the findings.....	150
5.1.1. Research question 1	150
5.1.2. Research question 2	154
5.1.3. Research question 3	159
5.1.4. Research question 4	163
5.2. Implications of the study	165
5.3. Limitations of the study	169
5.4. Recommendations for further research.....	169
REFERENCES	171
APPENDICES	184
APPENDIX A	184
APPENDIX B	186
APPENDIX C	188
APPENDIX D	189
APPENDIX E	191
APPENDIX F	192
APPENDIX G	194

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 1 Summary of data collection and analysis	47
Table 2 Emerging categories and themes for each research question	50
Table 3 Comment Length (Number of Words) of experienced and novice participant	128
Table 4 Comment Types used by experienced and novice participant in portfolios.....	129
Table 5 Hedges used by experienced and novice participant	136
Table 6 Text Specific Comment of experienced and novice participant.....	137
Table 7 Margin versus End Comments in experienced and novice participant's written feedback.....	139
Table 8 Changes in teachers' written feedback practices	140
Table 9 Summary of the results of the portfolio analysis	141

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.0. Presentation

This chapter has three main sections. The first section provides brief background information about the study. The following section introduces the purpose of the study along with its research questions. The third and final section is about the significance of the study

1.1. Background to the Study

The importance given to English language teaching and English itself has expanded throughout the world, making English a Lingua Franca (ELF), a term described as the ‘means of communication between people who come from different first language backgrounds’ (Jenkins, 2012, p. 486). This means that while the *inner circle*, including native speakers, has been shrinking, the *expanding circle*, where English is used as a foreign language and the *outer circle* in which English is taught as a second language have been on the increase in the last decades (Kachru, 1992). Since English has been widely used and there is a growing demand to learn English especially in the expanding circle which includes Turkey, the number of non-native English language teachers has also been on the increase.

Although they are not, as Medgyes (1994) claimed, “two different species”, it has been revealed that native and non-native English language teachers differ in some aspects like vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency (as cited in Llurda, 2006, p. 14). Quite naturally, the problems that non-native teachers face differ from those experienced by native ones. One such problem is related to writing as Manchón (2009) emphasizes: “particularly, FL [Foreign Language] contexts show their own idiosyncrasy regarding the role that writing plays (or can play) in the lives of students and teachers” (p. 2). Writing in EL contexts is considered to be a necessary skill for students and teachers alike in professional, academic and daily life. However, because of the nature of the setting and the participants, it requires special attention and effort on the part of the non-native teachers to deal with the emerging problems and simultaneously enhance students’ writing ability, which necessitates teacher intervention during and after writing. Written feedback, described as the “input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision”, is one method of intervention during the writing process and it aims to increase student understanding and writing quality in general (Keh, 1990, p. 294).

Thus, written feedback has been subject to research from varying angles regarding its effectiveness in writing. While some studies asserted that it is not effective, and thus should be abandoned (Fazio, 2001; Polio et al., 1998; Robb et al., 1986; Truscott, 1996, 1999, & 2007), others claimed that it is effective and thus should have its place in writing (Ashwell, 2000; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Sheen, 2007). As the results of these studies indicate, there is no consensus on whether feedback is really effective in improving students’ skills in writing. However, some studies have yielded significant results concerning effective ways of

responding. Two of the perhaps most-voiced suggestions are that teacher feedback should “focus on a range of issues, including content, organization, language, mechanics, and style, and the focus of response should depend upon individual students’ needs at that point in time” and that teachers should “give clear and text-specific feedback that includes both encouragement and constructive criticism and that avoids appropriation (taking over) the student’s text” (Ferris, 2014, p. 8).

A relatively higher number of research studies on responding to students’ writing has made at least some suggestions regarding good feedback practices that teachers can utilize when responding to writing. It can also be argued that most of the teachers throughout the globe still prefer giving written feedback because “both teachers and students feel that teacher feedback on student writing is a critical, nonnegotiable aspect of writing instruction” (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 185). However, regarding the issue of written feedback, what teachers really believe is effective, what they are actually doing in the classroom and on student papers and why they are doing this are some of the questions that have only been addressed to a very limited extent in the current research arena (e.g. Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2011, Lee, 2003; Orsmond & Merry, 2011).

Yet, because “teachers are active, thinking decision-makers who make instructional choices by drawing on complex, practically-oriented, personalized, and context-sensitive networks of knowledge, thoughts, and beliefs”, their beliefs should be investigated in detail (Borg, 2003, p. 81). In other words, it is also because teachers are not merely passive “implementers” of written feedback theories or “apprentice of observation”, what they consider to be correct and important and thus prioritize should also be worth investigating (Lortie, 1975, p. 61). Moreover, taking

university teachers' beliefs about teaching, students and learning into account is crucial for the effectiveness of educational programs (Entwistle & Walker, 2000). In brief, analyzing teacher beliefs concerning written feedback and looking into the sources behind such beliefs are of utmost importance because what teachers do in the classroom will eventually affect student beliefs and practices, and thus the whole teaching and learning environment.

Although not numerous, there have been studies that examined teacher views regarding written feedback and whether teachers' practices were in line with what they believed to be essential (Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2006, 2011; Goldstein, 2005; Lee, 2003, 2009; Orsmond & Merry, 2011). As for the causes or motives behind teachers' feedback practices, two issues, i.e. previous training and experience or lack of experience, come to mind (Junqueira & Kim, 2013, p. 182). Since the former has received "scant attention" (Lee, 2008, 2010; Ferris, 2007), more focus is called for into this area because "how teachers teach can have a direct impact on how students learn" (Lee, 2010, p. 143). When it comes to the latter, the impact of experience or lack of experience, very few, if any, studies have investigated the influence of the experience on teachers' feedback practices.

Hence, the current study was conducted with an aim to shed light on the impact of experience, previous training, institutional policies and beliefs on teachers', one novice and one experienced, written feedback practices together with the challenges they face in the process of giving written feedback. The study adopted a case study approach since it was suggested that "the field of L2 writing stands to gain much if the stories of diverse EFL writers are made visible through interpretive- qualitative longitudinal case studies" (Ortega, 2009, p. 249).

1.2. Aim of the Study

Written feedback is considered to be a pre-requisite for student success in writing classes and thus it is largely implemented in second and foreign language settings. The importance given by the institutions and/or teachers to written feedback plays a crucial role in how students perceive writing in general and sometimes how successful they can be in that skill. However, the importance teachers assign to written feedback is mostly due to their experiences and previous education. That is, teacher beliefs and experiences determine and shape the feedback they give to students.

Considering the aforementioned aspects of written feedback, the present study aims to explore the relationship between novice and experienced teachers' experiences and perceived beliefs about written feedback practices. It also analyzes the motives behind these teachers' written feedback practices. In other words, the study is designed to find out the reasons why the teachers in question respond in the way they do to students' writings. In addition, the present study aims to compare the teachers' beliefs about written feedback to see whether they are congruent with their observed practices.

1.2.1. Research Questions

This study aims to explore the following questions:

1. What beliefs do experienced and novice writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback to learners' writings?
2. How do these writing teachers respond to learners' paragraphs?

3. What factors may have influenced university preparatory school writing teachers' feedback practices?
4. To what extent are the novice and experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback congruent with their observed practices?

1.3. Significance of the Study

Written feedback has an indispensable place in ESL and EFL writing as it is a tool that can be used to improve, guide, help and motivate students in the process of writing. The significance and necessity of written feedback during the learning process in general, and writing in particular, has been proven in a number of studies (e.g. Ashwell, 2000; Beuningen, Jong & Kuiken, 2012; Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Li, 2010).

Moreover, in contrast to the aforementioned grammar-focused corrective written feedback studies, there are other research studies which investigated teacher comments only, as a type of written feedback. In such studies, what teachers write on students' papers, their intended message and how these messages or comments were perceived by students were examined (e.g. Chanock, 2000; Conrad and Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1997).

Furthermore, although to a limited extent, written feedback has been examined from teachers' perspectives because it is teachers' beliefs and attitudes that actually determine the application or termination of the practice (e.g. Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2011, Lee, 2003). What is emphasized about teachers' beliefs and attitudes in these studies is that what teachers prioritize and regard as necessary is highly significant and their opinions about this "painstaking task" affect the students' attitudes to writing to a large extent (Lee, 2003, p. 218).

In addition to these studies that focused on teachers' perspectives, research studies compared native to non-native teachers' written feedback beliefs and practices (e.g. Akpinar, 1996; Park, 2008). These comparative studies indicate that while non-native English speaking teachers (NNESTs) may be superior to native English speaking teachers (NESTs) when explaining grammatical rules and language learning strategies, the NESTs seem to be providing students with compliments for their efforts and utilizing student-centered teaching techniques to help them write independently (Park, 2008). Also, NNESTs rank organization in writing as the most important whereas the NESTs favor content most (Akpinar, 1996).

However, the literature indicates a lack of studies that compare the effect of experience, training and beliefs on non-native novice and non-native experienced teachers' beliefs, attitudes and practices regarding written feedback. Therefore, this study will address this gap by focusing specifically on non-native novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and their actual practices about written feedback. Besides the novelty regarding the focus in the study, it is hoped to make a methodological contribution to other studies in the field by applying a case study design to collect data so as to compare the beliefs, experiences and practices of these teachers concerning written feedback.

The results are expected to provide some insights about teaching writing in pre-service education and in-service teacher training programs and teacher professional development about written feedback and the practice of giving written feedback. Additionally, it may reveal the challenges that experienced and in particular novice

teachers face while giving feedback and the differences between the novice and experienced teachers on the issue of written feedback.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.0. Presentation

In this chapter, previous literature on written feedback will be reviewed. The chapter consists of three parts. The first section reviews the literature on the importance and foci of written feedback in ESL and EFL contexts together with the effective types of written feedback in such contexts. The second part deals with teacher beliefs and practices regarding written feedback and also, teacher comments as a form of written feedback practice. The final section discusses the literature on the sources behind teachers' practices, namely, pre-service education, and institutional policies and experience.

2.1. Studies on the place and foci of written feedback in ESL and EFL contexts

The attention given to writing in English as a Second Language (ESL) or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has increased over the last years, which has resulted in a growing amount of research conducted in this area. The research has yielded a considerable amount of information on writing and ways to better learners' writings.

In an attempt to enhance the quality of students' writings came the discussions as to whether learners' written grammar errors should be corrected and if so, how they should be treated. The former issue has been discussed extensively by Fazio (2001), Polio et al. (1998), Robb et al. (1986) and Truscott (1996, 1999, &

2007), who found that feedback on errors did not improve student proficiency in writing. On the other hand, there are a large number of researchers who support written corrective feedback (WCF) in writing and think that it should stay as one of the components of writing. Among those researchers that support WCF are Fathman and Whalley (1990), Ashwell (2000), Ferris and Roberts (2001), Sheen (2007), Bitchener (2008) and Bitchener and Knoch (2008a, 2008b, 2009). The general arguments put forward by these researchers are that providing feedback to writing is what the administration and students expect, so it cannot be ignored, feedback should be given to prevent fossilization and that teachers are not familiar with the selective marking. Moreover, they state that the results of their experiments with the control groups show the efficiency of WCF in short or long term. However, the present research has been inconclusive. Therefore, both sides, the researchers for and against WCF to student writing, call for further comprehensive and reliable studies to ensure the (in)efficiency of WCF in grammar in ESL or EFL contexts.

Other issues concern the type of feedback that is effective and thus should be implemented. Ferris (2002), for example, suggests that indirect feedback is generally more appropriate and effective than direct feedback. The danger of direct feedback is that teachers may misinterpret students' meaning; however, she suggests that direct feedback is appropriate for beginner students, when errors are 'untreatable', i.e., errors not amenable to self-correction such as sentence structure and word choice and when teachers want to draw students' attention to other error patterns which require student correction (p. 146).

Chandler (2003) focused on different types of feedback in L2 writing to correct grammar and lexical items with an experimental group. He discovered that ‘direct correction and simple underlining of errors are significantly superior to describing the type of error, even with underlining, for reducing long-term error’ (p. 267). For accurate revisions, direct correction was found to be the best. Moreover, it was the students’ preference because of being fast and easy for them and teachers, alike. On the other hand, students think that they benefit more from self-correction where the teacher only underlines the errors.

As for the preference of coded feedback vs. marking the place of the errors (underlining), Enginarlar (1993) found that students were quite positive when the teacher indicated their errors using error codes. He states that these “students regard such correction as a type of cooperative learning in which the amount of work and responsibility is shared by students and teachers’ (p. 193). He further suggests that ‘problem solving manner of this feedback type would lead to more revision and achievement in writing classes’ (p. 193). The reason why coded error feedback is the preference of the students in this study might be because of the fact that almost all of those students are enrolled in science related majors and they like to deal with symbols and problems. Similar to what Enginarlar (1993) found out, Leki (1990) indicated that students prefer error correction methods that label mistakes and let them make corrections on their own. That is, the results of her study indicate that coding or symbols are preferred by students as they think they will benefit from such feedback more.

In the light of the previous research, it can be concluded that there is hardly any ideal way of responding to students’ writings. However, as was confirmed by

Zacharias (2007) in the study where 100 students and 20 teachers participated and a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were utilized, “similar to the teachers... the majority of students strongly believed that teachers feedback is of utmost importance to improve students’ writing” (p. 51). Thus, written feedback has a significant place in writing both for students and teachers.

As for the foci of teachers’ written feedback, the results of studies that analyzed teacher feedback found out that the main focus of teachers’ written feedback is generally grammar (Ferris, 2004; Stern and Solomon, 2006; Vengadasamy, 2002; Zamel, 1985). As Vengadasamy, (2002) indicates “many teachers treat the teacher response stage as a copy editing stage where they embark on an error hunt” (p. 2).

Similarly, Zamel (1985) carried out a study to examine university level ESL teachers’ response to their own students’ writings. She discovered that ESL teachers ‘make similar types of comments and are even more concerned with language-specific errors and problems’ (p. 79). Moreover, ‘ESL teachers, like their native-language counterparts, rarely seem to expect students to revise the text beyond the surface level’ (p. 79). Thus, it is clear from this and the above studies that writing teachers are more concerned with language specific problems than they are with content or other aspects of writing.

The reasons behind comprehensive error feedback as a focus in writing might vary. One reason might be because comprehensive error correction is something students expect from their teachers because teachers are almost the only source of knowledge for them. As a result, teachers might feel the need to provide such feedback to learners. As Schulz (2001) indicates, students feel disappointed

when teachers do not correct their errors on assignments. Moreover, teachers in general thought that responding and correcting grammatical errors were among their responsibilities. Another reason might be due to school policies and exams (Lee, 2003). Several researchers suggest that another reason might be teachers' beliefs that corrective feedback is a way by which they can enhance students' grammar knowledge (Jodaie et al., 2011).

In sum, even though the literature is inconclusive regarding the effectiveness of written feedback in general and the types which are more effective than others, most teachers continue to utilize it in writing because of various reasons and thus it maintains its firm place in writing both for teachers and students. Regarding the foci of teachers' written feedback, studies have found out that most of the teachers give written feedback on grammar forms while giving little or no importance to content and other components in writing due to several reasons, which will be discussed in detail in section 2.2.

2.2. Studies on teacher beliefs and practices regarding written feedback

It is a fact that teachers bring their beliefs and attitudes to the classrooms and what they believe and expect either from themselves or their environment affect their teaching practices to a great extent. As Fler (1999) points out "the way the learning context is structured is a direct result of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and philosophy about how children think and learn", which highlights the importance of teachers' beliefs and the impact of pre-service education on practices (p. 275). Moreover, Davis and Andrzejewski (2009) also stated that "What [teachers] believe is real and true", adding to the issue about the importance of

teacher beliefs (p. 913). Regarding the significance of teacher beliefs, Smith (1971) further supported Fler (1999) and Davis and Andrzejewski (2009) in the following way:

There is little doubt that the attitudes a teacher has towards himself influence his behavior in the classroom. And there are strong reasons for believing that the teacher's attitudes towards his pupils-e.g., his expectations of them—will influence their achievement. (p. 8)

Considered to be ingrained and crucial, teacher beliefs and attitudes have been subject to research from varying angles. On the other hand, teachers' beliefs and perspectives regarding providing feedback have been analyzed to a limited extent, while these beliefs and attitudes actually play a crucial role as they determine application or termination of the practice (e.g. Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2011, Lee, 2003; Orsmond & Merry, 2011). That is, what teachers prioritize and regard as necessary are highly significant and their opinions about this "painstaking task" affect the students' attitudes to writing to a large extent (Lee, 2003, p. 218).

Considering teachers' beliefs and practices about written feedback, Orsmond and Merry (2011) carried out a study in a British university. They investigated six biological sciences tutors' intentions when providing feedback, whether there is a correlation between what they believe and practice and how their practices are understood by 19 students. Data were collected through interview and document analysis of written feedback. The findings indicated that teachers used praising and corrective feedback a lot, which matched their beliefs. However, 'identifying errors', 'correcting errors' and 'explaining misunderstandings' were more focused on than those aspects that guide students in future assignments and engage them in thinking, which contradicts teachers' beliefs that feedback should be given to improve student work.

In a study conducted by Rahimi and Gheitasi (2010) with 10 female English teachers, it was revealed that teachers with high sense of efficacy utilized indirect feedback while giving feedback on form. Moreover, although “feedbacks on content were in minority and in most of the parts were through requests for clarification, a few feedbacks on content were given by the teachers in the high self efficacy group, whereas the low self efficacy group had no feedback on content” (p. 1937). This study highlights the importance of teachers’ beliefs about themselves and its effect on their practices.

Evans et al. (2010) aimed to answer the questions to what extent current L2 writing teachers provide written corrective feedback (WCF) and what determines whether or not practitioners choose to provide WCF. They conducted an international online survey to reach many writing teachers from all over the world. The findings suggest that “WCF is commonly practiced in L2 pedagogy by experienced and well-educated L2 practitioners for sound pedagogical reasons” (p. 47). The teachers had an average of 16 years experience and stated that “personal teaching experience, academic training, and research and conferences” were influential in their practices (p. 64). Together with appreciating WCF in writing, they thought “it may be ineffective if the students are not motivated enough to take adequate advantage of the WCF they receive” (64). In short, as Ferris et al. (2011) state, teachers do want their students’ writing to “improve to its fullest potential” and they do not want their time and effort to be spent in vain as providing feedback is a time-consuming and rigorous job (p. 61).

A similar study by Lee (2003) aimed to find out about teachers’ views and beliefs regarding error feedback in the writing classroom. To answer the research

question, she used a questionnaire survey and interviews with volunteer teachers. The results indicate that “teachers’ error correction practices are not always consistent with their beliefs or the published research, and that the teachers do not appear to be prepared to help students develop self-editing strategies” (p. 230). She concluded her remarks by drawing attention to the lack of knowledge among English teachers in Hong Kong concerning selective feedback and called for pre-service and in-service training in the teaching of writing. Her findings echoed in a study by Montgomery and Baker (2007), who surveyed teachers’ beliefs in an intensive English program in the U.S. university and then compared them with teachers’ actual feedback practices. They discovered that teachers gave much more feedback on grammar and mechanics on student papers than they reported in their surveys, which indicates divergences between what teachers believe and what they put into practice. It was also observed that teachers ignored the suggestions regarding best practices by their supervisors and went on with their practices.

A different method of investigation was adopted by Diab (2005) in her study on teachers’ and students’ beliefs about responding to ESL writing in a case study. She investigated ESL instructors’ feedback techniques and the rationales behind these techniques to explore ESL students’ beliefs about the relative effectiveness of various types of feedback, and to compare students’ beliefs with those of their instructors. A university-level ESL instructor and two of her students participated in this case study. Data were collected by think-aloud protocols and semi-structured interviews. The case study results indicated that the ESL instructor agreed that writing teachers should provide feedback on content rather than on form and use alternative feedback methods to the traditional ones. Yet, she still recommended

using error correction as a “security blanket”, which was agreed with by the students.

Another case study was carried out by Min (2011). She was the subject of her research and she wanted to discover her own beliefs and practices in giving comments in a semester-long academic writing class. She preferred to use a qualitative study design that “can not only help us understand the different natures of beliefs and how they evolve from an emic perspective but also empower ESL/EFL writing teachers” (p. 11). The result of the study revealed that there was “... little impact of the writing teacher’s educational experience on her feedback beliefs” (p. 33). Her professional knowledge from the literature shaped the way she approached students’ writings. As an experienced researcher, she observes the changes in her feedback with the focus changing “from students’ texts to their affective state and intentions, from the procedural aspect of commenting on local and global issues to the interpersonal and conceptual aspects of commenting” (p.35).

A more comprehensive study by Li (2012) analyzed the beliefs and practices of 16 New Zealand university teachers. Preliminary survey, think-aloud protocol, individual interviews, stimulated recall discussions and focus group discussions were utilized to get in-depth data. The findings revealed that there were convergences and divergences between tutors’ beliefs and practices about providing assessment feedback to the written work by undergraduate students and also, teachers’ beliefs were found to be contextually- regulated and emotionally- modified (p.178). Moreover, teachers’ experiences were found to be important in their decision making.

Lastly, Ferris (2014) investigated the reasons behind teachers' feedback practices and the sources behind the reasons together with their actual feedback practices. She surveyed 129 and interviewed 23 community college and university writing instructors and also analyzed sample student papers of those teachers that participated in the interview. The findings suggest that most of these teachers apply what has been advised in writing response literature as best practices and teachers use "flexible response strategies that fit the student and the task rather than following rigid prescriptions", which was in line with what they considered to be important while responding (p. 21). In short, teachers who participated in the study cared about teaching writing and giving feedback.

In sum, the above studies were conducted using mostly questionnaires and surveys with a couple of them using class observations, stimulated recall and think-aloud protocols. They in general looked into what beliefs teachers hold about written feedback and the convergences and divergences between beliefs and practices. However, the present study aims to look into teachers', one novice and one experienced, beliefs, reasons behind their beliefs, written feedback practices and sources behind them by using interviews, class observations, written feedback analysis, stimulated recall interviews and portfolio analyses.

2.2.1. Studies on teacher written feedback and student revision

Written comments are a form of feedback aimed to enhance student understanding and improvement in writing. The process of writing comments is "slow because it is demanding and difficult" for teachers (Bruno & Santos, 2010, p. 118). Because writing commentary is challenging, time-consuming and often not well-taught to the practitioners, some problems may arise. That is, written comments

require quite a lot of variables like “teachers’ own beliefs, socio-political dimension, language ability of students, task type and the stage at which feedback is given” (Hyland & Hyland, 2001). Thus, they are “multidimensional social acts in their own right” (Sperling, 1994, p. 202).

Moreover, as Parr and Timperley (2010) suggest, “without a sound grasp of subject matter, from the point of view of teaching others, teachers are not able to formulate effective comments or questions” (p. 71). That is, “if teachers have less robust pedagogical content knowledge, they are more likely to emphasize the quantity of students’ work rather than its quality”, which most probably results in superficial error corrections in terms of written feedback (Jones & Moreland, 2005, p. 196). Therefore, teacher commentary and students’ understanding of these comments have been the subject of several studies which addressed the aforementioned issues.

In one study carried out by Chanock (2000), the misunderstandings resulting from teacher comments were analyzed by asking the subjects what they think “Too much description; not enough analysis” means. Using a questionnaire with open ended questions in different departments, she discovered that “almost half of the students who responded did not interpret this comment in the way their tutors intended it” (p. 95). In other words, although quite a few students indicated that they understood the comment, it was discovered that they did not understand it correctly. Because the comment can be considered to be generic, it would be safe to deduce that such comments lead to misunderstandings and poor revision on the part of the students.

Another study was carried out by Conrad and Goldstein (1999). They investigated the relationship between written comments and students' subsequent revisions for one teacher and three students in an advanced ESL composition course. They analyzed students' drafts before and after comments and exchanged ideas with students in student conferencing. The findings showed that "students tended to be successful in resolving many types of revision problems (e.g., adding examples, increasing cohesion), but they were unsuccessful in revising problems related to explanation, explicitness, and analysis" (p. 147). In other words, problems such as lexical errors, and sentence structures were found to be too difficult for students to correct with teacher's comments and thus they needed other types of interaction with the teacher.

Stern and Solomon (2006) also investigated "how faculty assess student papers (providing feedback)" by making content analysis on comments written on 598 papers. They found that "faculty are providing feedback on technical writing components such as spelling, grammar, and word choice" without writing any positive or negative comments. The findings of this study are in line with some previous teacher written commentary studies such as those done by Connors & Lunsford, (1993) and Sommers, (1982). As Sommers (1982) very nicely put it after the findings of her study which analyzed 35 teachers' comments and students' revisions in return and interviewed both about the effectiveness of the feedback, most teachers are biased about "what the writer should have said or about what he or she should have written", and they look for errors and thus, "instead of reading and responding to the meaning of a text, we [teachers] correct our students' writing" (p. 154). That is, what teachers do is to detect the grammatical errors and respond to them.

Mitigation, which is described as “a form of politeness intended to buffer and mediate the emotional involvement and possible sense of inadequacy of receiving critical responses to one’s writing” is another aspect of teacher commentary (Rubin, 2002, as cited in Treglia, 2008, p. 134). This issue was investigated by Treglia (2008) who looked into the effects of the critical and positive commentary, mitigated or unmitigated, written by two novice teachers on two students drafts in two assignments. Although she did not find the effect of mitigation, or hedging, on student revisions to be significant, she revealed that “it plays a critical role as a face-saving technique and as a tool to motivate and engage students to take an active part in revision” (p. 128). She concluded that “students found most helpful the commentary that, in addition to indicating some acknowledgment of their work, offered specific suggestions and provided choices” (p. 129). That is, the comments students favored were those that were specific and hedged. In her 2009 study, she found out that students could understand mitigated comments, which contradicts Hyland and Hyland’s (2001) study results where they discovered that L2 students often misunderstand mitigation, which results in poor or no revision. She concluded that “type of comment, linguistic form, and hedging technique used by a teacher did not appear to be determining factors in cases where there were poor or no revision” (Treglia, 2009, p. 83)

Ferris (1997) examined over 1,600 marginal and end comments written on 110 first drafts of papers by 47 advanced university ESL students. In her analysis, she focused both on the pragmatic goals and the linguistic features of each comment. She also looked at the second drafts of the learners to see the extent of effectiveness of teacher comments. What she found out was that teacher comments resulted in substantial revision; however, some types of feedback appeared to be more

effective. That is, the “marginal requests for information, requests (regardless of syntactic form), and summary comments on grammar appeared to lead to the most substantive revisions” (p. 330). She came up with another interesting result regarding the less influential feedback types. These were the questions or statements that provided information to the students, but positive comments almost never led to any change because they were short and general. The conclusion she draws is that longer and specific comments lead to more revision. Also, similar to what Treglia (2008) discovered, she found out that “the presence or absence of hedges had little effect on the degree to which changes were made” (p. 330). Therefore, it can be concluded that teacher commentary helped students improve in revision but certain types were found to be more effective than others.

In short, writing comments on student papers is a form of written feedback that some teachers utilize while responding to writing. Although research is not extensive in this aspect, it can be concluded that teachers’ preferences when writing comments vary and it is difficult to mark one type of comments as the best one.

2.3. Studies on the sources behind teachers’ practices

This section will summarize previous studies on the sources behind teachers’ practices in teacher education. The literature reports two main factors as influential sources behind writing teachers’ practices: (1) Pre-service writing teacher education and (2) Institutional policies, experience and intention. The following sections will summarize previous literature on these main sources behind teachers’ practices.

2.3.1. Influence of Pre-service Writing Teacher Education

Language teachers' pre-service education holds an indispensable place in teachers' professional development. As Jones and Moreland (2005) emphasize "teachers' understanding of the nature and purpose of the discipline strongly influences their personal pedagogical content knowledge, i.e. what they highlight as important" (p. 195). That is, "both lack of knowledge of the content of the subject, writing, and the difficulty in specifying a quality performance may partly explain the nature of unintended outcomes or lack of outcomes reported in the majority of the literature on teacher response to student writing" (Parr & Timperley, 2010, p. 72).

Additionally, because pre-service education serves as "the link between what is known in the field and what is done in the classroom", its importance cannot be underestimated (Freeman, 1989, p. 30). She adds that the purpose of language teacher education is to create a change in the teacher's decision making process. However, research conducted on pre-service teacher education in general draws a pessimistic picture about the effectiveness of the programs to shape teachers' future practices. The teacher education programs are defined by Grossman (2008), and Zeichner and Tabachnik (1981) as a "low-impact enterprise", which is partly because it is difficult to change people's beliefs, practices and attitudes just by education (as cited in Lee, 2010, p. 144). Some student teachers may resist change and be determined to do whatever they think is the best no matter what education they receive. This was further supported by Almarza (1996) who states that trainee teachers' beliefs about learning and teaching may not change but remain unchanged.

As can be clearly seen, teachers' perceptions have a significant importance in their perceptions about the effectiveness of the teacher education programs and their

influence in prospective teachers' teaching writing practices. However, it is not only the teachers' perceptions but the way teacher education programs are set which has a great impact on the success of the pre-service education in preparing future writing teachers.

There have been some scholars who have emphasized the need for improvement in pre-service education regarding writing and written feedback in particular. One such scholar, Lee (2010) drew the attention to the fact that "scant attention has been paid to writing teacher preparation" and called for more attention to be given to this area since "how teachers teach can have a direct impact on how students learn" (p. 143). Moreover, since giving feedback to students' writing is a very challenging task a writing teacher experiences and it is certainly "the most time-consuming, preparing future teachers to respond to L2 writing becomes an important aspect of any pre-service training course" (Ferris, 2007, p. 165). Although there have been some studies which focused on prospective writing teacher education (Hirvela & Belcher, 2007; Hochstetler, 2007; Lee, 2008, 2010; Reichelt, 2009), further attention needs to be given to writing teacher education especially in preparing teachers to give feedback to students' writing.

Lee (2008) aimed to fulfill the gap that exists in research concerning how school teachers in EFL contexts respond to student writing and why teachers respond to writing in the ways they do, and if discrepancies exist between teachers' feedback practices and recommended principles and the reasons that may account for the disjuncture (p. 69). She worked with 26 Hong Kong secondary English teachers and examined their feedback to 174 student texts. This was followed by interview to get details about the reasons behind teachers' feedback practices. The

findings suggest that the reasons are (lack of) teacher training, examination culture, teachers' beliefs and values, accountability, and overall context of teachers' work. The data revealed that teachers were unaware of the research findings in the area of feedback and they all indicated that "the training they received in the area of feedback was mostly from the more experienced teachers within the English panel" (81). That is, as Zeichner (1983) puts it, experienced teachers act as "guards and guardians" helping novice teachers in their first years (p. 9). However, not all the teachers are as lucky and they may have serious difficulties in assessing students' writing and giving feedback to them. Thus, as the study by Lee (2008) showed, future teachers do not get enough education in teaching writing and providing feedback to writing, which highlights the need to focus more on writing teacher preparation regarding feedback in pre-service teacher education.

To explore this phenomenon in more detail, Lee (2010) worked with four EFL teachers in Hong Kong and conducted classroom research and interviews to investigate teachers' perspectives on their own development as teachers of writing at the end of an in-service writing teacher education program. Another aim of the study was to explore the ways in which writing teacher education promotes teacher learning. She found out that "writing teacher education does have a role to play in the trajectory of EFL teachers' development..." (p. 154). She concluded that teacher education was essential if students' writing ability was to be improved and this improvement occurs through feedback, which is often neglected in pre-service teacher education.

In her paper, Ferris (2007) focuses on her own approach to training writing teachers in the area of written feedback. She discusses the three sections, approach,

response and follow-up that she follows when training future writing teachers in providing written feedback. She draws her students' attention to individualized feedback rather than a "rubber-stamped or generic sounding" one when responding to students' writing in the approach section (p. 169). In the response section, she focuses on the techniques which better the ways of giving feedback. Finally, the follow-up section is more like a practice section where students put what they have learned into practice. Ferris states that since response to students' writing is a very difficult task, teachers who are to teach writing should be prepared to respond effectively to writing in pre-service language teacher training programs.

In a more recent study, Ferris (2011) surveyed 129 college writing instructors in both mainstream and specialized L2 writing contexts and interviewed 23 of them about their training, experience, philosophies and practices with regard to response. The findings revealed that most of the instructors did not receive "any substantive formal training in working with L2 writers, nearly two-thirds of their sample reported adapting their feedback to the needs of L2 writers at least sometimes and the nature of these adaptations varied considerably" (p. 223). In other words, writing teachers struggle to do their best in responding appropriately to students' writing; however, lack of training in the area is a challenge for most of the teachers, which should be addressed in undergraduate programs.

Hochstetler (2007) aimed to explore the question of how pre-service secondary school teachers are taught to teach writing in three teacher education programs in California colleagues. Through an informal e-mail survey, she asked what institution taught them how to teach writing. "All indicated that they were 'self-taught' in writing instruction, meaning that they modeled their teaching after

other teachers of writing and sought help through continuing education or textual support' (p. 71). The study showed that the education of teachers in writing in pre-service programs is not enough as teachers feel the need to seek help from other sources. Therefore, it would be unnecessary to question whether these teachers received enough training regarding written feedback during pre-service education.

Additionally, Baleghizadeh and Rezaei, (2010) focused on a pre-service teacher's beliefs about written corrective feedback. They used questionnaire on beliefs and informal interview, and after teacher training course, they conducted class observations. The findings of their study suggest that the beliefs and practices of the teacher changes a lot after the Teacher training course, which hints the place of pre-service education and the way it affects teachers' future written feedback practices.

In the light of the recent research, it can be concluded that little attention has been paid to writing and especially feedback to writing in pre-service teacher education programs and teachers try to compensate for this gap by their own efforts. It would then be safe to conclude that student teachers' preparation to respond to L2 writing in EFL or ESL contexts has been of little concern as this is clear when the relevant literature is analyzed. Therefore, lack of training during teachers' university education generally represents a significant hindrance to teachers when responding to students' writings. However, in some cases, teachers stated that they benefitted from previous education by observing their teachers at the time, which helped them, although to a limited degree.

2.3.2. Influence of institutional policies, experience and intention on written feedback practices

It is a fact that there is no single perfect way of doing things because what works in one country might not in another. That is, as Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) emphasize “what is appropriate in an international context may not be appropriate in a local context” (p. 199). Therefore, the notion of “particularity” described as one that facilitates “the advancement of a context-sensitive language education based on a true understanding of local linguistic, sociocultural, and political particularities” is also needed in teaching practices (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 537). Thus, teachers and institutions alike should be aware of the local characteristics and thus appropriate their practices accordingly.

Written feedback is one of these practices and while giving written feedback, teachers refer to institutional policies frequently as sources behind their practices. However, research has indicated that such policies generally constitute hindrance for teachers and thus, result in frustration. While institutional practices can sometimes be helpful, they can also cause a hindrance and become an object of frustration for teachers because among the problems teachers face and the sources behind their feedback practices, institutional policies have an important place.

Aiming to analyze sources behind teachers’ feedback practices and the problems that underlie the practices, Lee (2011) used teacher feedback data from 26 English teachers from Hong Kong and interview data from six of them. The findings from the interview data showed that teachers provided feedback on all errors in students’ writing, or at least they claimed to do so since this was the schools’ policy. That is, they claimed to use comprehensive feedback since the school policy

necessitates it, not because they want to apply it, which naturally results in dilemmas for teachers.

Moreover, Bailey & Garner (2010) investigated the views and beliefs of teaching staff regarding written feedback along with what students do or do not do with it. Data were collected in a British higher education institution via interviews with 48 teachers coming from various educational backgrounds. Results indicate that teachers emphasize “the formative and developmental role of feedback” together with its motivation function (p. 191). That is, while giving feedback, teachers need to use it both “as a way of explaining to students how their work has been judged and graded and providing of feed-forward advice on how to improve it” and to “conform to institutional requirements, procedures and priorities” (p. 195). It is clear that as part of the institutional practices, teachers give feedback to justify the grade they assign. This often gives rise to conflicts between what teachers intend to do and what institutions require from them. Thus, it is concluded that “the policies and practices of the institution; the quality assurance agency; the stipulations of internal and external audit; and the often unclear and varied practices of colleagues across and within disciplinary and subject boundaries” all may bring about alterations in “the amount, form and quality of the feedback [teachers] can provide” (p. 195).

A study which came up with results concerning various sources behind teachers’ practices was carried out by Paiva (2011). She investigated Brazilian EFL teachers’ beliefs about grammar-based corrective feedback on L2 writing and the extent to which their beliefs related to their perceptions of their classroom practices. She found out that in addition to teacher beliefs, “experiences, educational

background and contextual factors at work are influential factors that shape teachers' instructional decisions" or feedback practices (p. 41).

Moreover, Ferris (2014) revealed teacher intentions as sources that determined their practices. Results indicate that "teachers' approaches ranged from the noble (empower students as individual writers) to the compassionate (build students' confidence in themselves) to the pragmatic (manage the time demands) to the cynical (just give students models to follow because they don't care much and won't exert much effort)" (p. 21). However, regarding the provision, value and efficacy of feedback, some teachers expressed "enthusiasm" while others voiced "frustration and doubt" (p. 21).

Thus, although there have been only a few studies on the matter, it is apparent that institutional policies exert a profound influence on what teachers do in the class or on paper because eventually, the place one works in determines the criteria and teachers need to take these criteria seriously during their practices. Furthermore, regarding experience and intention, they do have an impact on what teachers practice to some extent. It can be concluded that the impact experience has on teachers is quite positive because they get to know feedback types with their pros and cons under various situations, which probably helps them feel confident. Teachers' aim while responding is also influential, as what teachers want to achieve by their feedback can affect the way they respond.

2.4. Summary of the chapter

In the preceding literature review section, a significant number of studies have been analyzed and the following gaps have been identified:

To begin with, the current literature shows that teacher beliefs regarding written feedback have been subject to a limited number of research (e.g. Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2011, Lee, 2003; Orsmond & Merry, 2011). In addition, while some studies have focused on the impact of pre-service teacher education (e.g. Hirvela & Belcher, 2007; Hochstetler, 2007; Lee, 2008, 2010; Reichelt, 2009), experience (e.g. Paiva, 2011) and institutional practices (e.g. Lee, 2011; Bailey & Garner, 2010), very few investigated the possible influence of these aspects with a holistic approach. Moreover, regarding the possible impact of experience, very few, if any, studies in the current literature investigated what experienced and novice writing teachers do concerning written feedback and the possible sources behind their teaching practices. Furthermore, there seems to be a niche in the present day literature regarding the methodology used to investigate teacher beliefs and sources behind their beliefs because the frequently used methodologies so far have been questionnaires and interviews. Lastly, although some studies have analyzed the teacher feedback (e.g. Conrad and Goldstein, 1999; Stern and Solomon, 2006; Treglia, 2008), very few, if any, studies investigated teacher feedback on student papers throughout the semester and whether there are converges or divergences between teacher beliefs and practices.

Therefore, the present study aimed to enhance the understanding of teacher beliefs regarding written feedback and the sources behind teachers' beliefs investigating the possible impact of institutional policies, teacher education programs and experience. This research also aimed to contribute to literature by using a more comprehensive research design namely, semi-structured interviews, class observations, written feedback analysis, interviews with stimulated recall sessions and a detailed student portfolio analysis.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.0. Presentation

This chapter will present the methodology of the study. It will provide information about the participants, setting, data collection and instrumentation used in the study along with the data analysis.

3.1. Participants

The study was carried out at the preparatory (Hazirlik) school of Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus located in Northern Cyprus, during the fall semester of 2013-2014 academic years.

To determine the participants, the study applied two types of non-probability sampling, purposive and convenience. Purposive sampling, where “researchers handpick the cases to be included in the sample on the basis of their judgment of their typicality or possession of the particular characteristics being sought” was used (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 115). This was indispensable for this study since only such participants could “best help the researcher understand the problem and the research question” (Creswell, 2009, p. 178). In other words, for the purposes of this study, selecting teachers with at least 10 years’ experience and those without any experience was crucial and this was achieved by the use of purposive sampling. Moreover, so as to minimize the variables concerning the participants, teachers who came from the same educational background were asked to participate in the study, which was only possible by purposive sampling. The teachers were both female with a BA degree and they taught students with beginner level of proficiency, which was

also ideal for the study purposes and for gathering sound data with as few variables as possible.

Convenience sampling, on the other hand, “involves choosing the nearest individuals to serve as respondents and continuing that process until the required sample size has been obtained or those who happen to be available and accessible at the time (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 113). Because this is a case study and it involves continuous access to its participants, convenience sampling was preferred. Additionally, at the time of the study, I was also teaching in the same institution, which made the data collection that involves semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews and feedback analysis, relatively manageable. Besides “geographical proximity, availability at a certain time and easy accessibility”, I opted for this type of sampling because “willingness to volunteer” was very important for the study (Dornyei, 2007, p. 99). The participants were expected to spare time for the semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews and also arrange dates for the class observations, which could not have been achieved without willingness to participate in the research.

Considering all the factors and needs, a bio-data questionnaire was conducted to determine the study participants. Depending on the careful analysis, one novice and one experienced teacher, who are both full time teachers in the institution, were asked to be the cases of the study for 15 weeks. The study participants had to be representatives of the group the study aimed to compare, namely novice and experienced teachers. Therefore, the following participants were chosen for the study.

The experienced Participant (EP)

The experienced participant was a female teacher who was a full time staff at the university where the study was done. She held a Bachelor's Degree in English Language Teaching at the time of the study. After graduation, she worked in various institutions and places like Turkey and Germany as an English teacher, mostly in universities. For the last 10 years, she has been working in Northern Cyprus universities teaching students with different levels of English Proficiency.

As for the experience, the participant can be considered to be highly experienced since she had over twenty years of experience in English language teaching when the study was conducted. She attended many workshops during her teaching life on error correction and student errors. In addition, she had some input session on error correction on how to correct them, how to peer correct them, how to correct spoken errors, and how to correct written errors while she was studying for COTE (Certificate of Overseas Teachers of English).

During the data collection, the participant was teaching at beginner level with four hours of instruction every day with the same class. She was also teaching all the skills, namely reading, listening, writing and speaking.

The novice Participant (NP)

Novice teachers are defined as those “who have completed their teacher-education program (including the practicum) and have just commenced teaching in an educational institution” (Farrell, 2009, p. 182). Farrell (2012) also adds that novice teachers are considered novice usually within the first 3 years of completing their teacher education program (p. 437). Gatbonton (2008), on the other hand, describes novice teachers as “those who are still undergoing training, who have just completed their training, or who have just commenced teaching and still have very

little (e.g. less than two years) experience behind them (p. 162). For the purposes of the study Gatbonton's definition was adopted. In other words, since the study is comparing the novice teacher written feedback practices with those of the experienced teachers, novice teachers should be as little experienced as possible so that the difference between the two, if any, could be determined. Moreover, because the study also aimed to find the reasons behind teachers' written feedback practices, previous education could be best observed in a novice teacher with the least experience in teaching.

The novice participant was also a female teacher in her twenties and she was teaching at beginner level at the time of the study. She held a BA degree in English Language Teaching when the study was carried out; however, she had also specialized in Psychology. Apart from her short Comenius Assistantship experience with children in Portugal (9 months), she had no teaching experience. In other words, she can be considered to be a complete novice English teacher.

As soon as she graduated from university in 2013, she started teaching at the university where the study was conducted. The participant was giving lessons on all the skills at the time of the research.

3.2. The Setting

The study was administered at Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus (METU NCC). The medium of instruction at METU NCC is English; therefore, the students are required to get at least 59.5 / 100 in the English Proficiency Exam (EPE) in order to qualify for their departments. Upon being accepted to METU, students have to take the English Proficiency Exam which aims to determine whether their level of proficiency is appropriate to study at their

departments. In this proficiency exam, there are three main sections. 1. The language section includes two cloze tests, dialogue completion (five items), and response to a given situation (five items). 2. In the listening section of the exam, there are thirty listening comprehension questions and a note-taking section, where the test takers need to listen to a lecture, take notes and answer a related question in three or four sentences. 3. In the writing section, the test takers are to write an academic paragraph on a given topic. Therefore, writing is considered to be an important skill both by the students and teachers.

In the Department of Basic English at METU NCC, a year is divided into five spans and in each span, students write paragraphs on various topics. Beginner level students start with basic sentence level paragraphs and then, towards the end of the first span, they focus on different modes of discourse like process, descriptive and cause-effect paragraph writing. Process paragraph writing where students produce three drafts is applied in the institution. In this process writing students and teacher alike should follow the steps mentioned below.

In the first step, students write the paragraphs in class after an input session where students are presented with some new grammatical structures (App. E) and the teacher signs their papers to show that the student was in the class while the first draft was written and then students write the second drafts on their own outside the class by looking at the grammar check-list they are provided with.

In the second stage, the teacher collects the second drafts and gives feedback using an indirect written feedback form which is the error codes (*GR*: grammar, *SP*: spelling and so forth). The institution provides the teachers with an example code list that will be used during the year at the beginning of the academic year. The

teacher gives the second drafts back to the students and the students are to correct the mistakes according to the feedback the teacher has given. They write the final copy and hand that in to the teacher.

In the final step, the teacher collects the final drafts and gives direct written feedback to them. Then, s/he gives them back to the students. Students are expected to keep the paragraphs in their folders, which are assessed at the end of the span and have a 20% average of effect on students' yearly grade.

3.3. Data collection

The present study set out to explore the relationship between the novice and experienced teachers' experiences and perceived beliefs about written feedback, and analyze the motives behind their written feedback practices. Because "the choice and adequacy of a method embodies a variety of assumptions regarding the nature of knowledge and the methods through which that knowledge can be obtained, as well as a set of root assumptions about the nature of the phenomena to be investigated" (Morgan and Smircich, 1980, p.491), this study adopted a qualitative case study methodology, which is an empirical enquiry investigating "a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (Yin, 2003, p. 13).

One reason for the methodological choice is that case studies are very beneficial means which provide invaluable insight into the individuals' beliefs, perceptions and feelings. In other words, this design will enable a detailed investigation of teachers' perceptions, beliefs and practices regarding written feedback in a natural context, which will also allow the researcher to "preserve the

multiple realities, the different and even contradictory views of what is happening” (Stake, 1995, p. 12) and thus further contribute to gathering rich and in-depth data. This will in return enable the researcher to “gain a holistic view of a certain phenomenon or series of events and can provide a round picture since many sources of evidence were used” (Noor, 2008, p. 1603).

Moreover, the study aims to explore the “how and why of a complex situation”(Yin,1994, p. 16) and this is best addressed through case studies, thanks to their flexibility in allowing multi-methods of data collection to explore “complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon”(Merriam, 1998, p. 41). These methods include observations, interviews and documents, which will be the main data sources of the current study.

Furthermore, qualitative research methodology, case study, is favored over the quantitative one as this way of data collection provides “a means for the researcher to capture or interrogate the “real world” – be that a situation, an organization or a set of relationships- in all its complexity in a way that quantitative approaches cannot do” (Atkins & Wallace, 2012, p.108).

The last reason for the methodological choice is that “case study research is richly descriptive because it is grounded in deep and varied sources of information”, which are “quotes from key participants, anecdotes, narratives composed from original interviews, and other literary techniques to create mental images that bring to life the complexity of the many variables inherent in the phenomenon being studied” (Hancock and Algozzine, 2006, p.16). In short, to ensure “that the issue is not explored through one lens, but rather a variety of lenses which allows for multiple facets of the phenomenon to be revealed and understood”, a case study

methodology was preferred over other ways of data collection (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 544).

3.4. Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

The present study utilized a case study approach to investigate its research questions. To address its research questions effectively and adequately, this study used various data collection instruments, which are bio-data questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, stimulated recall interviews, writing paper analysis, class observations and analytical feedback analysis model.

3.4.1. Bio-data questionnaire

At the beginning of the study, as a first step, a bio-data questionnaire was administered in order to find out the experiences, backgrounds and written feedback practices of the EFL teachers in the institution. The aim of implementing a questionnaire was to form a baseline for the in-depth analysis and determine the participants for the study. Also, the reason for the choice of the instrumentation was because questionnaires are “quicker to code up and analyze...” (Bailey, 1994, p. 118) and they are “directly to the point and deliberately more focused ...” (Cohen et al, 2000, p. 321).

In line with the study needs, the questionnaire was created by the researcher (App. A) and distributed immediately after the new semester started to all the instructors working at the Department of Basic English at Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus, where the study was carried out.

Later, the results of the questionnaire were analyzed by the researcher and depending on the careful analysis of the responses, one novice and one experienced

teacher were asked to take part in the study. While selecting the participants, limiting the variables down was important in that in order to make a comparison between a novice and an experienced teacher, there should not be a huge gap in their background.

3.4.2. Semi-structured interviews

Another instrumentation used to address the research questions was the semi-structured interviews (App. B & C). These interviews were used so as to generate data about the novice and experienced teachers' beliefs and their reported practices in giving written feedback, to explore the sources of their beliefs and to form the base for the stimulated recall interviews.

The aim behind the choice of such instrumentation was because semi-structured interviews enable participants to express their opinions over the matter easily and thus they generate subjective data. Although the gathered data are generally subjective, semi structured interviews are useful means "when the researcher wants to delve deeply into a topic and to understand thoroughly the answers provided" (Harrell & Bradley, 2009, p. 27). As the aim of the present study was to reveal novice and experienced teachers' perceptions and beliefs regarding written feedback, interviews would serve well for the study purposes since they help uncover participants' subjective opinions on the issue.

The interviews were done at the beginning and end of the study (two times) to observe the changes in teachers' perceptions or practices concerning written feedback. While preparing the first interview questions (app. B), in line with the study goals, the researcher adapted the interview questions used in some other studies (Junqueira & Kim, 2013; Lee, 2008; Vandercook, 2012). As for the second semi-structured interview (app. C), besides the interview questions from Hyland and

Hyland (2001), some other questioned generated by the researcher for the study purposes were used.

The first interview was carried out in October, 2013 and the second one in January, 2014. At the beginning of the interviews, the participants were informed about the aim of the interviews and assured that their responses will be used only for study purposes and that their names will be kept confidential. The interviews were done in English so that any problems stemming from translation could be avoided. They were all audio- recorded and transcribed by the researcher.

3.4.3. Stimulated recall interviews

Stimulated recall interviews were yet another way used to gather data in the study. Stimulated recall interview (SRI) is one subset of the various introspective methods and it is considered to be “an empirically rigorous introspection data collection tool that allows the interviewer to elicit, identify and explore participants’ thinking” (Henderson et al., 2010, p. 3).

Although these interviews are invaluable tools to dig deeply into people’s consciousness and reveal the reasons behind their practices, there are some issues that need to be considered before they are implemented. In order to get the most out of these interviews, the interviewer should “reduce anxiety; limit the perception of judgmental probing; reduce the intrusion into the action; stimulate rather than present a novel perspective/insight; make the retrospection as immediate as possible; allow the subject a relatively unstructured response; and employ an “indirect” route to the focus of the research” (Lyle, 2003, p. 865). With all these in mind, the stimulated recall interviews were carried out three times during the study. The first interview took place in November, 2013. The second one was conducted 5 weeks later in December, 2013. Similarly, the final SR was done 5 weeks after the second

one in January, 2014. The aim for having these specific intervals was to see whether there are any changes in teachers' practices in time, which was one of the study purposes. Additionally, using SRs this way would help reveal any convergences and divergences between the teachers' beliefs and practices.

It is thought that with the help of some stimuli like a visual record, stimulated recall interviews can enable the recall of the mental processes that were in operation at the time of the event itself. As was stated by Bloom (1954), "a subject may be enabled to relive an original situation with great vividness and accuracy if he is presented with a large number of the cues or stimuli which occurred during the original situation" (as cited in Gass & Mackey, 2000, p. 17).

In order to enable teachers, both novice and experienced, relive what they were really thinking and what aims they had in mind at the time of their practices and collect "live data from live situations" for the stimulated recall interviews, classroom observation and feedback analysis data were utilized in the study (Cohen et al. 2000, p. 305).

3.4.3.1. Written feedback analysis

Feedback data were collected from the participants to provide stimuli for the stimulated recall interviews. First, the novice and experienced teachers were asked to provide all the papers that they lastly gave feedback to. Then, the feedback given by these teachers was analyzed by selecting five of their students' papers randomly. This analysis was repeated three times during the study, right before the stimulated recall interviews were carried out. Depending on the careful feedback data analysis, the researcher prepared some questions to be used in the SRs.

Contrary to some other feedback data analyses utilized in teacher written feedback practices studies, real feedback data were used in the study since teachers'

natural and real practices would best reflect their beliefs and thus help achieve the study goals. This would also enable the researcher to observe any changes in teachers' feedback practices and to see whether these teachers' beliefs about written feedback were congruent with their actual practices. In addition, the way teachers respond to students' writings would help in understanding the differences, if any, between the novice and experienced teachers.

3.4.3.2. Class observation

Since what teachers do is not confined to their feedback practices, the study also carried out three class observations to gather more data on these teachers' feedback practices in the classroom. The findings generated by classroom observations would exemplify and reflect the practices of the teachers in a natural environment and provide a basis for discussions among the teachers and researcher during the stimulated recall interviews.

Additionally, class observations were used as an indirect route to the focus of the study. To clarify, with class observations, the aim was also to reduce the possibility of guessing and responding in line with the study goals since these observations also enabled the researcher to ask a few questions about participants' in-class practices.

3.5. Portfolio Analysis

In the present study, student portfolios were also analyzed and what the teachers, both novice and experienced, had written on the second and final drafts were all noted down for close examination. The institution where the study was carried out used a process-oriented approach to writing and that enabled the researcher to delve deeply into the teachers' feedback practices over a semester.

Therefore, both the novice and experienced teachers were asked to provide 15 out of 20 student portfolios to be used in the study. However, only 10 of the portfolios were selected randomly and analyzed in the study. The reason for requesting more student portfolios than needed was to prevent teachers from selecting the ones that they thought were appropriate.

The teachers' commentaries were all analyzed according to an updated scheme suggested in Ferris (2007). This model (app. D), "a teacher commentary analysis scheme", was originally developed for a research project by Ferris, Pezone, Tade and Tinti (1997).

The purpose for using this model was that it is an invaluable tool to answer the question how the novice and experience teachers respond to students' writings. That is, this model would reveal teachers' responding behaviors or focus, what variations they have in different drafts, and what language they use in written feedback. In addition, using this scheme would enable the researcher to analyze the margin, in-text and end comments the novice and experienced teachers provide on student papers. Another contribution is that the model would help in finding out the ratio of comments each teacher provides over 15 weeks. In brief, analyzing teacher comments by means of this model formed one of the pillars of the study and would further strengthen the findings.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

The data in the present study were gathered through qualitative means. That is, the data came from two semi-structured interviews, teacher feedback analysis (three times), three class observations and three stimulated recall interviews. Thus, the analysis procedures were carried out with utmost care to prevent any data loss or manipulation. The collected data went through three main analysis stages and each

stage was checked by another colleague who is a native speaker of English with an MA degree.

First, the data gathered through semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews were recorded, and transcribed immediately after each was completed and, along with the audio recordings, filed under each teacher's name. The transcriptions were carried out manually by the researcher by noting down every sentence uttered in the audio recordings onto a word document. This process eased the following coding process by helping the researcher become familiar with the data. They were then checked by the native colleague to prevent any misunderstandings resulting from grammar or punctuation.

After the transcription stage, the data was transferred to MAXQDA (Qualitative Data Analysis Software) for initial coding. After iterative reading and reflection on the transcripts several times as suggested by Bogdan and Biklen (1982), initial codes were formed. As Charmaz (1990) suggested, "prior theoretical socialization in a researcher may produce ideational and ideological baggage which inhibits forming fresh ideas and promotes tunnel-vision" (p. 1171). Thus, every incident mentioned in the data was taken into consideration and coded. For interrater reliability, the data were reanalyzed by another researcher and the differences were discussed until an agreement was reached.

After the open coding stage was completed, the codes together with the data were reanalyzed and reflected on. When the necessary changes were made, the codes were hierarchically grouped into categories. In other words, the codes which give information about similar incidents were categorized under a more general name. During this process, none of the codes were excluded just because they were

not related to the research questions the study aimed to answer. As it was in the initial coding, everything was considered to be important and thus included in the study.

When the results were transferred and commented on, some unclear and contradictory points were observed. Thus, follow-up interviews were carried out in order to eliminate such points in the stimulated recall and semi-structured interviews.

Table 1

Summary of data collection and analysis

Source of data		Rationale	Form of analysis
1	Semi-structured interviews (SI)	To address research question 1	Iterative procedure of reading the transcripts and then coding the data in MAXQDA
2	Class observations	To form a basis for discussions in stimulated recall interviews and also address research questions 2 and 3	Recorded data and field notes were analyzed and questions about practices to be asked in stimulated recalls were formed
3	Written feedback analysis	To form basis for discussions in stimulated recall interviews and also address research questions 2 and 3	10 student papers (1 st and 2 nd drafts) of each teacher's were collected 3 times and teachers' practices analyzed to form questions for the stimulated recalls
4	Stimulated recall interviews (SRI)	To mainly address research questions 2 and 3 and also 1 although not directly	Data from written feedback analysis and class observations were used as stimuli to understand teachers' practices and reasons behind the practices. Data were coded in MAXQDA and grouped into their themes.
5	Student portfolio analysis	To address research question 4	Randomly chosen 10 student portfolios of each teacher throughout the semester were analyzed according to the model by Ferris (2007) and findings compared with teachers' beliefs

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

4.0. Presentation

This chapter presents the findings of the study. It consists of four main sections. The first section aims to answer research question 1 by analysing the beliefs which novice and experienced writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback on learners' writings. To answer this research question, the results of the semi-structured interviews 1 and 2 together with some sections concerning the teachers' beliefs which emerged from stimulated recall interviews 1, 2 and 3 were used.

The second section is designed to answer research question 2 which is about teachers' observed practices, and the challenges which they encounter when responding to writing. To address this research question, data were collected mainly through class observations, written feedback analysis and stimulated recall interviews. However, some themes from the semi-structured interviews were also relevant and are therefore included in the analysis in this section.

The third section aims to address research question 3 which tries to identify the sources behind teachers' written feedback practices. The results of the semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews were used so that this specific question could be answered. After the data were coded, the sections in which the novice and experienced teachers stated the sources behind their practices were gathered and categorized under relevant themes. The final section deals with the extent to which

the novice and experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback are congruent with their observed practices, which is research question 4. In order to ascertain teachers' written feedback practices and compare them with the beliefs which they stated regarding written feedback, ten randomly chosen student portfolios of each teacher were analysed at the end of the study and the findings were compared with the beliefs which the teachers had stated in the semi-structured and stimulated recall interviews. This section helps to see teachers' practices in the second and final drafts and, additionally, to observe the changes throughout the semester. Furthermore, it clearly reveals the differences between the experienced and the novice teachers regarding their written feedback practices, which facilitates the comparison between their stated beliefs and their actual practices.

Table 2

Emerging categories and themes for each research question

RESEARCH QUESTIONS	CATEGORIES	THEMES
<p><u>4.1. Research question 1:</u> What beliefs do experienced and novice writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback to learners' writings?</p>		<p>4.1.1. Beliefs regarding the purpose of written feedback and teacher role in writing -Experienced participant (EP) & Novice participant (NP)</p> <p>4.1.2. Beliefs concerning the effectiveness of written feedback -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.1.3. Beliefs regarding written comments and their effectiveness -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.1.4. Beliefs on best practices for responding - (EP) & (NP)</p>

Table 2 (continued)

<p><u>4.3. Research question 3:</u> What factors may have influenced university preparatory school writing teachers' feedback practices?</p>	<p><u>4.2. Research question 2:</u> How do experienced and novice teachers respond to learners' writings and what are the challenges they encounter in the process?</p>
<p>4.3.1. Attitude towards writing, errors, teacher role in writing and students -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.3.2. The impact of teacher education and experiences on teachers' beliefs and practices -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.3.3. Beliefs about school policies -(EP) & (NP)</p>	<p>4.2.2. Challenges Face Teachers While Responding To Students' Writings</p>
<p>4.2.1. Feedback Practices</p> <p>4.2.1.1. Foci while giving written feedback -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.2. Practices in the second draft -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.3. Practices in the final draft -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.4. Practices regarding written comments -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.5. Written feedback preferences -(EP) & (NP)</p>	<p>4.2.1. Feedback Practices</p> <p>4.2.1.1. Foci while giving written feedback -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.2. Practices in the second draft -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.3. Practices in the final draft -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.4. Practices regarding written comments -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.2.1.5. Written feedback preferences -(EP) & (NP)</p>

Table 2 (continued)

<p><u>4.4. Research question 4:</u> To what extent are the novice and experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback congruent with their observed practices?</p>		<p>4.4.1.1. Comment length, number, distribution & characteristics -(EP) & (NP)</p> <p>4.4.1.2. Comparison of beliefs and practices -(EP) & (NP)</p>
---	--	--

4.1. Research question 1: The beliefs which experienced and novice writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback to learners' writings

To address the first research question of the study, two semi-structured interviews were conducted. The beliefs which emerged from the stimulated recall interviews 1, 2 and 3 are also included in this section. The first semi-structured interview was carried out at the beginning of the study so that attitudes of teachers, both experienced and novice, towards and beliefs about written feedback could be elicited. The second semi-structured interview was conducted at the end of the semester in order to gather more data about teachers' beliefs and thus have a better overall understanding of their ideas and beliefs. The stimulated recall interviews, on the other hand, were conducted every five weeks.

4.1.1. Beliefs regarding the purpose of written feedback and teacher's role in writing

The experienced participant (EP) indicated that written feedback “has a big role” in writing and that its intention is to improve students’ language abilities in general. More specifically, according to her, the purpose of written feedback was as follows:

eliminating their mistakes and making room for new mistakes, new risk-taking ... unless they correct their mistakes, they will not be brave enough to risk making new mistakes so their writing will always be extremely limited. ... if they feel confident about those things, then the next time they will be more adventurous and write more stuff and make different mistakes, hopefully. That will lead to learning and improvement. (EP, SI-1)

Moreover, she noted that she expected students to read and process her written feedback, and to be able to correct their mistakes. Similar to what she indicated previously, she emphasized that students should not continue to make the same mistakes as this would result in a vicious circle and that students should “fully understand what they did wrong and be able to avoid or correct that in the following paragraphs” (EP, SI-2).

In SRI-1, the EP stated that written feedback was a way to show students how much you cared about them and their work, which emphasizes the communication function of written feedback. As for the second stimulated recall, the EP emphasized that written feedback was given just because it was a tool which enables students to see their strengths and weaknesses before the exams. Having given written feedback, she would tell them what their grade would be if that piece of work had been an exam, which she believed was a way to motivate some and encourage others to take the necessary measures before the exam. She stated that “written feedback is 100% exam-oriented” because “it aims to point out [students’] strengths and weaknesses in writing and give them support on what they need” (EP, SRI-2).

Overall, she believed that as a teacher it was her duty to provide written feedback because it was necessary for students to get an idea about what they had done. Although the students might not use or read her written feedback, she was very careful to provide equal feedback opportunities to every student because she thought that to do otherwise would be unethical for a teacher. Also, she held the opinion that it is not quantity, but quality which matters in written feedback and despite not being sure, she hoped that written feedback would lead to permanent learning. She also aimed to provide students with good models for writing so that they could be better writers in their subsequent writings.

In the third stimulated recall interview, similar to what she had said in the first, the EP expressed the view that written feedback could strengthen her relationship with the students because correct use of written feedback shows that you care about the students, which in return leads to improvement in writing. She also said that the effectiveness of her feedback depended very much on the student and on his/her application of the feedback.

In parallel with what the EP said, the novice participant believed that the purpose of giving written feedback was “to bring the student to a better level” (NP, SI-1). Different from the EP, she added that another aim of written feedback was “to raise awareness” (NP, SI-1). That is, the purpose was “to indicate that everything – grammar, vocabulary and content – is important while writing” (NP, SI-1). She added another purpose, which was to help students to see their own progress because she believed that if the student does not see any progress, s/he might become sad and discouraged, which would put them off learning. She therefore gave “feedback to

show the student that s/he has progressed a lot from the first draft to the final” and she “just put the codes, and that is his success” (NP, SI-1).

She also mentioned the use of the language in a more appropriate and natural way in writing as yet another aim of written feedback. That is, the combination of words without errors does not automatically mean a natural and acceptable language, and “the only person that can make the student realise this is the teacher and we do this with feedback to writing” (NP, SI-1).

Additionally, like the EP, she indicated that the aim of written feedback was to prevent the reoccurrence of the same errors. In other words, it is “like investing for the future” (NP, SI-2). She also emphasized that her real purpose was to improve herself as a teacher as it was not only the students but also the teacher who needed to improve when giving written feedback. In short, she saw written feedback as a tool to better herself and her practices as a teacher.

In the final SRI, the NP noted that written feedback had a communication function but that it did not work every time, so it should be supported with “immediate help”(NP, SRI-3). That is, oral feedback should be preferred when students need instant help. As for her position in the process of writing, which she believed is very difficult to do in the mother tongue let alone a second language, it is to be just like a guide, showing the way but not doing the job for them.

4.1.2. Beliefs concerning the effectiveness of written feedback

Under this section, teachers’ beliefs regarding the effectiveness of written feedback along with their opinions about the effectiveness of their own written feedback practices are discussed. Teachers’ preferences about oral or written

feedback and their beliefs regarding the effectiveness of comprehensive feedback are also included in this section.

The EP claimed that her written feedback is effective because she can easily observe the improvements in the final draft. An improvement of 80% was a success for her and when a student failed to improve, she stated that this was his/her fault as she had helped them in different ways, with symbols, mini written presentations and examples, and had done her best.

In SI-2, she stated that because she did not know whether the students were repeating the same errors, she was not sure about the effectiveness of her own feedback but the reason for this was “not because [her] feedback was not useful” but because students “were not interested” (NP, SI-2). However, she still thought that some students benefitted from her feedback. Although she was not completely sure about the effectiveness of her written feedback, she thought, in general, that it was effective and in cases when it was not, her feedback was not to be blamed as that was the students’ mistake. She wished her feedback to result in permanent learning; however, she indicated that this had not been the case so far. Nevertheless, she was determined to continue her practices because of the ethical issues and her own personality.

Regarding the effectiveness of written or oral feedback, she stated that oral feedback given during the lesson while students are writing is not useful at all because students do not pay attention to how they write at that time. That is, their only aim is to finish writing as soon as possible. As for her preference, she believed that generally “oral and written feedback should be hand in hand” (EP, SI-2). She also indicated that written feedback is necessary but that there were times when

students could not understand what she meant in her comments as they were all in English. Therefore, they needed help in their mother tongue as well, which necessitates oral feedback. In general, she favoured both forms of feedback.

As for comprehensive feedback, she remarked that “whether it works in the long term depends on the students” (EP, SRI-1). As in any other issue, if a person is interested, s/he would benefit from everything whilst it is just the opposite for those who do not care. To conclude, she thought that comprehensive feedback was useful only when the students make use of it. In the subsequent SRIs, she continually emphasized that comprehensive feedback is good when students already know the structures. At lower levels, she corrected known structures only, whereas she corrected every error when students reached the pre-intermediate level. That is, she stated that she “corrected all errors” because “at higher levels, it is necessary” but “at lower levels, you can just correct what you have taught” (EP, SRI-3).

Like the EP, the NP claimed that her feedback was effective and good enough to guide students to discover their errors in their writing. In her comments, she indirectly referred back to awareness raising as she said that she created a desire in students to correct their errors. Although the NP questioned the effectiveness of her written feedback, she concluded that “this is all about students” (NP, SI-2). Therefore, similar to the EP, she blamed the students for any failure in their writing.

To support her opinions regarding the effectiveness of her written feedback, she recounted a case in which she underlined the word ‘fish’ and wrote ‘singular/plural?’, which resulted in the student searching for countable and uncountable nouns and then using the same and similar structures correctly, which she considered to be a success for herself.

As for her preference regarding written or oral feedback, unlike the EP, she stated that oral feedback is better in the first stage when students are writing in the class because it is immediate help and this might make it permanent, but she was not quite sure about that. In the second draft, however, she opted for written feedback. She also added that they should go hand-in-hand when the student is weak and cannot understand her written feedback. For the final draft, she thought that “written feedback is more important” as students want “to see what went wrong in the paragraph and they just want to see it explicitly” (NP, SI-2). Therefore, written feedback, she agreed, is better than oral in the second and final drafts because it is on the paper and thus prevents students from forgetting it.

She was asked whether she used the same comments she made during class when giving written feedback because her comments in class were slightly insulting. She replied that she preferred not to write personal comments when responding to student writings as she liked to express her thoughts orally. She thought that written feedback is “just a (piece of) paper and your message can go wrong” (NP, SRI-1). So although “this is about your relationship with your students and it depends on the student most of the time”, she tried to avoid expressing anything personal in written feedback (NP, SRI-1). However, she thought written feedback to be better than oral feedback as students can see everything on paper.

In the second SRI, she stated that written feedback is more effective than oral feedback and she explained this view as follows:

When you write on the paper, they know that they have to correct their mistakes and they will be graded for this, so it is being more effective and more meaningful for them ... The written feedback is more effective in these terms. ...Sometimes in the class, it is a 50-minute lesson and they are just

getting lost, but if it is on the paper, they read it. If they do not understand, they reread it and try to make it meaningful for them. (NP, SRI-2)

She added that she approved of written feedback when there are not many errors. However, when there are lots of errors, it would be a very difficult and not practical for the teacher to provide written feedback. In addition, correcting papers full of errors would make the teacher's job much more difficult so oral feedback, she thought, is more practical than written feedback as she expressed in the following quote:

If there are not many mistakes, written feedback is more practical. ... but if it is a paper like this with many grammar mistakes, no appropriate sentences or words, oral feedback is easier. Maybe it is not an exact solution but it (oral) may help better and it is also a burden for the teacher. What if I have six students like this and if I had to correct each and every mistake in the paragraphs in every draft? (NP, SRI-3)

Regarding comprehensive feedback, the NP commented that she corrected every error in the second and final drafts "but it does not work most of the time" (NP, SRI-1). That is, although she believed that comprehensive feedback does not yield the results she expects, she still carried out the practice. Also, she was "not comfortable with correcting the mistakes that students should have dealt with before that point" but she still corrected the errors as this was part of the school policy (NP, SRI-1).

In SRI-2, she was also found to continue giving comprehensive feedback. In SRI-3, however, when she was asked whether she still corrected each and every grammatical error, she gave the following explanation:

Not each and every error in writing. The big mistakes like wrong usage of linkers or very obvious grammar mistakes, but not article mistakes or preposition mistakes all the time if it is not very important again. (NP, SRI-3)

Thus, towards the end of the semester, she gave up giving comprehensive feedback and focused on what she regarded as major grammatical problems.

Overall, the EP thought that written feedback is effective as she could observe student improvement directly in the final drafts. However, because she could not follow students' progress continuously, so she was not sure whether written feedback results in permanent learning. She still gave written feedback and thought that failure in writing is the students' fault not hers. Regarding her preference between oral and written feedback, she stated that oral feedback is not effective when students are writing the paragraphs but it is necessary if students cannot understand written feedback. However, she thought that written and oral feedback should be used together. Regarding the effectiveness of comprehensive written feedback, she stated that it depended very much on how students use it. She preferred comprehensive feedback only when structures have already been studied.

Like the EP, the NP believed that her written feedback is effective because she creates a desire in students to discover their errors. Her preference between written and oral feedback, on the other hand, varied in different phases of writing. That is, in the first stage, she thought oral feedback to be better but in the second and final drafts, she preferred written feedback. Moreover, her feedback preference changed under different conditions. In other words, when there were many errors in a paragraph and when she wanted to say something personal, oral feedback was more practical and appropriate for her. As for comprehensive feedback, she practised it although she did not think it worked. However, towards the end of the semester, she said that she had given up the practice and focused on major errors only.

4.1.3. Beliefs regarding written comments and their effectiveness

The participants expressed their beliefs regarding written comments on students' paragraphs. In this section, the teachers' opinions are discussed separately for the experienced and the novice participant respectively.

The EP stated that comments motivate students and as long as they are academic “not ‘lovely’, ‘wonderful’ or ‘very bad’ or ‘terrible’”, they are useful (EP, SI-1). The focus of the EP's written comments was on writing both positive and negative comments when responding. In other words, she not only gave negative feedback, but she also provided positive feedback which she thought is necessary for student motivation. She pointed out that if the students received negative written comments all the time, this would put them off, so “it is always nice to say something good about the paragraph” (EP, SI-2). Another significant point she raised was that comments should guide the students and show them how they can correct their mistakes. Fortunately, she believed that students would appreciate her efforts and “tell the difference between writing a feedback for the sake of writing a feedback and writing a feedback because you really want to point out something” (EP, SI-2). That is, she implied that different from the written feedback which other teachers provide, her feedback is personalized and specific and that she really is careful when writing a comment.

She went on to suggest that the most useful comments are those written in a short tutorial form because students cannot understand the codes used in second drafts every time, and those which ask questions to “get students to think and look at [the paragraph] in a more critical way” (EP, SI-2).

The NP, like the EP, believed that written comments are very important in motivating or demotivating students. She also added that comments are like guides for students to correct their own errors. Similar to the EP, the NP considered that the “comments or feedback which are the least extreme, and fair to everyone, should be given to the students” (NP, SI-1). Additionally, she preferred feedback that is “as short and concise as possible” (NP, SI-1). It should also be specific enough to guide the student to find the answer without giving it directly. In other words, she emphasized the need to write more to the point and to give specific comments rather than generic ones as such comments are not helpful for students at all, which she explained in the following extract:

For example, when I say ‘be careful about your grammar’, he or she does not get anything, but if I say ‘focus on passive sentences or linkers’, they do better in their final drafts, so being specific is very important for them because they do not know what went wrong or they cannot identify the mistakes. (NP, SI-2)

Regarding the effectiveness of comments, the NP thought that she knew what is important when writing effective comments, but she did not know the theoretical background. For her, comments should be understandable so she kept them short and simple. They should also be “encouraging not discouraging and you should not write a million of feedback” (NP, SI-2). She also suggested that comments should also be “to the point” and that guidance should be given to students in other handouts (NP, SI-2). She believed that she should “at least cover all the language points or one or two that they can use in their lives or homework” (NP, SI-2). That is, when writing comments, she gave importance to directing students to use daily and natural language in their writing.

In brief, the EP considered written comments to be important and useful as long as they are academic. She paid attention to writing negative comments after the positive ones as she thought that comments are effective for motivating and guiding the students. The most effective comments, for her, are the ones written in short tutorial form and aimed at eliciting the answer by asking questions. She thought that her comments, unlike those written by other teachers, are specific and written meticulously, which she hoped that students would appreciate.

Similar to what the EP said, the NP agreed that comments are important and necessary in guiding, motivating or demotivating the students. Her focus was on being fair to every student by writing the least extreme, short and concise comments. That is, she preferred specific comments over generic ones. Her foci when writing comments and her beliefs regarding effective comments turned out to be almost the same as those of the EP. In other words, short, motivating, specific and directive comments in addition to those that encourage the everyday use of the language were the best for her.

4.1.4. Beliefs on best practices for responding

This section aims to explain what the participants thought regarding the best ways to respond to students' writings. Similar to other sections, the experienced participant's comments are discussed first, and then those of the novice participant are recounted.

The EP noted that best practices change depending on the "content of the paragraph". She continued by stating that showing students' strengths and weaknesses together with direct feedback and the appropriate symbols is good practice. That is, writing not only negative but also positive comments, using

symbols and giving direct written feedback were considered by her to be the best practices. She added that teachers:

should show how mistakes could be corrected, not just point out the mistakes, not just using signals but also showing how they can be corrected. I also suggest everybody should do some sort of free writing with their students if they can. Most semesters, I try to do two or three creative writing activities. (EP, SI-2)

As is clear from the comment above, she pointed out that written feedback should show students how to correct their errors rather than merely marking the place of the errors. However, she emphasized that there is no perfect way of responding and that teachers should help students “in various ways to try to get them to check or correct their mistakes” (EP, SI-2).

For the NP, the process approach, with students writing multiple drafts and receiving feedback on each, was the best practice. Similar to what the EP stated, she thought that good feedback should be encouraging, but the most important issue which she developed was providing “the feedback in which students can make progress”, which implies that she was open to different ways of responding as long as they ensure student improvement (NP, SI-1).

She added that “the feedback where the students discover their mistakes and correct them is the best one” (NP, SI-1). This, she believed, results in permanent learning as students discover and see for themselves. Also, little, specific and understandable comments were stated to be some of the best practices for giving written feedback. Above all, she stated that empathy when giving feedback is of the utmost importance as teachers should put themselves into students’ shoes.

Overall, although the EP thought that best written feedback practices change based on the content of paragraphs and that there is no perfect way of responding;

she generally agreed that written feedback which reveals students' strengths and weaknesses is one of the best practices. She also considered codes, and direct feedback along with feedback which shows students how to correct their errors in order to become very proficient.

The NP, on the other hand, considered the process approach to be the best one for improving students' writing. Moreover, like the EP, she emphasized motivation and development in written feedback to be some of the best practices. Furthermore, she stated that written feedback which aims to enable students to discover their errors is a very good way of responding. Finally, together with being specific and understandable, written feedback which empathizes with students is very effective and good practice.

What teachers described about their feedback practices was almost identical to the methods mentioned regarding the best practices for responding. It can therefore be concluded that teachers' written feedback practices stated in the semi-structured interviews were in parallel with their beliefs regarding the best practices for responding.

4.1.5. Beliefs concerning the reasons for student failure in writing

The participants were asked whether they knew the reasons for student failure in writing regardless of teachers' written feedback on each draft, which would in return reveal the teachers' opinions regarding the effectiveness of written feedback in general and their own feedback practices in particular.

The reasons which the EP gave for student failure were mostly linked to their "laziness" (EP, SRI-2), and because they did not take teacher feedback seriously or

did not want to spend time on writing, they showed little improvement. Another reason which the EP gave was related to the school practices. She explained that “because we move too fast for the students to absorb what they have been introduced to, they cannot see they have made a mistake” (EP, SRI-2). Moreover, she thought that students cannot write even in their mother tongue as they lack critical thinking and questioning skills. They cannot produce ideas and thus they fail in writing.

For her, students who pay attention to her feedback improve whereas others who do not care do not show any progress. However, she still asked the question about whether student failure is because they are “lazy or they did not understand [her] comment”; therefore, she kept “mentioning it in different ways and correcting it in different ways” (EP, SRI-2).

At the beginning, in answer to the question about why most students repeat the same errors, the NP explained that students make the same errors for several reasons. One of these might be transfer errors from the mother tongue. Also, because they have the same teacher, if they cannot learn from that teacher, then there is no another person who can help them. That is, “understandings or misunderstandings could be the same in the class” (NP, SRI-1). Another reason was inadequate writing opportunities and the artificiality of the writing handouts as “they are not relating this to their lives” (NP, SRI-1). It might also be merely because students do not care. It was observed, however, that she was not sure about the reasons for student failure.

Later, regarding the reasons why some students are unsuccessful and are consistent in their errors, she again mentioned direct transfer from Turkish, student

laziness and capacity. Interestingly, she did not blame herself or her written feedback in any way, which is clear in the following extract:

But his grammar is always poor so this is not about reading and not understanding the feedback, but this is his capacity in a way ... but when we look at the final draft, there is no correction and this is not about my feedback, I guess. (NP, SRI-2)

In SRI-3, it was again observed that some students continued to make the same mistakes and she was asked what she thought were the reasons for this. Similar to what she said in previous SRIs, she put the blame on the students. That is, they were inattentive, uninterested or lazy. However, when the majority of the students repeated the same errors, she accepted the responsibility, so it depends, to her way of thinking, on the number of students.

To summarize, the EP believed that because students are lazy and lack critical thinking skills and ideas, they do not show progress in writing. She added that the teaching programme in the institution is so overloaded and fast-paced that students do not have time to digest what they have been presented with. In general, however, she held the opinion that if students take her written feedback seriously, they can improve their writing, which implies that she blames students themselves for failing in their writing.

Regarding the reasons for student failure, the NP said that students fail because they depend heavily on translation and have only one source of information, which is the teacher. In addition, the insufficient writing opportunities and artificiality of the writing handouts in the institution were, for her, among the reasons why students failed. She gave student capacity as yet another reason for failure. Like the EP, she also thought that students do not improve in their writing because they do not care about it. In general, similar to the EP, she put the blame on students when they

failed. However, when a large number of students failed, she accepted the responsibility for it, just like the EP.

4.2. Research question 2: How do experienced and novice teachers respond to learners' writings and what are the challenges they encounter in the process?

4.2.1. Feedback Practices

4.2.1.1. Foci when giving written feedback

In this section, the foci in teachers' written feedback practices are analysed. The related sections mostly from class observations, written feedback analyses and stimulated recall interviews are gathered to answer the second research question of the study. Below, the findings from the EP and the NP are discussed consecutively.

In the semi-structured interviews, the EP noted that the focus of written feedback varies depending on the content of the input before the writing. She preferred to focus only on those specific language points ignoring every single error. That is, she always gave priority to those structures introduced in the input section when giving written feedback.

In the first SRI, the EP talked about her practices during the first class observation. What she did was to note down the common errors which students made in that handout and then shared them anonymously with the whole class. Students practised the codes and how to correct the errors on the board with the teacher, which she claimed is necessary because otherwise, it would have been very difficult to answer similar questions individually. She focused on the grammar in those sentences and ignored the content. Five weeks later, in the second SRI, she

said that her focus was on content and language in feedback, and the reasons she gave were as follows:

I have to. Even if we do not agree with the ideas, we still have to give them feedback on whether the ideas support the main idea or not, so you have to look at the paragraph from different perspectives. We have to look at the language and check if the student has used the necessary structures and vocabulary appropriately, but you also have to check if their ideas are cohesive and in line with the controlling idea, so feedback is necessary. (EP, SRI-2)

It was observed that she helped the students a lot during the class by giving some sentences directly, and finding the main ideas herself (observation-2). Thus, she was asked whether she helped the students that much with her written feedback and wrote some sentences directly. She noted that if the students did not yet know the structures, she would still correct their sentences directly as she wanted to familiarize them with the structures. However, she still thought that this would not work or result in effective learning.

The paper analyses revealed that she wrote the referencing errors directly on the second drafts of some students, which she thought was necessary as that was a repeated problem and she wanted to draw students' attention to that issue. She put a tick on some sentences, which was her general practice when she liked a paper, and she wanted to encourage the students and "thank them for the effort" in that way (EP, SRI-2). In the final SRI, she was observed to correct each error and when asked the reason for that, she replied that this was dependent on students' levels. That is, at higher levels, she would correct every grammatical error because the students had studied the structures. At lower levels, however, she would correct only the errors that the students were immediately familiar with.

For the NP, her general practices stated in the semi-structured interviews included writing ‘well done’ or similar messages on good written work and if there is something missing or wrong, she wrote messages such as ‘be careful about punctuation’ and ‘use more linkers’ because sometimes students are not aware of their mistakes or they are careless (NP, SI-1). She also drew smiley faces on good writing. She found “not receiving the message worse than using the incorrect language”, which clearly highlights the importance she gave to content.

The focus of her written feedback was grammar but she also paid attention to the use of the language and the content. In other words, she guided students to use everyday, natural language by her feedback. For example, she wrote comments such as ‘your sentence is correct grammar-wise, but you would not see such a sentence in daily life’ to indicate that the language is artificial (NP, SI-1).

In SI-2, she emphasized that the focus of her written feedback was not purely grammar but she still focused on grammar. She changed her practice of writing full correction sentences by leaving this to the students. She added that when there are many major errors, she ignores the minor ones and focuses on the correction of the major ones. Surprisingly, she also mentioned that she paid attention to grammar even when there are coherence and organization problems in the paragraph. She explained the reason for her practice as being the school’s practices: “This is what we do in the midterms and finals or in their quizzes, so of course my first focus is on grammar because we expect them to write pure grammatical paragraphs” (NP, SRI-3).

She also noted that the focus of her written feedback was grammar because the administration is “so stuck with grammar and students are also stuck with it” (NP,

SRI-2). Even if students cannot understand the logic of a structure, they try to use it in their paragraphs since this is what is wanted from them. As a consequence, she considered her feedback to be rather artificial, grammar-based and demotivating because the weaknesses rather than the strengths of the students are emphasized.

Moreover, she indicated that in the first handouts, it was easy for her to correct the grammar because there was not much content to correct, but now that the students had started to write more, “you should think about the content, coherence and everything”, which made her unsure of her written feedback as she thought that content is very subjective (NP, SRI-2).

To conclude, at first, the EP stated that her focus when giving written feedback changed depending on the content of that specific writing handout. She gave feedback heavily on content and grammar. Later, she emphasized that she corrected every grammatical error so that she could familiarize students with these structures. She was also observed to correct some errors directly, and to use ticks in her written feedback. At the end of the semester, however, her feedback analysis indicated that she corrected every error, which she explained as something that depends on students’ level. This contradicted what she had said at the beginning of the term as she had indicated that she corrected everything no matter what the level of the student was.

The NP’s explanations at the beginning of the term indicated that she used generic comments and focused on content, grammar and formality of the language when responding. When a paragraph was full of errors, however, she corrected major ones only. Sometimes, she was also observed to correct the grammar of sentences which were meaningless and irrelevant. Overall, it was clear that she

focused mostly on grammar, which she found easy to correct, and secondly on content, which she considered challenging.

4.2.1.2. Practices in the second draft

The EP explained that she gave feedback on drafts, second and final, by “writing notes” and “giving examples”(EP, SI-1). She used basic, simple symbols when responding as she was teaching at beginner level at the time of the study. She then checked whether the students made use of her feedback, which she considered to be important in the final draft. Because she believed that symbols are not adequate as a form of feedback, she preferred to “give them sample sentences with similar mistakes”, and also to use arrows to point out errors (EP, SI-1). She explained her feedback practices in the second drafts as follows:

... they know that it is a tense mistake but they do not know how to correct it according to what. So I do not think using just symbols is enough. It is always useful to give an example sentence with similar errors and correction, ways of correcting it. And also writing some comments at the end of the paragraph is, I find it very useful, positive and negative feedback. Not just for errors but also on positive things. (EP, SI-1)

The first thing the EP focused on was whether the students had addressed the content “because it is the way they are graded and tested in exams” (EP, SI-2). Thus, in the second draft, she made sure that problems about content were eliminated by her feedback. Then came “language and other things” for her (EP, SI-2). Additionally, because of the school policy, the second drafts were corrected by using codes. Writing comments or using any other extra practices was left to the individual teacher’s choice.

The EP talked about the reasons why she corrected everything in the second and final drafts by referring to the fact that these writings are “designed in a way that

[students] are revising already what they were supposed to learn in the other lessons” (EP, SRI-1). Because there was nothing new in their paragraphs, she corrected everything. She also omitted some errors directly without using the symbols in the second draft, which she said was because “it is more practical for me when I check and read” (EP, SRI-1). Not only was direct omission practical for her but also for the students, so she preferred it. She was asked why she gave full sentences directly as feedback and she explained that she would use similar practices when the students did not know the structures and she wanted to make them familiar with them.

The EP was also asked what she thought about symbols and their efficiency. The efficacy of symbols, for her, depended pretty much on whether the student makes use of them properly. If not, she did not think they were effective. She also pointed out her use of smileys. For good improvement and effort, she put a smiling face whereas she put a crying one for unsuccessful paragraphs. She emphasized that her aim was to show that she cared about them and did not read the paragraphs just for the sake of grading. In other words, she believed that feedback, symbols here, has the function of communication as she can convey her feelings that way.

The paper analysis revealed that the EP deleted incorrect words or structures directly in the second drafts although she was supposed to use the error codes. She explained that this was easier for the students and more practical for the teachers. Moreover, each error was indicated by the symbols. The reason for that was because students had used the structures in grammar lessons, practised them and “studied so many skills around the same content” (EP, SRI-1). It was further observed that she checked the self-checklists to see whether the students had made use of the

structures required from them. If not, she addressed the problem by writing the structures down. However, she was careful not to give the structures directly. Another interesting practice was that the EP started correcting the errors directly without reading the paragraph for the content:

When I first started checking, I started checking like any other paragraph by trying to put symbols and then towards the second sentence, I realized that the sentences did not make any sense at all, so I decided to call the student to my office. (EP, SRI-1)

Furthermore, the codes which she used varied from one paragraph to another. For example, instead of using the 'wo' symbol for wrong order, she preferred to correct by arrows for weak students, or in some papers, she preferred to use two symbols for the same error because, as she put it, her "choice of symbols and the way to use these symbols were also very dependent on the student that wrote it" (EP, SRI-1). That is, student level and her communication with the students determined her practices in general. She used the '?' symbol frequently when she could not get the meaning and preferred to delete words instead of using the 'frag/m' symbols (fragment/meaning). She avoided 'frag' and 'S/V' because she stated her practices as follows:

... what I do is I choose the most basic ones at the beginning and when they see how this affects their writing, S/V, frag, this and that, then I can start using them as well, but at first I use the very basic ones and slowly, maybe one-by-one, I add new ones so I do not use too detailed ones at beginner level. (EP, SRI-1)

She also had interesting practices regarding good paragraphs. She used lipstick and kissed the well-written papers in addition to smileys and terms of praise such as 'good'. In general, when she was first interviewed and her papers were analysed, it was clear that she was quite flexible in the use of coding and varied her practices a great deal in the second drafts depending on the students. She additionally indicated

her wish to change the symbol list which she gave to the students in the following quote:

I will try to give them more details about their mistakes but I have just realized, when I was talking to you, I need to change this before I give them because I think this [a symbol list] is better for the second semester. So perhaps, thank you, I have just realized I need to revise that for them. (EP, SRI-1)

In the second SRI, the EP maintained that symbols are “mostly for language not organization or ideas”. For her, they are really effective for language errors and she still used them. Moreover, the use of illustrations in written feedback, a form of symbols, was favoured although she agreed that they cannot be used in every type of feedback.

Later, she was again observed to correct each grammatical error and if there were any uncorrected sections, the reason was because she “did not see or ignore them on purpose” (EP, SRI-2). She said that she would have corrected the errors if she had seen them. Different practices were again common in her feedback and the following extract explains her practice clearly:

It depends on the student. I know that he is able to correct the mistakes just by looking at the symbols, but some need more support, some need less support. So it depends on the student’s needs. That is how I decide. (EP, SRI-2)

Similar to what she did in SRI-1, in SRI-2, she again corrected some errors directly and wrote comments on some papers in addition to all the help she gave with codes. Also, she did not read the paragraph for content and coherence first but directly started to correct the errors. That is because she was reading the same paragraphs and thus did not feel the need to do so first. Additionally, she liked using drawings such as umbrellas to guide students in organization. Another practice was

to write the same symbol under each repeated error instead of indicating the error once.

In SRI-3, her practices had not changed much as she went on correcting the errors. She opted for writing comments on the second draft as she explained that her aim was to help students to correct their errors and thus get a good grade from the final draft. Even so, she wrote some comments on the final draft as well because she thought “maybe it will help in the next writing handout” (EP, SRI-3).

The NP described her practices and focus in the second drafts when she was asked questions regarding her class practices and students’ paper analysis. She explained that a meaningful and well-organized paragraph was important for her. However, “the most important part while responding to drafts is grammar because of the administration because they just want the students to write perfectly grammatical writings” (NP, SI-2). She emphasized that “vocabulary is the least important part” for her “because even native-like speakers sometimes cannot use the words appropriately” (NP, SI-2)

The NP’s opinions in the first SRI indicated that she used coding to raise students’ awareness and made them do most of the job instead of the teacher, which she thought was something positive. Questioned about the reason for her practice of writing comments in addition to codes on students’ second drafts, she claimed that sometimes the “coding is not working” (NP, SRI-1). Later, she emphasized that coding sometimes works but that at other times it does not, depending on students’ level. She therefore concluded that although “it is not a magical stick” and it is tiring for teachers and students alike, “for most of the students it works” (NP, SRI-3).

The NP was observed to be quite flexible in her practices in the second drafts. The paper analyses revealed that her most common practices were crossing out grammar errors and irrelevant sentences directly without using the codes. She was also correcting some errors such as capitalization directly because she thought this to be more effective at times and for her some errors were just not worth indicating by using the symbols. Moreover, she used codes plus a question word frequently and she explained that “this is more effective than just using the symbols” (NP, SRI-1). Additionally, she underlined whole sentences to show that the meaning and the grammar should be corrected. Even though she was observed to use different codes for the same types of error in different paragraphs, because she had a limited number of codes, she claimed that she was consistent at least in the same paper in their use.

She claimed not to correct every grammatical error in the second drafts; however, “if it is the new topic that they are getting used to write in, I am comfortable with correcting every error because I know that you should process the information for a while and sometimes you cannot” (NP, SRI-1). Therefore, we can conclude that errors related to something newly studied were all corrected whereas others were corrected selectively. Although some paragraphs were divided into different sections, she said that she did not check organization. She went on by defining her focus:

Most of the time, I am focusing on grammar and then the meaning and then if we have something special to check like linkers, past perfect or past tense whatever, I am just checking them. I think they are not there yet (NP, SRI-1)

Thus, it is obvious that grammar came before meaning and organization in her feedback. It was also seen that some inferences and additional sentences in the second drafts were indicated by her with the code ‘m?’, which shows there is a

problem with the meaning. This is a clear indication that these sentences are not encouraged in her feedback because for her, such sentences cannot be used in such paragraphs. Another observed practice was the use of smileys and ticks in her feedback, which were given to show that the paragraph is a good one.

She was asked whether she had a different strategy or technique which she used in writing or written feedback. The NP described giving short, clear, consistent and encouraging feedback as her technique when responding. “Putting an exclamation mark (next) to the section where there is something missing or helping them discover their own mistakes and thus ensure permanent learning are the strategies” was a technique that she used at the time (NP, SRI-1). She discussed common errors on the board in front of the whole class without mentioning the names of the students, which was a technique noted down once during class observation 1. She additionally taught them the source of their errors, which she believed was their mother tongue, and she gave feedback accordingly. Another strategy she used was to “explain the errors by using some examples that might stay in their mind”, such as saying ‘am/is/are/ are like brothers’ (NP, SRI-1).

In the second SRI, the NP focused on improper vocabulary use by the students in her feedback because sometimes “you just need to be a natural language speaker” (NP, SRI-2). She was also observed to pay attention to natural and correct vocabulary use during the class observations. Another practice was that she was not correcting every error in some papers because she did “not know how to correct them” (NP, SRI-2). Some irrelevant sentences were also just indicated by comments such as “you used some irrelevant sentences” (NP, feedback analysis-2). That is, they were not directly marked in the paragraph because students should “come up

with the answer” not her, and they should spend more effort than she did (NP, SRI-2). Another observed practice was that she varied her feedback, although slightly, according to the level of the students. In other words, she helped weaker students by giving more explanation while leaving some of the corrections for the stronger students to make for themselves.

The final SRI revealed similar results with those of the previous SRIs because the NP was not correcting every error, indicating irrelevant sentences or writing long detailed comments. As for the reasons for her practices, she said that sometimes there are many more important errors than petty ones, and she did “not like giving so much feedback and writing more than the student” (NP, SRI-3). Moreover, students at this stage “should be able to differentiate between relevant and irrelevant sentences” (NP, SRI-3).

Furthermore, she was observed to insert some structures directly without using the codes. That was because she did “not have enough codes to correct everything”, the errors were minor ones or some students would be able to do it anyway (NP, SRI-3). She used short comments, one of which was ‘rewrite’, very frequently as that was “the easiest way to convey my message” (NP, SRI-3).

Additionally, she gave very limited content-directed feedback as she thought only “after this (grammar) phase, they can move to the content because even in the midterms, [they] did not lower their points for content but only for the grammar mistakes” (NP, SRI-3). However, she claimed that she did not give grammar-focused feedback very much anymore. She still used symbols to correct their grammar mistakes but different from previously, she was not writing full sentences. The motive behind this was because if she did not focus on content, this meant that

she wanted them to achieve the grammar points and her first focus was on grammar because the institution and teachers expect students to write pure grammatical paragraphs. In case of plagiarism, she was observed to indicate it directly in her comments and call students to her office. That is to say, she did not tolerate plagiarism.

In summary, the EP preferred to write notes, give examples to exemplify the correct use of the errors, focus on content, and correct every error with symbols in writing. Moreover, she changed the symbols in different papers and used a great deal of praise for good work or improvement. Similar to the EP, the NP focused mostly on grammar by correcting almost every error in the second drafts because of the school policy. She also paid attention to meaning and organization. She did not focus on vocabulary, however, because she thought that even native speakers have difficulty in this aspect of language. She also used codes although she did not think that they are always effective. Her practices on student papers were observed to be quite flexible since she ignored using the codes or used different codes for the same type of error, she corrected errors directly or wrote question words next to the codes. She was also observed not to give feedback on organization, which she thought should be done after grammar has been mastered. Moreover, she wanted students to delete the sentences which they had written independent of the writing handouts. That is, she did not allow additional relevant sentences in the paragraphs. Finally, she took a firm stand against plagiarism in her practices.

4.2.1.3. Practices in the final draft

In the final draft, the EP focused on “whether the mistakes in the second draft have been corrected or not” which she thought is “the whole purpose of process

writing” (EP, SI-2). If errors are not corrected in the finals, she corrected them with direct feedback, using arrows or writing comments asking the reason “why they have not corrected their mistakes” (EP, SI-2). The EP was observed to correct all the errors in general in the final drafts in the first SRI. The reason why she did the corrections was because everything had been covered previously and so the students were expected to use the structures correctly. If the students, however, had not corrected their errors in accordance with her feedback:

there is always some kind of telling-off, like ‘you are supposed to make corrections by looking at the symbols before you write the final’. There is some polite way of saying ‘I do not appreciate this’, ‘I do not like this’, and ‘next time, make sure you use the symbols and correct your mistakes’”. (EP, SRI-1)

The second SRI revealed that the EP still wrote comments, marginal and end, and she rewarded the students even when there had been only a little improvement in the final draft compared with the second by writing ‘good’ or ‘very good’ in general. Overall, she tried to encourage students in every possible way whenever she saw an effort being made. In the final SRI, she was observed to continue with her practices. In addition to comments, she also sometimes wrote mini-lectures at the bottom explaining how to correct errors related to content. Another interesting practice which she had started doing by the time the third SRI was carried out was that she gave up correcting all the errors in some students’ final drafts as these were generally just copied from the second draft. In other words, she thought that if the student had not bothered to correct them, she did not correct them, either. When she was asked whether that was her usual practice, she denied that and said that this was her “practice for those who can do it but won’t do it”, like a punishment (EP, SRI-3).

Although she stopped giving comprehensive feedback to those who ignored her written feedback, she continued the practice with those who she thought were struggling to improve their writing. That is, by not providing some students with written feedback, she was punishing them for not paying attention to her previous feedback. However, she went on helping those who tried to act on her written feedback.

As for the NP, most of the time, she concentrated on “grammar, especially if the student has not corrected himself” as she thought that students need to see the errors in the final phase of the writing (NP, SI-2). The NP drew smiling faces on some final drafts and corrected every error in the paragraphs. In the first SRI, she emphasized that if the student tried very hard and achieved something, she put such faces to indicate that she appreciated the effort. The analysis of her papers and class observation for the second time revealed that she preferred not to correct every error and, although only a few, she wrote comments on the final drafts. She explained that she did not correct errors for the following reasons:

I think that they will check their final draft and see the mistakes that the teacher did not correct and they will come and ask me, and sometimes I feel that even if I correct the mistakes, my message will not be conveyed to student. Even if I corrected it, s/he will not get it so sometimes I just give up maybe. (NP, SRI-2)

One of her reasons for this practice was because she expected students to discover their errors and ask her related questions. Another reason was because she had lost faith in her own practices. She did not believe that her feedback would help students to understand their mistakes. As a result, she gave up. She went on by stating more reasons:

I did not correct all the errors in the final draft because I did not know how to correct them. I really do not want to write everything because they do not

care about the draft. ... I do not want them to feel untalented. ... If my teacher gave me a final draft with the whole (thing) written again, I would feel bad ... (NP, SRI-2)

In short, she did not correct everything because she did not know how to do this, but she was hopeful that the students would realize their errors themselves; she did not believe in the efficiency of the feedback as the students did not care about the final drafts and she did not want to discourage students by writing everything.

As for the comments which she wrote on the final drafts, she thought that some of the students would read the comments because they knew that they would have to write six more writing handouts and they were all going to be similar, so her aim was to prepare them for future writing.

In the final SRI, however, there were very few comments on the final drafts and not all the grammatical and content-based errors were corrected. She stated that she was hoping that students would correct their errors, but because they just copied the second draft onto the final disregarding her feedback, she did not care anymore. Similarly, she started to write very few comments because of the lack of student interest. She explained her practice and feelings as follows:

I write just because I think that maybe they will use this information or feedback on their next writing handout, but most of the time they do not use it. They do not care and I just give up writing. (NP, SRI-3)

It can be observed that, towards the end of the semester, the NP was not sure about the effectiveness of her written feedback on students, so she changed her feedback practices to some extent. In some cases, however, she tried to comment on the final drafts with the expectation that students would use her feedback in their future writing. The results were not close to what she hoped, which made her doubtful about her practices.

To sum up, the EP paid attention to whether her feedback was taken into consideration and errors were corrected in the final drafts. If the errors were not corrected, she corrected them all at first, but then she gave up doing so with those who were not interested in her feedback. She also wrote comments and praised students who she thought deserved it.

Like the EP, at the beginning, the NP focused on grammar by correcting each error in the final drafts. But she started to make fewer grammatical corrections gradually for various reasons: because she did not know how make corrections, she expected students to correct their own errors, she did not believe in the efficiency of the feedback and she did not want to discourage students by writing everything, so she stopped giving comprehensive written feedback. Another practice of hers was to check whether the students had corrected their errors and to draw smiley faces on papers where there was progress. Moreover, unlike the EP, she wrote few comments on the final drafts because of students' reduced interest.

4.2.1.4. Practices regarding comments

In general, the EP stated that her focus was on starting with positive and then moving on to negative expressions when writing a comment as student motivation was important for her. Moreover, she avoided the use of general adjectives as she thought that they are not always useful, which she explained as follows:

My comments are not mass production, they are custom made. I do not write similar or the same sentences to everyone. ... They are personalized. ... Of course coherence is very important also. When I write feedback, I also try to focus on how I can get them to write more coherent paragraphs where the ideas are in harmony and the sentences are in harmony with each other, and not just independent sentences that do not fit together. ... And language and vocabulary of course. I try to push them a little bit so that they can take risks when they use vocabulary. (EP, SI-2)

Comments were observed to have a significant role in the EP's feedback as she stated that she tried to "put comments, positive or negative, in most of [her] papers" and preferred to write guiding questions for students to find the errors in their writing (EP, SRI-1). She appreciated students' efforts in using newly acquired vocabulary or structures in writing. She explained her practices thus:

Yes, praising, or criticizing or telling off the students are important because students need to know that we are really reading their papers, we are not just reading for grading, or that we can tell the difference between somebody who has put a lot of effort and somebody who did not care at all. (EP, SRI-1)

She thought that comments are a way of communicating with her students and that is why she used them frequently in her written feedback. In other words, she conveyed different messages through her comments. Also, because she felt close to her students, she did not mind using imperative structures in her comments.

In the second SRI, in response to a question related to her giving written feedback in different ways, she responded that her aim was to reach the students in every possible way and because she did not have enough time to talk to each one separately, she tried to do her best with comments. She talked about her practices as follows:

I exemplified the structure because it is not enough for them just to see referencing. Just trying to provide more help. It is like a mini-lecture really. Because I do not want her to make the mistake again and I am trying to teach her. (EP, SRI-2)

What we can infer regarding her practices is that she wrote comments in the form of questions, mini-lectures or sentences to compensate for oral feedback. Moreover, she used many comments such as 'V. good' and 'good' at the bottom of the paragraphs as end comments. However, she also wrote some comments in the margins because she thought that if there is a very good sentence, she should

indicate it directly. As for the end comments, she used them to refer to the whole paragraph and the effort which the student had made in general.

During the written feedback analysis in the third SRI, it was noted that she made use of names frequently before writing a comment and she explained that this was very important for the following reasons:

They realize that it is not something that is written just for the sake of writing, it specifically refers to their own problem; but it is also acknowledging your students. It makes you feel valuable, cared for I think. (EP, SRI-3)

When asked about the things that she focused on when writing a comment, she said that she was attentive about using students' names, giving specific rather than mass-produced feedback and showing how much she cared about them, which she said strengthens her relationship with students and encourages them to correct more. She also focused on students' needs while writing comments, which she explained as follows:

... so student personality is important, students' level of English is important, students' needs are important. (For) The easiest and best way to get to see what their mistakes are, I have to be direct and I have to consider the most effective way for that particular student and for that particular paragraph. (EP, SRI-3)

Other things which she focused on in comments were organization and coherence. She indicated whether sections that should have been in a paragraph were missing and any irrelevant sentences. However, she emphasized that she was not interested in the stated ideas even when they were completely different from what she herself thought. The language structures she used in her comments were sentences, questions or imperatives, but her practices varied under different conditions. For example, when she sensed that a student was plagiarising but still had doubts, she expressed this indirectly, by using a question. However, when she

was sure about plagiarism, she would “definitely take more drastic measures” and punish the student severely (EP, SRI-3).

She made comments such as ‘be careful with fragments’ which contain jargon that the student might have difficulty in understanding (feedback analysis-3). The reason for writing such comments was to make the student curious about the words and come to her to ask for the meaning. Because students did not ask clarifying questions contrary to her expectations, they ended up having even more fragments or errors. However, she claimed to use jargon only when such words had been covered in class.

The best way of writing a comment, to her, was when the comments are directed at that particular student and paragraph. Praising was frequently encountered in the EP’s feedback as well as her classroom practices. When asked the importance of praising, she replied that it was essential in every part of our lives as teachers or students, and that is why she was careful to provide motivating feedback as much as she could. However, she pointed out that intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation is important because although she can push the student a little further by praising them, that would not last long if the student is not intrinsically motivated. She also said that she preferred to use specific praising phrases instead of clichés in her feedback to make the student aware that she is really interested in what they are writing.

On the other hand, in the semi-structured interviews, the novice participant explained that she focused on short and to-the-point comments. Additionally, using simple language in comments was important for her. Overall, “short, specific, to-the-point, basic grammar, natural language points” were her focus in comments (NP, SI-1). Moreover, she stated that she never used the students’ first language (L1)

when making written comments but she did use L1 in oral feedback. The reason she gave for this was that “everything should be in ELT” and even if it was free to do so, she would not use L1 because she does not like it (NP, SI-2). She added that if the teacher uses Turkish (L1), students would use Turkish in their paragraphs as the teacher is a role model.

At the beginning of the study, in the first SRI, even though the NP stated that comments are more “meaningful” and attention-grabbing for students than codes, her feedback analysis showed that she wrote a few impersonal and generally grammar-focused comments mostly on the second drafts. She explained this as follows:

I do not prefer to write comments. Just about the grammar or “use this more” because this is the criterion by which I will give the points or cut the points, so I am just saying do this or you will lose points. (NP, SRI-1)

Although they were very few in number, she was observed to put smiley faces or ticks on some good paragraphs to show her appreciation and to motivate the students, which was among her general practices regarding comments at the beginning of the semester.

In the second SRI, the analysis showed that although they were still few, her comments varied according to students’ levels. Although she wrote comparatively long comments for strong students, she preferred short ones for weak students. What she focused on were generally grammatical errors but, in some instances, her comments were aimed to elicit more natural language, break some prejudices or challenge students to realize their potential. Another observation was that her end comments were fuller than the ones in the margins and that was because there was

more space for her to write at the bottom of the paper, an issue which she discussed in the following extract:

... if you give them that feedback at the end, they are reading their own work and then there is the comment part. Everything is in their head and the comments are also at the end so they can just link the things and the feedback together. That is easier for them. (NP, SRI-2)

On the other hand, the expressions she used at the end of her comments indicate that she was neither sure about the effectiveness of her comments nor hopeful that students would benefit from them. To illustrate, she explained that she was “sure they do not get it” and that “maybe sometimes it is just not working for students to make them find their own mistakes” (NP, SRI-2). In addition, she said that in the end, you, as a teacher, are “just feeling under” and give up (NP, SRI-2).

In the last SRI, the comment ‘rewrite’ was used frequently on student paragraphs and her other comments were also direct and short. She explained her feedback practice by maintaining that because students’ level was not good enough, and she had herself had bad experiences in university as the long feedback she received then was very demotivating, she opted for short comments. Additionally, for her, even when the feedback is good, it should not be long, as that would make it confusing for the students. Therefore, for her, “student’s potential, level in the class and [their] participation” and “sometimes personalities” are important considerations when writing a comment (NP, SRI-3).

She used feedback to motivate students similar to her practices which she talked about in SRI-2, but again she preferred to use only smileys or ticks as praise, but still they were used very rarely. She explained that when she did not give very much feedback such as negative feedback, that meant that she “liked the paragraph and the students know it” because she had told them beforehand (NP, SRI-3). She explained

the reasoning behind her practices regarding the amount of praise she used as follows:

This is my style because if you really praise them and if they fail, they feel bad, but as a teacher you also feel bad because you know that s/he has the potential to do better but because of your praising maybe, she just got snob and stopped studying. (NP, SRI-3)

It is clear that another reason why she avoided giving too much praise was because she did not want the students to overestimate their success and thus give up studying. That is, she believed that too much praise has negative rather than positive effects on the students as this is very clear in the quotation above. She was also observed to use little praise during class observations and she explained that, in general, she only approved students' answers by saying 'yes', 'this is true' or 'correct' and using words such as 'congratulations' or 'very good' "if it is a real success" (NP, SRI-3). Yet another practice was about plagiarism. Her comments 'This sentence is from the internet!' and 'Not written by you!' was a very direct comment accusing a student of plagiarism (feedback analysis-3). She noted that if there was a case of plagiarism, she directly warned the student concerned and criticized him/her, which was her general practice in such cases.

In summary, the EP paid considerable attention to writing comments which she stated were a way of communicating with the students. She was especially careful to start a comment with something positive for student motivation and then to continue with the negative comments. She also claimed that her comments were specific ones aimed at encouraging students to take more risks and thus improve themselves. In addition to content, she aimed at improving students' language and vocabulary skills with her comments. Because she did not have time to talk to each student individually, she preferred to give detailed written feedback by asking

questions, writing positive, negative and specific comments, and giving examples and mini-lectures.

When the NP wrote comments, she focused on them being short and specific, with simple grammar and everyday language. The reason for using short comments was because of her own experiences in her undergraduate studies and of students' level of competence. That is, whatever the content is, written feedback should be short. She also focused on students' personality and capacity when writing comments. She avoided using the students' mother tongue as she thought that everything should be in English. She preferred to write comments mostly on second drafts but still her total number of comments was limited and mostly grammar-oriented. Although she claimed that positive comments motivate students, she used few, mostly smileys and ticks on good paragraphs, because she did not want students to overestimate their success and give up studying. She also varied her feedback slightly by helping less proficient students more. She said that her comments were aimed to encourage students to take more risks, use natural language and break their prejudices. Her other practice was that she wrote more end comments than marginal comments simply because she had more space at the bottom of papers. Regarding plagiarism, she took a firm stand against it and warned the students directly with her comments.

4.2.1.5. Written feedback preferences

Teachers were asked what their written feedback practices would be if there was no enforcement policy in the school. That is, if they were free to do whatever they wanted regarding feedback, what their preferences would be is discussed in this section.

The EP said that she would definitely give written feedback to students no matter what the school policy entailed. To replace the grammar-focused writing syllabus of the school, she indicated that she would apply a journal-keeping activity with those who volunteered so that she could “have some satisfaction in the job” (EP, SI-1). In addition to being on a voluntary basis, this activity would be based on free writing and a creative topic which the teacher assigns. Students can write as much as they want and depending on students’ requests, the teacher would give language feedback using symbols or by giving direct feedback. She would also respond to questions herself and comment on their ideas. She emphasized that the type of the feedback would depend on that particular student’s preference at the time.

Moreover, when asked whether she already applied something different from what the administration required, the EP said that she had a “best work of the week corner” (EP, SI-1) where she hung well-written paragraphs so that other students could see what had gone wrong in theirs and be motivated for the next time, as they would want to see their paragraphs on display in the corner. To encourage students, she would still give positive feedback before negative. She would also discuss common errors on the board in the class and train students on what was wrong, and how it can be corrected. Additionally, she would have a voluntary diary-keeping activity in which students write freely on whatever they want and she would give them written feedback if asked to.

The EP stated that she was developing over the course of time and experience and that she “would change lots of different things that would reflect on their writing” if she had the opportunity (EP, SI-2). However, changing only writing

would not help and “you have to follow a different approach to teaching” (EP, SI-2). Overall, she would change “a lot more than just writing” as her priorities were different from those of the institution (EP, SI-2).

As for the feedback practices, she expressed her desire to “sit down with the students and spend more time with them individually and explain their mistakes, give them more guidance and get them to rewrite their paragraphs”, which, for her, is impossible under the current circumstances because of the workload (EP, SI-2). She found process writing, symbols and written feedback very useful but she wanted to have more peer and in-class correction as “perhaps [students] do not have enough practice in correction and that is why they do not use it and all our efforts go to waste” (EP, SI-2). Moreover, she repeated her desire to get students to do some free writing as she believed that they cannot improve their academic writing skills without free writing because “you need to feel the urge to write something in order to make it better and develop it” (EP, SI-2). That is why she had introduced a journal keeping activity but it did not work as it was not graded.

She also pointed out the use of the symbols in the second draft. She was of the opinion that symbols should be used more than once until students “get it right, instead of giving direct correction in the final draft because some of them write the final draft just for the sake of writing it without paying attention to the symbols” (EP, SRI-1). If they are forced to do so by providing them with symbols more than once, “in the end, they will get fed up with writing the same thing and start correcting their mistakes” (EP, SRI-1). Similarly, she mentioned another aspect regarding the symbols. She said that she would train the students first on the use of the symbols properly in more detail as she claimed students do not know how to

make use of the symbols. Also, she would make them write a similar paragraph after each handout but as a product because they need this to better get prepared for the exams.

Furthermore, if it was free writing, which she believed is necessary to really master writing, she would not “correct every mistake or give symbols or put symbols on every single mistake”. She would be more flexible but still, when she was asked whether she would still give written feedback, she concluded that it was her job to do so and unlike teachers who do not care about their students, she would do her job properly by providing written feedback. Thus, she considered giving feedback as an important component of being a teacher.

Similarly, the NP held the opinion that students certainly developed with written feedback, which meant that she thought that it is necessary in writing. However, “they cannot produce as much as they can do with [teachers]” (NP, SI-2). That is, she believed that students are so dependent on teachers to direct and help them in the process of writing that they have trouble in writing even when they are guided. Therefore, the NP would add some free-writing tasks to the schedule if she could, but would keep some tasks for grading to be fair. Furthermore, she would ask students to keep a journal in which they would do some free writing, and she would give them written feedback if they wanted it. Consequently, she hoped that students would feel more confident in their writing.

As for her feedback practices, she mentioned giving more individual oral feedback and asking questions so that she could “understand if [the problem] is a lack of grammar knowledge, vocabulary knowledge or it is just student’s potential” (NP, SI-2). She explained that she would continue using the drafts by omitting the

input part as she thought that the writing handouts are “bombing [students] with the input and then we are asking them ‘now produce it’” and “it is not working” (NP, SI-2). In addition to academic writing, she said that students should be able to write something in everyday language. “Drafts, giving feedback, guiding, using symbols” are “all great things” in her opinion, and she liked process writing but she was annoyed because of the fact that what is done is “very teacher-centred” (NP, SI-2). Therefore, she would make the process writing more learner-centred if she could.

She also agreed with giving written feedback to students even if it is not the school policy. She was content with the input sessions, in which grammar points that students are supposed to use in their writing are introduced. However, she did not approve of writing the first drafts immediately after an important grammar point had been presented as “the students should be given enough time to digest them before production” (NP, SRI-2). She also was not happy with the fact that teachers help students just a little when they are writing the first draft in class. If it was left to her, she would “be a bit more tolerant and flexible in this aspect” (NP, SI-1). Additionally, she indicated that she would give individual feedback as she sometimes could not be sure what the student meant and oral, person-to-person feedback would do in that case, which she, interestingly, emphasized would lead to “permanent learning” (NP, SRI-2).

Moreover, the NP mentioned the changes that she would make in the coding system for responding to the second drafts. She realized that her current coding list was not detailed enough to help students find their errors. Therefore, she was planning to change the list by adding new codes. Likewise, after a meeting with her colleagues, she noticed that she was “not specific about pointing out their students’

mistakes” and she considered using two specific codes in places where it was necessary to spot the errors (NP, SRI-1). Later, she explained that she had added some codes to her list and she would continue doing so after students learn new subjects. However, when her overall feedback was analysed, no change in the codes was observed. She maintained that she did not know the names of the techniques, or which techniques should be used for giving feedback. However, she would still try to develop her own written feedback, the coding system, and try to be consistent with the codes.

In brief, the EP emphasized that nothing would change except when the regulations regarding writing in the institution are changed, but that she would like to make changes in many things. Yet she would still give written feedback no matter what the school administration required and would use symbols in multi drafts until students discover all their errors. However, since she was tired of the institution’s grammar-focused syllabus, she wanted to have free and creative writing activities in which students could express their opinions and feelings freely without the need to conform to any pre-determined structure. She would provide the students with the written feedback they wanted. She would also spend more time with students giving them individual feedback if she had the opportunity.

Similar to the EP, the NP regarded written feedback as something that is important and should be given even when school policies do not require it. Because she complained about the spoon-feeding-like writing practices in the institution, like the EP, she wanted to do more free writing activities but to keep some fixed tasks for grading. Similar to the EP, she would give students feedback if they wanted it. Although she liked process writing, using drafts and symbols, the process writing,

she thought, should be more learner-centred, which was one of the changes she would like to make. To learn the source of students' problems in writing, she would also give more individual oral feedback, which she believed results in permanent learning. Moreover, in spite of complaining about too much guidance and the lack of a learner-centred approach, she stated that she would help the students more when they are writing and keep the time between the input and writing longer. The coding list was another change that she was planning to make. Because there were not enough codes in her list, she wanted to add more to give more specific feedback, an aim which she had not achieved when her feedback was analysed. Finally, she said that she was open to changes particularly in written feedback, although she lacked the theoretical background.

4.2.2. Challenges Which Teachers Face When Responding To Students' Writings

The EP stated that she had experienced various challenges when responding to students' writings. She stated that she felt "very frustrated" as her students made "really huge mistakes" (EP, SI-1). She explained one of her challenges in the following extract:

... they do not just make grammar mistakes or language mistakes; the whole sentence can be upside-down. I mean, you look at a sentence or a paragraph, the sentence order is wrong, the tense is wrong even the idea is wrong. There is no subject/verb agreement. So what are you going to do? I mean, you need to prioritize and you do not want to give the paper full of red lines, so you try to find different ways of correcting and it takes a long time. (EP, SI-1)

The EP thought that seeing no progress in students' work after she had given so much feedback and put a lot of effort and time into it was "very demotivating". However, she indicated that she did her best even when the students did not pay any attention to her feedback because she wanted to feel that she had done her part.

In the first weeks when the first SRI was carried out, the EP mentioned several problems which she faced when giving written feedback. One of them was that when she read a paragraph that could have been written in a better way for the student's level, or they were supposed to write it in a certain way but they wrote it in a very basic way, she desperately wanted to "cross it out and write the correct version". However, because she believed that this would not help the students, she tried to stop herself from overcorrecting, which she explained in the following way:

... to hold yourself back from correction is quite challenging because we are teachers and when you see mistakes, it really disturbs you and you want to correct it. ... The challenge is then is to hold yourself back a bit if you can while giving feedback and give feedback on the most important things that the writing handout focuses on. This is the challenge for me. I want to give more feedback than I do. I want to do more corrections than I have done.
(EP, SRI-1)

Similarly, students sometimes translate from Turkish to English directly, which "causes chaos" and in that case, she did not know what to correct or underline because "none of the symbols work". Therefore, she resorted to oral feedback and just asked the student to see her in the office.

Another challenge she mentioned was about correcting the content. Although she sometimes completely disagreed with what students write as the ideas are "extremely meaningless", she cannot express this in her feedback as those are students' ideas and thus, she cannot say that they are wrong (EP, SRI-1). It is clear that she experienced problems in responding to the ideas in the paragraphs because opinions are subjective and she felt the need to respect them.

Yet another problem was that she did everything to help the students but she still could not observe any notable change or improvement, which made her sad and

helpless. She linked this to the use of symbols in responding and explained it in the following way:

I do not know what else I can do. I gave the list, I gave an exercise on it every time I gave the papers, and I explained the errors on the board. Still, they do not register. Perhaps it is because they have never used symbols before because most of them come from traditional schools. ... It is very difficult for them to understand why they have to correct their own mistakes. Maybe there is a mismatch between what the students expect from us and what we offer them. Maybe they still cannot see the rationale between using symbols and doing process writing and editing their work several times before they give the final (version). (EP, SRI-1)

The final but the “biggest” challenge she stated in SRI-1 was also related to the symbols. She said that “sometimes the symbols are not enough because there is not a symbol for correcting a really problematic sentence when there is nothing right in the sentence” (EP, SRI-1). Therefore, she felt helpless and frustrated as she had either to rewrite the whole paragraph or call the student to her office.

In the second SRI, she pointed out a different problem about comments. Because she often received really bad papers, she had difficulty in starting with positive comments and then moving on to the negative ones, although she knew that this is how it should be performed. She added that making mistakes is quite normal for students in the second draft, but when they repeat the same errors in the final draft despite her feedback, then it becomes “very difficult to be positive”. Moreover, she again complained about the symbols in that she thought they were not adequate for responding appropriately. Finally, she mentioned the huge amount of time she spent on writing comments; however, she was not sure about the efficacy of what she was doing and thus felt frustrated.

In the final SRI, she identified three main problems, some of which were the same as those expressed in the first SRI. First, she faced some problems when giving feedback on content because the ideas are:

... so irrelevant that they have nothing to do with the sentences. There is no coherence at all. The sentences are like independent sentences. They have nothing to do with each other. There is no flow of ideas, no coherence and it is very difficult for me sometimes to make them see it, because in their mind somehow it is connected. ... To make them see that it is wrong and how it is wrong is quite difficult. (EP, SRI-3)

In addition, like the problem which she raised in the first SRI, she complained about the fact that most of the student paragraphs are full of errors, mostly caused by direct translation from Turkish, which made it very difficult for her to respond. Although she intended to cross the paragraph out, she could not do so, so she wrote comments such as 'rewrite' instead. She was asked how she felt when the students did not show progress despite her feedback, and she replied that she felt "frustrated, very frustrated" (EP, SRI-3). She also stated that she sometimes felt "demotivated because you try and try and you do not get much in return in terms of satisfaction" (EP, SRI-3).

To conclude, one of the challenges the EP faced was when she encountered papers in which there was hardly anything that could be corrected. Thus, she struggled to find ways to respond. She also felt demotivated when there was no student progress despite her written feedback. Holding herself back in order not to rewrite everything again was another challenge encountered by the EP. Yet another challenge was about students' translations from Turkish to English, which creates chaos and makes it very difficult to understand the sentences and respond properly using the codes. That is, the codes are inadequate when the grammar and the content are very poor in a paper. She also thought that the codes do not work with her

students because they cannot grasp the rationale behind using symbols since they did not have to discover their errors themselves in their previous education stage. Moreover, the EP could not comment on the content presented in paragraphs no matter how ridiculous and meaningless the content is since she thought that she should respect students' ideas. However, she found this very challenging. Additionally, she had difficulties in finding something positive in some papers with which to start her comments. Although she spent a great amount of time writing comments, she did not believe in their effectiveness due to the lack of improvement in the students' papers.

Similarly, the NP experienced numerous difficulties when giving written feedback. She stated that at the beginning of the semester, she "felt terrible because when [she] got the first writing handout, [she] did not know what to do" (NP, SI-2). That is, because she was inexperienced, her first difficulty stemmed from her lack of expertise in providing written feedback. Another challenge was when students did not show any progress. She said that she got really "mad" and started to "show errors directly if they could not do it" (NP, SI-2). As a consequence, the NP said that she had a period when she questioned and doubted her abilities as a teacher. Afterwards, she came up with two reasons for that: students might read but not understand the feedback, or they might be disinterested in it. However, she concluded that that failing was entirely the students' mistake.

Most of the problems mentioned in SRI-1 were related to the use of the symbols. Differentiating between errors and deciding which symbol to use for each was one of the challenges the NP faced when responding. Another problem was related to the variety and number of the codes because even at the beginning of the term she

realized that “there were not enough symbols” to indicate all the error types (NP, SRI-1).

Although the school encouraged teachers to use the codes to respond to the second draft, the NP claimed that when a paper is very poor and there is no way to correct it but writing sentences again, “coding is not working in that case because the student is so weak that he will not understand even if [she] says ‘spl’ or ‘gr’” (NP, SRI-1). Another challenge that caused frustration in her was when she corrected an error many times and spent a considerable amount of time on it but saw no improvement in the student. Then, she got really “annoyed” (NP, SRI-1). She expressed her feeling as follows:

I think that ‘oh, what the hell, I could not teach you anything. Why are you making these mistakes?’ these small mistakes are more annoying than these real grammar topics. ... this is ridiculous. That feeling is really annoying me. (NP, SRI-1)

In SRI-2, the NP expressed a different challenge for her, vocabulary. That is, when giving written feedback, she could not be sure whether the word is really the correct one, and most of the time, she checked dictionaries to eliminate the problem. This problem worsened with the level of the students. The higher the level, the more challenging it became for her in terms of vocabulary and this “is chaos for a teacher” (NP, SRI-2).

Other problems that became more challenging by the students’ level were “content and coherence” (NP, SRI-2). She thought that in “the first handouts, it was just correcting the grammar and the word” but with the rising level, the difficulty of giving adequate and effective content directed feedback increased (*ibid.*). She found content feedback very “subjective” and she might be “too harsh or too tolerant” (*ibid.*).

The final challenge was about students not taking her feedback seriously, which made her feel down and thus reconsider her feedback practices. That is, she came to a point where she said “OK, if you do not (care), then I will just keep my feedback short and leave you alone” (NP, SRI-3). She recounted one of her experiences with a student who did not care about her feedback as follows:

I told [name of the student] to organize her ideas better and I was kind of (very annoyed). When I see the same paragraph just with little changes, this means they are not reading your feedback ... when I am angry, I am just taking a step back and I am just reducing my scaffolding and helping. I am trying to make them aware that ‘OK, you have to work, not me’, and it was one of the ways I was trying to say this. (NP, SRI-2)

In SRI-3, she again complained about the inadequate number of codes, which made her job even more challenging. Additionally, mostly because students translated directly from Turkish to English, she did not know what to correct in the paragraphs mainly in terms of grammar and vocabulary. She talked about her challenges in the following extract:

... and sometimes because I am not a native English language teacher, I feel like ‘OK, this seems OK, but maybe some other word should be here’, and I have this ambiguity and I am checking the dictionaries sometimes. That is the only challenge for me. Not the grammar points, but most of the time the cohesion, coherence and the appropriate word in the paragraph, the flow of the ideas, tense and everything. (NP, SRI-3)

She felt frustrated and desperate as a result of the challenges she experienced when giving written feedback. Because she did not see her feedback being taken seriously, she thought, ‘if they do not care, I do not care’ and thus, “I just give up writing” (NP, SRI-3).

In short, the NP had difficulties first because she did not feel she had been prepared to give written feedback in her pre-service education, and second, as students did not show progress, she felt helpless and inadequate. Moreover, she

encountered numerous challenges such as differentiating between codes, an insufficient number of codes and the effectiveness of codes when responding. She also faced challenges in terms of vocabulary use in paragraphs as she could not judge the appropriateness of words in various contexts. Additionally, she experienced difficulties when giving written feedback on content and coherence.

4.3. Research question 3: The factors which may have influenced university preparatory school writing teachers' feedback practices

When the sources behind teachers' practices and beliefs were analysed, three main categories emerged. These were: *i* teachers' attitudes towards writing, errors, teacher role in writing and students; *ii* the impact of teacher education and experiences on teachers' beliefs and practices towards the students; and *iii* beliefs about school policies. In this section, each category is discussed for the experienced and novice participant respectively.

4.3.1. Attitude towards writing, errors, teacher role in writing and students

Understanding the beliefs which teachers hold about writing, errors, teacher role and students is a way that might enlighten the sources behind teachers' practices as what teachers believe highly influences what they actually do. About writing and its purpose, the EP stated that writing is one of the means people use to express themselves in the best way. She went on by talking about the place of writing as follows:

I do not think without writing, I cannot imagine, for example, myself because for me it is very important to express my feelings, the way, the code, the register, everything. You can understand the attitude of a writer, point of view, even cultural religious background and beliefs. Writing reflects all that,

so I think it is a very important means of expressing beliefs and opinions.
(EP, SI-1)

It is clear from what she explained that writing was essential in her life and that it is not just writing since it is a tool that includes various layers. For her, good writing should have “coherence”, “fluency” and “richness of vocabulary”, which are necessary for a piece of writing to be enjoyable and understandable (EP, SI-1). Thus, it is natural to expect her to pay attention to those aspects when giving written feedback and assessing students’ writings.

The EP approached student errors as something quite natural and necessary for further improvement. She also paid attention to students’ feelings in that she did her best to make them comfortable about asking questions about their errors. She let them know that she was always there to give help and encouragement. She talked about her practice in the following way:

My philosophy is that they need to explore, they need to experiment with the language, they need to take risks and make mistakes but also after making mistakes, they also need to take the feedback seriously and correct their mistakes. That is what causes improvement. (EP, SI-1)

Regarding her approach to students, the EP’s general attitude to students was observed to be quite positive, caring and helpful. She was quite attentive and positive during class observations throughout the semester because this was “just part of [her] policy as a teacher” and whatever she did, “positive reinforcement is always very important” (EP, SRI-1). Even if there were some negative things like sleepy students in the class, she used humour to warn them. Another finding was that because she knew each student individually together with their backgrounds and problems, she varied her feedback depending on the student. She noted her practice as follows:

His English is quite good but he is the laziest student in the class. He is lazy in nature. He just cannot be bothered even though he can. This is the reason why I wrote harsher comments. [The name of the student] would not be able to correct her mistakes even if she tries. She is a hopeless case when it comes to English. However, [the name of the student] is just the opposite. He cannot bother to correct his mistakes even though it takes five minutes. (EP, STI-3)

It is obvious from the comment quoted above that she used harsh comments for students who could have written better paragraphs but she gave detailed feedback to those who could not have written a better paragraph even if they tried. In other words, she tried to vary her feedback according to the individual student's level in English. In short, during class observations, she had a very positive way of communicating with her students but she was careful about their personality and study habits and varied her feedback accordingly. She tried to do her best as she believed that even a small improvement is a significant success for her.

To sum up, the EP thought that writing is a necessity in life as it an important way to express beliefs and opinions. As for the characteristics of good writing, she stated that it should be coherent, fluent and rich in vocabulary. Her approach to students and the errors which they make was observed to be quite positive. She approached students in a friendly manner and varied her feedback according to their level and personality. That is, because she knew her students closely, she was able to differentiate between those who studied but could not be successful and those who did not study although they had the capacity to succeed in writing. Therefore, she altered her feedback accordingly by helping the individual students less or more.

The NP, on the other hand, thought writing to have been born out of the “need for production” (NP, SI-1). She explained that writing was only one of the ways of showing the degree of mastery in a language. Although she thought that writing is

highly feared, she believed that individuals can develop with the help of another person. She explained her beliefs in the following way:

The thing that gives the sense of mastering the language is speaking and writing. ... We need to write as well. ... For me, the most important aim of writing is its practicality. That is, I do writing since I can benefit from it. First thing is about production where you prove your language ability and then because of its utility in daily life. (NP, SI-1)

The NP thought that “making mistakes is not something that is bad or should be punished” and that errors show the teacher what to correct (NP, SI-1). That is, she thought that “errors are like things that show the reality” (NP, SI-1). Moreover, teachers should be a guide, showing the way in the process, and should “try to encourage students and say things like ‘make mistakes, we will correct them together’” (NP, SI-1). For the NP, writing was perceived as an indication of language proficiency. She also thought that it is a tool to be benefitted from in daily life, when writing an application, for example. As for good writing, she believed that that is what manages to convey its message no matter what ideas it has. She added that when the message is clear, she did not pay much attention to grammar, which she explained as follows:

If the message is conveyed, it is successful for me, but apart from this, of course grammar, the structure and suitability of the sentences are important. Content and consistency are also important in writing, but if I am to grade them, I would divide it into two. Has the student conveyed the message? Has he met my expected criteria? (NP, SI-1)

Above, she mentioned grading as well while indicating her priorities in writing. In addition, when the issue is grading, the NP expressed her worries about objectivity and consistency. She thought that writing is a highly feared skill but still, the teacher is the person who can help students to develop themselves in that skill. Therefore, the teacher’s role in writing is that of a role model who is knowledgeable in his/her field. That is, they should know the types of essays, the differences

between them and how they should be taught. They should also “help students and give clear instructions and a similar example in a familiar context”, so the teacher’s role is similar to that of a “facilitator” (NP, SI-2). As for teacher role in responding to drafts, the NP considered herself to be highly important during the process of writing. She put forward this issue in the following way:

I think I am the source of everything for them ... You should give them feedback about everything; grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, capitalization and everything. ... We are the source especially at the beginning but then you are just guides to them because then they have enough knowledge, how to form a sentence, use vocabulary. (NP, SI-2)

In the final draft, her role is showing students their mistakes explicitly because if they were unsuccessful up to that time, then this means they need direct help, which is provided by direct feedback. Yet, instead of blaming the school policy for making her give direct feedback to the final drafts, she considered it to be quite natural and part of her duty.

Because the way in which teachers approach their students in general and some in particular can affect their feedback practices, teachers’ attitudes towards students during class and SRIs were analysed. The NP seemed to be a very caring, friendly and sympathetic teacher during the class observations in the first observations and SRI. The following comment summarizes her attitude towards her students:

Rapport is always important with the students in every lesson. You see how it affects the students, their attention, interests. I really like to have a good relationship with my students. You should be approachable as a teacher and the best way to do this is not by being friends, but friendly in the class. They should be comfortable with you and the classroom atmosphere. (NP, SRI-1)

Although she thought that written feedback does not have a rapport function, she emphasized that she would never change her feedback practices depending on whether she likes the student or not. Thus, her personal emotions are irrelevant

during her practices. However, later she stated that she varied her feedback when the student level is concerned. In other words, she was “always more helpful” to weak students whereas it was just the opposite for “strong students” (NP, SRI-2).

The reason why she did not give a lot of feedback was that she felt empathy towards them and therefore avoided giving too much feedback as this would mean that they could not produce anything correctly. She sometimes opted for correcting the grammar of irrelevant sentences because she gave priority to grammar with those students who had bad grammar. At the end of the term, she had changed her attitude to those who did not take her feedback seriously. That is, she made changes in her written feedback by not correcting their work and by giving little feedback.

In short, the NP considered writing to be a way of showing a person’s mastery in a language. She added that writing is necessary because of its utility in everyday life. In other words, her approach to writing was quite practical. Her opinions regarding errors were that she thought errors to be quite natural and good indicators for teachers to see what to correct and thus obtain feedback about students’ progress. Another point she made was about the criteria that make writing effective and good. She stated that conveying the message was very important in addition to grammar and other structural issues, to which she gave equal importance when grading the papers. She regarded herself as the source of everything, so she felt the need to give feedback on “grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and everything” (NP, SI-2). Moreover, giving direct feedback in the final draft was something she thought quite natural as students need to see their mistakes explicitly. As for attitude towards the students which might have affected her practices, she was friendly to and approachable by the students. She said that she would not change her written

feedback depending on her feelings towards a student, but that she would vary it based on a student's level. Additionally, because she understood how students would feel after receiving a paper covered in red ink, she avoided giving large amounts of feedback.

4.3.2. The impact of teacher education and experiences on teachers' beliefs and practices

The teachers mentioned pre-service and in-service education and experiences in teaching as important factors which had affected their feedback practices. Although both came from similar educational backgrounds, the EP raised different aspects about pre-service education. When asked about the type of training she had received for responding to students' writings, the EP said:

We did not actually receive any training. I do not remember receiving any particular courses on error correction. Of course, we always had the theory from methodology books and methods and approaches and ... the classical approaches and how they approach this problem of error correction. Errors should be corrected or else they become habits and they become fossilized. Or else students make mistakes over and over again. That is all we learned when we were at university. (EP, SI-1)

In addition, she did not remember any activities or techniques that would be useful in providing feedback from her undergraduate education. She claimed that practical issues were not dealt with in pre-service education and that it was more theory-based, which she found difficult to reason out. To her, practical issues were left out, so that teachers struggled to cope with them when they start working in the profession. When she was asked whether the pre-service education had prepared her enough to be a competent feedback provider, she replied that it was "just memorizing stuff, going to exams" (EP, SI-2). Therefore, she thought that her pre-service education was inadequate in helping her to feel confident about giving

written feedback. She had had particular difficulties in that aspect at the beginning of her career.

She also referred to her pre-service education when she was asked to talk about the source behind her practices concerning motivation and its place in written comments. She said that motivation is essential and that she tried to motivate students with her written feedback. As the source behind her belief, she argued that “most probably we read in books at university that motivation is important and we have to give positive feedback” (EP, SRI-3). Thus, her pre-service education seemed to affect her practices.

The EP, in short, had not received any training in terms of written feedback, as all she did was read sections from methodology books regarding errors. That is, her pre-service education was based on theory not practice, so teachers like her were left to struggle with various issues including giving written feedback when they started in the profession. She concluded that the pre-service education she had received was inadequate in preparing her to respond to students’ writings, which created numerous difficulties for her at the beginning of her career. However, she said that her practices regarding motivation and writing positive comments were the result of the theories she read about during her undergraduate studies.

Similarly, the NP complained that she was not in general content with the education she had received at university regarding written feedback and writing assessment. She said that there had not been a specific class which was particularly dedicated to giving feedback at university and that as a consequence she had doubts about the efficiency of her pre-service education in this respect. Like the EP, the NP referred back to the fact that what they had learned was pretty much based on

theory, not practice. She observed and imitated her previous teachers in her practices. She explained this as follows:

We have not learned such a technique but what should and should not be done. For example, do not use red pen when giving feedback, or do not just give the symbols to the student. Give students tips that they can use in their writing. Be consistent with your feedback and let the feedback be explanatory. These kinds of things I remember hearing in classes or learning from our teachers by chance, but there has not been a particular activity or something that I would say 'yes, I can use (that) in my classes'. (NP, SI-1)

As for the question of whether her previous education had prepared her enough to be a competent feedback provider, her answer was a direct and clear “no, not at all, no” (NP, SI-2). In short, she did not find her pre-service education satisfactory on the issue of written feedback, which she stated in the following extract:

Of course not. It was so limited practice for me. ... I do not think it really prepared me for this feedback and also as a teacher you learn by time, the experience, wisdom comes with this period. ... You should really live these things and then you can come up with your own style or philosophy. ... Maybe they can give a course about this feedback to future teachers. (NP, SRI-2)

She concluded her remarks by emphasizing the need for a comprehensive course on written feedback in pre-service education so as to prepare future teachers in this area. This would, in return, contribute to teachers' having fewer problems when they start in the profession.

Although the NP did not approve of her pre-service education in general, she was observed to have been affected by it. She often referred to her university education when talking about the sources behind her practices. However, unlike the EP, some of her responses hinted at the issue of the “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975, p. 61). Her comment “I learned how to give and how not to give feedback from my teachers' feedback to my work” is a very nice indication which

supports this term (NP, SI-1). The following excerpt shows how her observations about practices were and the way she was affected by them:

Our teachers would give us examples from their work. Every teacher had a different way of giving feedback. I firstly became aware of that. Then, I chose the ones that I thought would be good for me but ... no specific thing was done as to how to give feedback. (NP, SI-1)

Previously, she had indicated that the best techniques for her were when the students find their own mistakes, which she believes results in permanent learning. The reason behind her beliefs turned out to be her observations during her undergraduate studies, which is another indication of how undergraduate education might determine feedback practices and beliefs about them. She explained this as follows:

Firstly, one of my undergraduate teachers used to use this technique. We were writing drafts and discovering our own mistakes ... and now I never make those mistakes as I found them myself, corrected them and thus they are in my mind. (NP, SI-1)

One of her practices was writing few comments in the margins and numerous ones at the end of papers, which was because this was “one of the techniques that one of my university teachers used and it was effective on me” (NP, SRI-2). Therefore, she was “just trying to do it her way” although she was not sure whether it has any methodological foundations (NP, SRI-2). Another practice of hers was to give very little feedback, which was the result of her pre-service education. She believed that long feedback is demotivating. She talked about her experiences in the following extract:

(If) there is more writing of the teacher than of students, it makes you feel bad. At least for me, as a student, this was the case at university. I had such an experience. Even if good or bad, too much feedback is not good for the students. It might be confusing. (NP, SRI-3)

She ignored students who did not care about her feedback and just copied the second draft to the final without considering the alterations. She was of the opinion that if students did not care, she would not care, either, which was again the result of her previous education as she explained below:

This is what worked on me when I was a student, either the ignorance of the teacher or seeing he or she is trying harder than me and I am embarrassed. If he or she is trying for me without a reason, why should I give up? Those are the two policies that worked on me. (NP, SRI-3)

The features of a good comment were the ones related to students' level, potential and participation for her. The motive behind her practice about comments was thanks to "all the methodology courses about personalization, relating to their lives and so forth" (NP, SRI-3). She emphasized that the methodology courses taught her how to teach grammar, speaking, listening and writing in general but she did not have a specific course in which she learned how to respond to student writings. She knew the theoretical background to a limited extent thanks to her pre-service education, but she insisted that they did not practice giving feedback and how to do that at university.

The other reason given as a source behind teachers' practices and beliefs was the in-service training. When talking about the in-service training, the issue of experience emerged, which was considered to be part of the in-service education and is therefore included under this title.

When considering her pre-service education which had been inadequate for preparing her to be a competent feedback provider, the EP spoke highly positively about the in-service training she had received in different universities regarding written feedback. In response to a question regarding the source behind her beliefs about best feedback practices, she mentioned experience along with the in-service

training in different universities. Over the course of time, she had experimented with written feedback and after a trial-error period, she had devised her own way of responding. During that period, she also received quite a few training sessions, workshops and seminars, which had guided her.

Unlike the EP, the NP stated that the in-service training she had received was not sufficient because she had “not seen anything about writing handouts” (NP, SI-2). That is, she claimed not to have been sufficiently prepared in terms of giving feedback during the in-service training.

Although the NP did not have much experience as a teacher at the time that this current study was carried out, she still mentioned her experiences with her students at the time as a factor influencing her practices. She emphasized that experience is influential in helping a teacher to become competent in written feedback. That is, trial, error and experiences with students determine and form a teacher’s feedback style.

In her written feedback practices, she was observed to cross out sentences or parts of sentences and, for her, this was because she knew that the students were weak and could not correct their own errors, so she did the job for them. Additionally, when giving examples to clarify her comments on some papers, she preferred not to do this on others with the same mistakes because she varied the feedback according the level of the student, which she related to her experiences with her students. In brief, depending on students’ level, personality and her perspectives about them, her written feedback varied, and this is clear from her following comment:

I know that this student is kind of weak and even if I underlined the whole sentence and wrote 'gr' or 'linker', I know that she will not be able to find the mistake. Instead of that, I am making her job easier (NP, SRI-1)

The NP's written feedback was mostly focused on grammar, ignoring content or organization. She explained that as she knew her students and their levels, she thought "content might be achieved later for beginner students" (NP, SRI-1). That is, because of her experiences with the students, she was able to devise a way of responding to them. As for the reason why she opted to give as little praise as possible, her praise would lead to laziness in them as they would believe they were too good to study more, which is clear in the following comment:

This is my style because if you really praise them and if they fail, they feel bad, but as a teacher you also feel bad because you know that s/he has the potential to do better but because of your praising maybe, she just became a snob and stopped studying ... I am not always flattering them, so I sometimes say 'OK, that is good' That is it. (NP, SRI-3)

As it is obvious from this comment, because she did not want to affect students negatively, which she believed happens if there is too much praise and flattery, she preferred short phrases and smileys to indicate good work. That is, she thought that too much praise would harm not help students, so she avoided it.

In brief, the contribution of pre-service education had been quite influential in determining the NP's written feedback practices. Although she did not find it adequate in terms of written feedback, she was observed to refer to her observations during that period frequently when explaining the reasons behind her practices. That is, she managed to survive thanks to the careful analyses of her pre-service teachers' written feedback practices, some of which she used herself as a teacher to give written feedback. Moreover, she emphasized that the pre-service education had been based on theory rather than practice. However, she still explained that the theories she learned then were effective on some of her practices. In addition to pre-service

education, she thought that experience had an indispensable role in helping teachers to become better at responding. As part of experience, she referred to the in-service training that she had received, which she believed was not at all adequate concerning written feedback.

4.3.3. Beliefs about school policies

Institutional practices, that is policies, were found to be one of the most frequent excuses that teachers used when talking about the reasons behind their practices. Below are discussed the sources which the experienced and novice participants stated respectively.

When asked what her role as a writing teacher is, the EP stated that her role in writing “depends a little bit on school policy” (EP, SRI-2). That is, teachers’ practices and roles are constrained by the policies and she was not satisfied with this. She added that the writing in the institution was guided and mechanical without a place for creativity, which “is a pity”, because without free writing, she did not think that academic or any kind of writing can improve.

She considered herself to be a “postman” who delivers whatever the institution requires without the choice to decide for herself (EP, SI-1). She explained that the input sessions, steps, materials and exercises are all provided so “you do not even get to decide how you are going to practise” (EP, SI-1). She went on to give the reasons behind her focus when giving written feedback. She paid attention to the input sessions before the writing handout, in which grammar topics are introduced first and then students are asked to use those structures while writing about the topic specifically designed to elicit the structures. Thus, she had to focus on whatever the input is when giving written feedback and assessing students’ work.

She also expressed her thoughts regarding the tasks and feedback schedule used in the institution, which she believed affected her practices naturally. She expressed her desire to get the students do more free writing because she did not think that “getting them to write about how oil is made or things like that works” (EP, SI-2). Because everything is controlled, guided and specifically designed for specific aims, she thought that what they do in class is not really writing but that “it is more grammar, vocabulary than writing skill” (EP, SI-1). Additionally, she would definitely do more peer-correction together with teacher feedback. Moreover, she warned that “we should not be imposing things”, which she thought is “what we do here with regards to writing”. She emphasized that writing is “too mechanical”, so “a little bit more freedom would be nice” (EP, SI-1). In other words, she was against forcing students to write very mechanical and grammar-based paragraphs about topics which they do not have the freedom to choose. As an example of what the school required them to do, she gave the following explanation:

The school tells me that when I read the final, I have to write the correct answers, so I do not have a choice but I still write some comments there, like ‘next time be more careful about this’. I try to give as much as I can, but the school policy is that in the final draft, you just write the correct answers. (EP, SI-2)

When asked what her written feedback practices would be if she had the freedom and choice, she stated that she would definitely give written feedback. However, she thought that making alterations only in writing would not solve the problem since writing is merely part of a much larger picture. She expressed her opinions in the following way:

You have to follow a different approach to teaching I think, and that again depends on school policy because we have such an intensive programme. To be honest, I think some of the things that we test are too much. (EP, SI-2)

However, the “process writing is ... very useful”, “symbols are ...very useful” and “giving written feedback is ... very useful” (EP, SI-2). That is, there are school practices such as process writing, symbols and giving written feedback that she was content with.

As was stated in the methodology section, the school has a process approach to writing and teachers are asked to apply this procedure. However, in the real exams, that is, midterms and proficiency exams, students do not have the opportunity to rewrite a paragraph for a second and third time and then get graded on the final draft. These exams are product-based and the EP thought that “there is a mismatch” between what is applied and what is required in the end (EP, SRI-1). In other words, she did not approve of this sort of dichotomy.

When she was asked about her comprehensive feedback practices in the second and final drafts, she commented that “it is the school policy” and that she did what she was told by the school, indicating that she had no freedom in this respect and this was not her decision (EP, SRI-1). Moreover, she claimed that what students are doing regarding writing is neither creative nor free writing. Because the writing in the institution is very structured, she questioned whether it really develops students’ writing skills. Although she accepted that “the aim of the school is not to help them become writers, authors, poets, or help creative writing”, and that it “needs structured, clear, cohesive and fluent writing”, she wished that was not the case as she was not really sure about the effectiveness of these goals (EP, SRI-2). She believed that this type of writing is not writing but grammar, and very artificial as the topics are designed to fit whatever grammar rules are being studied at that time. She stated her opinions in the following extract:

There are things that I question. For example, it is a fact that our writing topics are determined by the grammar subjects the students see in that week. I do not think that is very good because sometimes it is so obvious that the task is chosen so that they can use the grammar they have seen in the course book and it just does not fit. It becomes like very grammar-like. ... You can tell that somebody tried very hard to choose a topic to suit the language purpose in the course book. (EP, SRI-2)

In other words, she complained about the grammar-focused writing handouts that did not in the real sense promote writing. Additionally, she stated that there is always a new input and that students repeat the same errors in addition to the new ones because they are not given enough time to recycle what they have learned. She emphasized this issue in the second stimulated recall interview as follows:

Having the same errors means we have to reconsider our system, doesn't it? We need to reconsider and develop. Perhaps some things are not working properly for the students. That means we have to reconsider things as an institution. (EP, SRI-2)

She was aware of the fact that the writing system in the institution was not working properly as students were repeating the same mistakes regardless of the written feedback they had received. Therefore, she recommended that institutional practices be altered to increase efficiency. However, because this has turned into a vicious circle, it puts "a new burden on teachers" when responding and makes them doubt the efficiency of their written feedback (EP, SRI-3).

The grading procedure and the focus during that process were also mentioned by the EP as an important factor that had an effect on her written feedback practices. That is, the written along with the oral feedback which the EP gave during the observations and analyses revealed that grades had a significant role in her feedback practices. To illustrate, the EP paid a great deal of attention to whatever the students would be graded on when giving written feedback, mostly with the help of comments. She supported her practice by indicating that she wanted her "students to

get high marks and to score well in the exam” (EP, SRI-2). Overall, grading or what students are required to do in a specific task because of the school policies had a significant role in the EP’s feedback practices. However, her corrections were mostly about grammar.

In brief, school policies were found to be effective in the EP’s many written feedback practices and her role in writing. To illustrate, she indicated that her role in writing was like a postman because the school determined everything and what was left to her was merely to convey what she was told to, which she found quite mechanical and non-creative. Moreover, because every writing and input session is specifically designed to make students practise particular grammatical rules, she thought that what they have to do is not real writing, which naturally affected her writing and written feedback practices. In addition, because in the final drafts, the school tells her to make corrections, she felt that she did not have the freedom to practise whatever she wanted to, but she still wrote comments to overcome that feeling. Regarding her practices in the second and final drafts on which she gave comprehensive written feedback, she explained that this was because of the school policy, not her. However, despite such comprehensive feedback, she thought that students’ writings did not improve or even actually worsened with new types of errors added each time, which implies the necessity for the policies to be changed. Another effect of the school policies was on the grading process, which in return affected the EP’s feedback practices as she focused more on the structures which the writing handouts aimed to elicit from the students. However, she thought that there was a dichotomy between the process writing applied throughout the semester and the product-based approach to writing in exams. Although she liked the codes and process writing, she still thought that the school’s approach to writing should be

changed and that teachers should have more freedom to apply their practices in writing.

The NP produced similar reasons for why she carried out her practices in a particular way. She explained that her “focus in written feedback is grammar for now because this is what is required from [her]” (NP, SI-1). This was repeated frequently when she talked about the sources behind her practices:

I think the most important part when responding to drafts is grammar because of the administration, because they just want the students to write perfectly grammatical writings. So of course I mostly focus on grammar. (NP, SI-1)

Like the EP, she complained about the fact that the school and the handouts it prepared did not allow creativity or free writing as students were asked to write about topics specifically prepared for them to practise recently learned grammar topics.

... when you leave them alone, they cannot produce as much as they can do with us. ... They really need an outline, a topic, a brainstorming stage. I was hopeful in the beginning because I thought that if you practise enough, you can make it perfect. But no, it is not. (NP, SI-1)

Additionally, she did not like the idea of presenting grammar rules and then requiring students to write about a topic and use these structures immediately afterwards. She was, however, satisfied with the codes, which is one of the school practices in writing. Different from the EP, she raised the topic of assessment and the advantages of institutional practices by stating the reasons as follows:

I am actually happy with the things the institution recommends us because I am a new teacher who does not have a lot of information about this (feedback) ... I mean, they give you the basics but you are free to change the coding system if you want. ... I think teachers should be given the necessary freedom and basics to ensure standardization, but sometimes teacher initiative is necessary and teachers are supported in this aspect. That is why I love the techniques used to give feedback here. (NP, SI-1)

That is, as a new teacher she believed that she could not have done without the practices required by the institution. Additionally, she frequently referred to the assessment criteria used in the institution. She thought that in the preparatory school, “everything is graded and the most important thing is the grammar”. On the other hand, because nobody required her to justify her grade or criticize her practices, she was content with the assessment in general.

She also raised the issue of subjectivity in grading since if the student “does not write according to your expectations and format, unfortunately this child does not get the grade he wants” (NP, SI-1). She indicated that a teacher “might think it is a bad writing just because s/he did not like the reasons but another one might like it, so it is subjective if the teacher is a reader” (NP, SI-1).

Another thing she explained about assessment was the relationship between written feedback and assessment. That is, unless the student has taken her written feedback seriously and made some improvements, “this affects his grade because *she* guided him but he did not choose to cooperate” (NP, SI-1). She added that this way, the student would “be more careful in the following final draft of another writing”, which implies that she punished those not taking her feedback seriously or cooperating with grades (NP, SI-1).

Initially, the NP was observed to delete some sentences which the students had added to their paragraphs themselves and which were different from those required from them. The motive for her practice was that the school did not allow for such creative additional information. She stated her reason as follows:

... you cannot make such an assumption in a task because everything is planned for him so that is why I used this. ... I think they cannot have these things especially if they are graded with these writings”. (NP, SRI-1)

However, at the same time, she complained about the artificiality of the writing handouts used by the institution as they kill students' creativity and make them write almost identical paragraphs, which is clear in the following statements:

We do it three times a month but this is so artificial. We are giving them everything and we are expecting them to write. This is not like real writing. Maybe they are not relating this to their lives and sometimes they just do not care. (NP, SRI-1)

Although she believed that the comprehensive feedback practice in the institution “does not work most of the time”, she indicated that she “would still give comprehensive feedback” if she were to apply her own written feedback practices (NP, SRI-1). She also approved of the codes and comprehensive direct feedback in the final draft used by the institution. In addition, in the first stimulated recall interview, the NP mentioned the impact of the grading process applied in the institution and the effect which this had on her practices. Throughout the semester, during the class observations, the NP frequently referred to the grammar or grammatical structures which students should be careful about and include in their paragraphs. She warned the students because she said, “while we are grading the papers, we are only looking at the grammar” (NP, SRI-1). Grammar was very frequently repeated when explaining the reasoning behind her practices.

In the second SRI, she frequently mentioned the writing task topics and input sections in the writing handouts of the institution. According to her, the writing handouts were not real writing handouts as they had grammar points which students needed to use when writing their paragraphs on a topic specifically designed to elicit the newly acquired grammar points. She explained her opinions as follows:

... so first we are trying to teach them something else, not only writing, and the second one is we want them to write perfect final drafts so we are just showing them in which way they can use the grammar or in what context

they can these structures or vocabulary We are just preparing them for the last phase of the writing handout. (NP, SRI-2)

Despite the fact that she liked process writing, she was not satisfied with the way it is carried out in the institution since there is too much emphasis on grammar, which naturally affected her written feedback practices, which was apparent in the following comment:

Most of the time, no, what we are doing is not real writing. ... So we are just giving the grammar, vocabulary, linkers and everything and we are asking them to write something with these structures, but real writing is not like that.... it is so controlled and sometimes it is so artificial and we are assigning the topics to the students and they are not happy with it. Of course this affects their performance on these tasks. (NP, SRI-2)

Moreover, in her opinion, the writing topics were very artificial and not related in any way to the students' lives. Therefore, students did not like them, which affected their motivation and performance in the tasks. Despite her efforts to change the topics and give some choice to the students, she failed because they "are really restricted by the rules, by the schedule, by the time, so it does not work always" (NP, SRI-2). Consequently, students come up with paragraphs including the target structures but "it does not feel like you are reading a real paragraph" (NP, SRI-2). The end product, therefore, is by no means a real and natural piece of writing. Her only wish was to be able to give students options to choose from. Apart from this, she was happy with the process writing approach as she thought that this improves student autonomy.

In the final SRI, the NP expressed her dissatisfaction with the input section before the writing. In other words, the time between the input and the grammar sections should be longer so that students can digest what they have learned before having to reproduce it, which influences the quality of their writing and thus, the teacher's feedback.

She favoured grammar over content since only “after this phase, students can move to the content because even in the midterms, we did not lower their points for content but only for the grammar mistakes” (NP, SRI-3). She graded a paper mostly by looking at the grammar points and she informed the students about this to be fair to everyone. Even so, she contradicted herself when she was asked the reason for leaving some errors uncorrected in the final drafts towards the end of the semester. She explained that “when you try to see the big picture, grammatical errors are not really very important”; however, they are “important for grading” (NP, SRI-3).

In short, the NP offered various issues regarding the institution’s practices and their effect on hers. She claimed that her practices regarding giving grammar-focused feedback and deleting sentences which the students produced themselves were due to the school’s regulations. She complained about the grammar-focused, mechanical and creativity-lacking writing handouts prepared by the institution. Moreover, she raised the issue of subjectivity and the fact that being fair to students was difficult as she thought that grading was not objective. Although she approved of the process writing approach to writing, she was not satisfied with the way it was carried out in the institution because there was little time between input and output, and the topics in the handouts had hardly any relationship with students’ lives and tastes. However, she was content with the codes and some of the practices that were required from her due to school policies. That is, because she was a new teacher, she said that she needed that kind of support, otherwise, it would have been a lot more difficult and challenging for her to cope with written feedback and grading.

4. 4. Research question 4: To what extent are the novice and the experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback congruent with their observed practices?

In this section, the analyses of the feedback practices of teachers, experienced and novice, in ten randomly selected student portfolios throughout the semester are presented. It consists of two main sections. In the first section, the EP's feedback practices both on the second and final drafts during the semester and those of the NP are presented separately. In the second section, the teachers' stated beliefs and observed feedback practices are compared for the experienced and novice participant respectively.

As was stated in the methodology section, when the portfolios were examined, the scale which Ferris (2007) suggested was preferred since this scale served the aims of the present study to a great extent. The portfolio analyses were carried out because it would help to show clearly what teachers do in general concerning written feedback. It also enabled observation of whether any changes took place in the teachers' written feedback practices over the course of time. The findings also clarified whether teachers' beliefs were congruent with their practices. During the portfolio analyses, the findings were compared with the beliefs which the teachers had stated regarding written feedback.

4.4.1. Comment length, number, distribution & characteristics

Table 3: Comment Length (Number of Words) of experienced and novice participant

	<i>Experienced participant (EP)</i>	<i>Novice participant (NP)</i>
1: short (1-5 words)	108	28
2: average (6-15 words)	30	17
3: long (16-25 words)	7	7
4: very long (26+ words)	0	0

As is quite clearly shown in Table 3, the EP had 145 comments in total, the majority of which were short. With 108 short, 30 average and 7 long comments, she was observed to write mostly short rather than long comments.

The written feedback analysis revealed that the NP preferred to write relatively few comments in general. As is clear in Table 3, a significant number of her comments were short (28), followed by average (17) and long (7). However, like the EP, no very long comments were encountered in the NP's feedback.

Table 4: Comment Types used by experienced and novice participant in portfolios

<p>3. Direction/statement</p>	<p>Exp: this paragraph might be better earlier in the essay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Merve, this paragraph is a bit too short. Try to add a couple of example sentences. - The order of the items in your topic sentence must be followed in your paragraph too. - Murat, you should be more careful when I explain your mistakes on the board - Sorry! This paragraph is not acceptable. See me! - Batuhan, you must always start your paragraph with a topic sentence. - this is not the result of the reason given
<p>#6 (4: average, 2: long)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is an irrelevant sentence /- you can write a better conclusion sentence - In your first reason, you talked about phone's invention. But you don't need to do this. - In your conclusion sentence, say why you prefer a small family. /- not necessary to say - you can write a longer paragraph. / - Concluding sentence should be about why it is the most imp. invention - A sentence should be here. / - This is not very related to your paragraph. give another supporting idea - You didn't give your reasons why it is the most imp. invention. / - you don't have a concluding sentence - Your paragraph is not related to your topic. / - Kaan, you wrote telegraphy's history. I want your reasons why it is the most important invention. - Your concluding sentence is problematic. /- There are some irrelevant sentences. - Your concluding sentence should be about why it's the most important invention, not about using it. 	

Table 4 (continued)

<p>5. Give information/question</p> <p>Exp: most states do allow a waiting period before an adoption is final – do you feel that all such laws are wrong?</p> <p><u>0</u></p>	<p>4. Direction/imperative</p> <p>Exp: mention what Zinsser says about parental pressure</p>
<p><u># 2 (1 average, 1 long)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third reason is irrelevant. It is downside of phones but what is the relation with invention of it? - Rewrite your concluding sentence. You should write about reasons – why it's the most important discovery? 	<p><u>#10 (short: 4, average: 6)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - See me in my office at 4.30 pls. / - Concluding sentence pls. (#2) - Add an example to social activities . / - Explain what should be done - Write one thing that he is not doing next week . / - See me please, Muhammed, Tuesday 15.30 - Please read my comments carefully and if you do not understand, ask me.(# 2). / - Rewrite
<p><u># 2 (1 average, 1 long)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third reason is irrelevant. It is downside of phones but what is the relation with invention of it? - Rewrite your concluding sentence. You should write about reasons – why it's the most important discovery? 	<p><u>#15 (11 short, 4 average)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rewrite your concluding sentence (#4). / - rewrite the sentence (#3) - A more detailed concluding sentence! / - Talk about why computers are the best invention in your concluding sentence - write a better conclusion sentence. / - Support your ideas better. Don't just order the reasons - go back to your family. / - Support your main ideas better - organize your paragraph better. / - Rather than comparing two forms of transportation, focus on advantages of planes only.

Table 4 (continued)

<p>7. Positive comment/statement or exclamation Exp: a very nice start to your essay! You have done an impressive job of finding facts and quotes to support your arguments.</p>	<p>6. Give information/statement Exp: Iowa law favours parental rights.</p>
<p>#66 (short: 62, average: 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - V. good (#35). / - Good (#16) - Excellent (#8). / - This is a much better paragraph, Merve - Good improvement. / - This is a well-written paragraph, Buse - Good conclusion sentence, Melis. / - This is a very good paragraph - Good sentence ☺ . / - A very well written paragraph, well-done 	<p>#2 (short: 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - So many friends too busyman - T.S. missing
<p># 5 (5 short)</p> <p>-☹ (#5)</p>	<p>#0</p>

Table 4 (continued)

8. Grammar/mechanics comment/question, statement or imperative	Exp: Past or present tense?
<p>#49 (short: 28, average: 16, long: 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be careful with spelling, Deniz. / - would like to + V1 - be careful with articles (a/an/the). / - be careful with fragments - be careful with reference (e.g. buses--they). / - 2 activities joined with 'or' - 2 activities joined with 'and'. / - Example: on Tuesdays, she usually works, but this Tuesday she is meeting her friends - Please use possessive pronouns too. E.g. there are 5 rooms in her house, but there are 3 rooms in mine. - Use reference (#4). / - Use passive, please (#2). / - Use plural pls. - Batuhan, please do not translate word by word directly from Turkish into English. Think about S+V+O when you write. 	
<p>#6 (3 short, 3 average)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present cont.? Simple past? - Linker? - Be careful about English word order (S+V+O) - use more linkers" - use 'firstly', 'secondly' to order your ideas (#2) 	

Table 4 (continued)

<p>8. Grammar/mechanics comment/question, statement or imperative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Had breakfast (1), took a shower (2). After I had breakfast, I took a shower. Before I took a shower, I had breakfast - To conclude, in conclusion. / - Continuous tense: am/is/are + Ving - Object + relative clause + passive form. / - Murat, you use there is/there are in almost every sentence. There is no need for this. Use S+V+O please - S+ would like to. / - S. present: she studies/she goes - He is playing tennis at 7.00 o'clock in the evening/p.m. / - P. cont.: she is studying/he is going - Where does one sentence start? Where does it end? / - Aslı, be careful with reference: (e.g. buses, they are - they are) plural - Modal verbs, Berk, must/can/should + V1. / - Be+going to + V1 - Next time, write a sentence with 'when'. E.g. When I came home, I had my lunch. - My house -, but + hers -. Her house -, but mine-. / - Place + time 	
---	--	--

Table 4 (continued)

<p>8. Grammar/mechanics comment/question, statement or imperative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try to use different structures. E.g. there is a – in her house, but there is no – in mine. - Use ref. (metro –it is – it is) - Her house has five bathrooms, but mine has two. - S+V+O (#2). / - After/before/when? - use before/after/when correctly /- p. cont. for future - Be careful with tenses! / - Linkers p:39 - Try not to repeat names all the time. Alice – she – she – - P- punctuation: noktalama işaretleri. / - Prep: preposition: at/in/on/with/from - Modal verb? / - Make passive pls. 	
---	--	--

Table 4 represents what types of comment the EP and NP frequently preferred when giving written feedback. According to the scale, teacher comments can be of various types regarding their content and grammatical structures.

The analysis revealed that among the 145 comments which the EP wrote, the highest number belonged to the category of positive comment/statement or exclamation (66). The comments were generally phrases such as ‘good’ or ‘very good’. The second highest percentage belonged to comments on grammar/mechanics in the form of questions, statements or imperatives (49). Quite a few of the comments were asking for information in the form of questions (12) and

showing direction in the form of imperatives (10). The remaining ones were direction/statements (6) and give information/statements (2). However, she did not use any direction/question comments.

Regarding the types of comment which the NP used when giving written feedback, the categorization in Table 4 shows that unlike the EP, the majority of the NP's comments were direction/statement (16) and direction/imperative (15). Moreover, different from the EP who preferred to write numerous positive and mechanical comments, the comments which the NP wrote on grammar/mechanics were only six in total and those on positive aspects were merely five. Other comments were asking for information/statements (4), direction/question (4) and giving information/question (2). Give information/statement section was not commented on, however.

Table 5: Hedges used by experienced and novice participant

	<i>Experienced participant (EP)</i>	<i>Novice participant (NP)</i>
1: hedge included. - lexical hedges: maybe, please, might	0:no hedge	
<u>#15</u> - Murat, you should be more careful when I explain your mistakes on the board. / - Batuhan, you must always start your paragraph with a topic sentence. - See me in my office at 4.30 pls. / - Concluding sentence pls. (#2) - Please read my comments carefully and if you do not understand, ask me. / - Please read my comments carefully and if you do not understand, ask me. - See me please, Muhammed, Tuesday 15.30. / - Please use possessive pronouns too. E.g. there are 5 rooms in her house, but there are 3 rooms in mine. - Use passive please (#2). / - Use plural pls. - Batuhan, please do not translate word by word directly from Turkish into English. Think about S+V+O when you write. - Make passive pls. / - Murat, you use there is/there are in almost every sentence. There is no need for this. Use S+V+O please	<u>#130</u>	
<u># 5</u> - You can write a better conclusion sentence. / - you can write a longer paragraph - A sentence should be here. / - Rewrite your concluding sentence. You should write about reasons –why it’s the most important discovery? - Concluding sentence should be about why it is the most imp. invention?		<u>#47</u>

Table 5 (continued)

<p>Syntactic hedges: e.g.: can you add an example here?</p>	<p>#<u>0</u></p>	<p>#<u>0</u></p>
<p>Positive softeners: “you have raised some good points, but...”</p>	<p>#<u>0</u></p>	<p>#<u>0</u></p>

Table 5 exemplifies the types of hedge used when writing comments. The hedged comments which the EP gave were observed to be only a few and these were only lexical hedges, that is, those containing modal verbs or some lexical items. Among the 145 comments, only fifteen included hedges. Moreover, positive softeners and syntactic hedges were not used in the EP’s comments at all.

Similar to the EP, the NP used very few hedged comments in her written feedback because of the 52 comments, only five were hedged. The hedged comments which the NP preferred to write were all lexical ones, which resembles the EP’s practice.

Table 6: Text-Specific Comments of experienced and novice participant

	<i>Experienced Participant (EP)</i>	<i>Novice Participant (NP)</i>
<p>0: generic comment (could have been written on any paper) Exp: nice intro.</p>	<p>#134</p>	<p>#<u>41</u></p>

Table 6 (continued)

<p>1: Text specific comment. Exp: why is the American system better for the children, in your opinion?</p>	<p>#11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Batuhan, you must always start your paragraph with a topic sentence. / - Batuhan, please do not translate word by word directly from Turkish into English - Add an example to social activities. / - Murat, you should be more careful when I explain your mistakes on the board - Murat, you use there is/there are in almost every sentence. There is no need for this. Use S+V+O please - Explain what should be done. / - Write one thing that he is not doing next week - Asli, be careful with reference: (e.g. buses – they are – they are –). / - This is a much better paragraph, Merve. / - The order of the items in your topic sentence must be followed in your paragraph too. - Merve, this paragraph is a bit too short. Try to add a couple of example sentences.
<p>#11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rather than comparing two forms of transportation, focus on advantages of planes only. / - Your concluding sentence should be about why it's the most important invention, not about using it. - Kaan, you wrote telegraphy's history. I want your reasons why it is the most important invention. / - You didn't give your reasons why it is the most imp. invention - Third reason is irrelevant. It is downside of phones but what is the relation with invention of it? / - Talk about why computers are the best invention in your concluding sentence - Concluding sentence should be about why it is the most imp. Invention. / - In your conclusion sentence, say why you prefer a small family. - In your first reason, you talked about phone's invention. But you don't need to do this. / - What is the advantage of being not crowded? / - What is the most important invention? / 	

To determine whether a comment is text-specific or generic, the criteria suggested in Ferris (2007) were taken into consideration. That is, if a comment can be written on any paper of the same kind and does not have any personal reference or content, it is regarded as a generic comment. When, however, a comment refers to that specific student or content and cannot be placed on another paper randomly, it means that it is a text-specific comment. The analysis in Table 6 shows that the EP used generic comments a lot more than text-specific ones. This is very obvious in her positive and mechanics/grammar comments, which constitute the highest number in her written feedback. That is, of the 145 comments, only eleven belonged to the text-specific category. The rest of the comments (134) were generic.

Similar to the EP, the NP's generic comments outnumbered text-specific comments. Whereas the number of generic comments was 41, there were only eleven text-specific comments. It can therefore be concluded that the NP had a tendency to generally use short and generic comments instead of specific comments.

Table 7: Margin versus End Comments in the experienced and the novice participant's written feedback

Experienced participant (EP)	<i>SECOND DRAFT</i>	<i>FINAL DRAFT</i>
Margin comments	33	1
End comments	53	58
Total	86	59
Novice participant (NP)	<i>SECOND DRAFT</i>	<i>FINAL DRAFT</i>
Margin comment	12	1
End comment	30	9
Total	42	10

Although it is not part of the original scale used by Ferris (2007), the margin and end comments in the second and final drafts were also analysed and the reasons behind them were questioned.

The findings in Table 7 show that the EP wrote more comments on the second draft (86) than on the final (59). However, the gap between the second and final drafts in terms of total comments seems not to be very large. Of the 86 comments on the second draft, 33 were marginal comments while only one of the 59 comments was written on the margins in the final drafts. To summarize, the EP preferred to write more marginal comments on the second draft compared with the final draft; however, in general, the number of classical end comments was considerably higher (111).

The NP's practices, on the other hand, indicate that her comments on the final drafts (10) were not nearly as many as those on the second (42). Twelve out of 42 comments on the second drafts were written on the margins, while this was only one out of ten on the final drafts. In short, like the EP, the NP wrote most of her comments at the bottom of the paragraphs and she generally preferred to write them on the second drafts.

Table 8: Changes in teachers' written feedback practices

	<i>Experienced participant (EP)</i>	<i>Novice participant (NP)</i>
Beginning	54	0
Middle	29	6
End	62	46

The EP and NP's written feedback on student portfolios was divided into five week intervals and the corrections they had made together with the number of comments they had written were also analyzed. As it is clear in Table 8, the number of comments the EP wrote is high at the beginning, lowest in the middle and highest towards the end of the term. The NP, however, did not write any comment at the beginning of the term but the number of comments slightly increases in the middle of the term. Yet, towards the end of the term, it is clear that the number of comments is far more than the rest. As for the corrections the teachers made on student papers, it is clear that both the EP and NP corrected almost every student error throughout the term regardless of student level in English or other aspects.

Table 9 below summarizes the kinds and amount of comments which the experienced and the novice teacher preferred to write on drafts.

Table 9: Summary of the results of the portfolio analysis

	<i>Experienced participant (EP)</i>	<i>Novice participant (NP)</i>
Total comments	145	52
Short	108	28
Average	30	17
Long	7	7
Ask for information	12	4
Request/question	0	4
Request/statement or imperative	16	31
Give information/any form	2	2
Positive	66	5
Grammar	49	6

Table 9 (continued)

#of hedges	15	5
# of text-based	11	11

4.4.2. Comparison of beliefs and practices

The portfolio analyses conducted at the end of the study by collecting ten student portfolios of each teacher randomly revealed significant information regarding convergences and divergences between the experienced and the novice participant's beliefs and practices. The following section compares first the EP's and then the NP's beliefs and practices in the second and final drafts in the ten student portfolios throughout the semester.

In the portfolio analysis, it was discovered that the majority of the EP's comments were given at the bottom of the pages or paragraphs. This was in line with what she indicated concerning her preference between end and margin comments. Because she had more space at the end, she wanted to show a problem or give praise directly, which was also easier for students as they can "link the things and the feedback together" (EP, SRI-2).

Another finding was related to the number of comments written on each draft. She had indicated that she preferred to write more comments on the second drafts as her aim was to help students correct their errors and thus get a good grade from the final draft, which she indicated as follows:

Second, because otherwise they would write the same mistakes in the final, wouldn't they? When you give them feedback after the final, what can they do about it? It is too late. I think you need to deal with the mistakes at a stage when they can correct their mistakes. It does not serve its purpose because after the final draft, there is no other one to correct their mistakes. (EP, SI-2)

Even so, she still wrote some comments on the final drafts because she thought "maybe it will help in the next writing handout" (EP, SRI-3). As the examination of the portfolios revealed, most of her comments (86) were on the second drafts. But 59 comments were written on the finals which might be because of the reason she mentioned above about future writing. In brief, her thoughts about whether written feedback is more important on the second or final drafts were parallel with her practices.

As can be seen in Table 7, the EP wrote quite a few comments on students' paragraphs. She had indicated that her focus in written feedback was on "writing both positive and negative comments" when responding (EP, SI-2). She stated that she was careful not to demotivate students. In contrast, her aim was to motivate them and encourage them to make more mistakes so that they could improve. The results of the portfolio analyses were in parallel with her beliefs regarding the motivating function of written feedback because the highest number of her comments (66) belonged to those that praise students' work. That is, her ideas regarding effective comments matched her practices.

In general, the EP was observed to correct every grammatical error in students' second and final drafts throughout the semester. In cases where she missed something, she claimed that this was not on purpose. However, her beliefs were that at the higher level she would correct every grammatical error because the students had studied the structures and should know them, but at lower levels, she would

correct only the ones that the students were familiar with (EP, SRI-3). Moreover, as a focus of her written feedback, she had given the following explanation:

The focus of course depends on the input so whatever the input is on language-wise, you have to focus on those things, so this means you do not have to necessarily correct every single mistake in the student's paragraph. You can focus on one thing at a time and the priority is always on what is given in the input session. (EP, SI-1)

She emphasized that she made corrections on the basis of level and input. However, her beliefs and practices contradicted each other as from the first handout onwards she corrected every grammatical error.

In addition, she had stated that effective comments are those which ask questions to “get students to think and look at it in a more critical way” (EP, SI-2). Her total number of questions in 145 comments was only twelve, and of those, none were average. That is, all the comments that asked for information were one- or two-worded and they were mostly asking questions about missing grammatical structures, such as ‘how often?’

She also frequently emphasized that her “comments are not mass production” and that she did “not write similar or the same sentences to everyone” (EP, SI-2). That is, her comments were personalized and she hoped that students would appreciate her efforts in this regard as she thought that her practices were different from what other teachers did. However, the analysis revealed that of the 145 comments, only eleven were text-specific while the other 134 were generic. That is, almost all of her comments were found to be generic, which can be placed on any paragraph as they are mass produced. This is also a mismatch with what she said regarding the fact that she focused on whether the students had addressed the content first and then checked the grammar since grammar-directed comments had

the second highest number in the analysis and the numbers of text-specific comments together with questions directed at content were very low.

She had explained that using just symbols is not enough when giving written feedback as students need to see examples which aid their understanding and thus enable more corrections in the paragraphs. She explained her practice as follows:

I think the most useful ones are when I give short tutorials at the bottom because if that student has a problem with referencing for example, OK, you can write 'ref' a thousand times, but if they cannot see what is wrong with that reference, how are they going to correct it? So I think the very short tutorials I write at the bottom, showing them how it should be are the most useful ... (EP, SI-2)

Quite a few of her comments were exemplifying what she meant by a particular word. For instance, although she used the coding for an error related to modal verbs, she also wrote 'modal verbs [name of the student], must/can/should + V1' (see Appendix A). However, the majority of her comments did not illustrate what she meant by the codes or for a repeated error.

She did not have any comments containing positive softeners or syntactic hedges at all, and quite a few of her comments were in the form of imperatives with or without lexical hedges. The lack of syntactic hedges and positive softeners can be explained in relation to her closeness to the students which she described in the first semi-structured interview.

Overall, whilst there were a few parallels between the EP's beliefs and her practices, quite a few of the practices were found to contradict her previously stated opinions. That is, her beliefs regarding end or margin comments, the number of comments on each draft, and writing motivating comments matched her beliefs. However, the focus of her written feedback, the type of language she used for

writing comments, and her use of generic or specific and exemplifying comments were found to contradict her beliefs.

With regard to the NP, her stated beliefs and practices were also compared to identify any convergences and divergences. When she was describing the content of her feedback, she stated that she preferred not to write personal comments when responding to student writings because, on paper, “your message can go wrong” (NP, SRI-1). Although she gave oral feedback in the classroom on various aspects, including comments about students’ personalities and laziness, she stayed away from doing so in written feedback. Therefore, the analysis above is in parallel with the ideas she presented previously. That is, the portfolio analysis confirms that she wrote few personal comments on students’ drafts. Moreover, when the length of the comments is analysed, it becomes clear that her beliefs are in line with her practices. In other words, the analysis shows that the majority of her comments were short (28) or average (17) in length with only seven long ones, which conforms to what she said was her preferred feedback, which is “as short, and concise as possible” (NP, SI-1).

Another point regarding her beliefs was that she had stated that comments like ‘Be careful about you grammar’ do not help students to discover what was wrong in their writing. However, comments such as ‘Focus on passive sentences or linkers’ are more effective and specific, which the NP considered important when writing comments (NP, SI-2). Although she had only six comments on grammar, almost all of them were specific enough to point out the errors. To illustrate, her comment ‘present cont. simple past?’ was specific enough to indicate the type of the error.

The analyses revealed that the NP corrected almost all of the grammatical errors from the first handouts onwards, which clearly matched her belief that “the most important part while responding to drafts is grammar because of the administration ...” (NP, SI-2). Even though she had only six comments in this category, it can be concluded that this is NP’s general tendency because she had indicated that a teacher “should not write a million of feedback” (NP, SI-2). This is even more clearly confirmed when the total number of comments (52) which she wrote on the second and final drafts of ten students’ portfolios throughout the semester is considered. That is, because she did not like writing more than the students and giving large amounts of written feedback, her comments were limited in number, which is in parallel with her beliefs.

With her comments such as “however, conveying the message comes first for me [and] the others come later” and her focus on the natural use of the language, it was clear that the content of a paragraph is very important for her when responding (NP, SI-1). She expressed her opinions as follows:

... the student might have written a grammatically correct sentence but if the language used is very artificial and seems to be English that cannot be used, I give the student feedback on these, too. That is, ‘your sentence is correct grammar-wise but you cannot see such a sentence in daily life’. My aim is to make students more realistic (in their writing). (NP, SI-1)

Although she did not have many comments in total, because most of the NP’s comments were somehow related to the content of the paragraph, it can be concluded that in addition to grammar, she gave importance to the content of the paragraphs.

Another finding was about NP’s practices regarding vocabulary. She had emphasized that “vocabulary is the least important part” for her “because even

native-like speakers sometimes cannot use the words appropriately” (NP, SI-2). She had also pointed out that vocabulary was a challenge even for her because she sometimes looked a word up in a dictionary to be sure of its usage, so she preferred not to correct the vocabulary errors in general, which was the case encountered in the analysis. Even though there were a couple of corrections on the use of vocabulary, they were written in parentheses as an alternative to what the students had used in their paragraphs. To be more specific, she wrote ‘prefer’ in parenthesis next to the word ‘choose’ written by a student. However, her aim was not to impose the word but rather to suggest an alternative.

The analysis showed that the NP used very few positive or motivating comments (five in total) in her written feedback. Interestingly, those which were positive were only smiley faces without words or sentences accompanying them. That is, throughout the semester, she had not written any sentence or word that showed students that they had improved or had done a good job. However, she had previously stated that “comments are very important because students might be adults or children but they can both be very motivated with the teacher’s small star or small lovely faces on the paper” (NP, SI-1). Moreover, she had stated that comments should also be “encouraging not discouraging” (NP, SI-2). Hence, it can be concluded that her beliefs did not match her practices because she did not provide written motivating comments at all and only used a couple of smiley faces during the whole semester.

Nevertheless, her belief that some students may “lose their motivation when criticized for even their tiniest mistakes” was found to be echoed in her written feedback (NP, SI-1). It was observed that she was careful not to write harsh

comments on paragraphs, which conformed with her stated beliefs. The analysis also revealed that the NP preferred generic comments (41) which had nothing to do with the students they were supposed to address. Although her aim of giving written feedback was “to indicate that everything – grammar, vocabulary, and content – is important while writing”, she was observed to comment on content only to a very limited extent (NP, SI-1). In short, the NP was observed to give written feedback in parallel with her beliefs or those of the institution. Her beliefs regarding the quantity, length and specificity of written feedback matched her beliefs to a great extent. Moreover, her opinions concerning comprehensive, demotivating and vocabulary-based written feedback were in line with her practices. However, giving positive and encouraging written feedback and focusing on content, which were stated to be important when giving written feedback, were the NP’s observed practices, contradicting her beliefs.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.0. Presentation

This final chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the study. It starts with the summary of the findings regarding each research question by referring back to the studies in the literature review section. The second section is concerned with the possible implications of the study. The final section includes limitations and recommendations for future research consecutively.

5.1. Summary and discussions of the findings

The present study aimed to reveal the beliefs experienced and novice writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback to learners' writings, how these writing teachers respond to learners' paragraphs, what factors may have influenced their feedback practices and to what extend their beliefs about written feedback are congruent with their observed practices. To answer the research questions, semi-structured interviews, class observations, written feedback analysis, stimulated recall interviews and portfolio analysis were conducted.

5.1.1. Research question 1

The initial question the study aimed to find answer to is about the beliefs novice and experienced writing teachers in the preparatory school of a private university hold about written feedback. To answer this question, two semi-structured

interviews, one at the beginning and the other at the end of the semester, were conducted. Moreover, some of the data came from the semi-structured interviews 1, 2 and 3.

The findings show that both the experienced and novice participant have a positive attitude towards written feedback and consider providing feedback their duty as a teacher. That is, contrary to arguments in the studies by Fazio (2001), Polio et al. (1998), Robb et al. (1986) and Truscott (1996, 1999, & 2007), the teachers both think that written feedback improves student proficiency in writing and therefore, has a place in the teaching of writing. The EP thinks that written feedback is a tool that can be used to increase student motivation, improve student writing and justify her grade. Similarly, the NP uses written feedback to motivate the students, improve their writings, enable them to use the language in a natural way and better herself as a teacher in giving written feedback. Moreover, both teachers emphasize the communication function of written feedback since similar to what Ferris et al (1997) “it allows for a level of individualized attention and one-on-one communication that is rarely possible in the day-to-day operations of a class” (p. 155).

Regarding the effectiveness of their own written feedback, both the EP and NP think that their written feedback is effective as they can see student progress directly in the final drafts. Interestingly, what they mean is found to be related to grammatical corrections. That is, as Zamel (1985) states, ‘ESL teachers, like their native-language counterparts, rarely seem to expect students to revise the text beyond the surface level’ (p. 79). Although both question the effectiveness of their written feedback at times, in general they think that student failure in writing is not

their fault and students are the ones to blame. The EP, however, expressed her doubts about the permanence of her written feedback in the long term. As for teachers' preferences between written or oral feedback, the EP thinks that written and oral feedback should be used together when necessary while the NP believes that in the second and final drafts, written feedback is a lot better since it prevents students from forgetting, helps students see everything explicitly and forces them to make corrections to get a good grade. Yet, unlike the EP, the novice participant avoids written feedback when she wants to express something personal and uses oral feedback instead as written feedback might lead to misunderstandings in such circumstances. While the EP believes oral feedback does not work when students are writing the first drafts, the NP thinks that it is effective at that stage. They both, however, consider that oral feedback is efficient when students are weak and unable to understand written feedback and also if the paper is full of errors. That is, oral feedback is a tool they use when they want to lighten the burden written feedback creates on them as written feedback is a "time consuming endeavor" (Ferris et al., 2011, p. 41).

As for teachers' beliefs concerning comprehensive written feedback, the EP thinks its effectiveness depends on the students and it works when students already know the structures. The NP does not believe that comprehensive feedback is effective but she still carries on using it in the first and second paper analyses because it is school's policy. However, towards the end of the term, she emphasized that she terminated the practice and focused more on major errors only.

Regarding teachers' beliefs about written comments, the EP considers them to be important and useful as long as they are academic. That is, for her, comments

should not stress very good or very bad aspects of a paragraph but be moderate in severity. In addition, negative comments should come after the positive ones to ensure student motivation and comments should be specific. She believes comments written in short tutorial forms and aimed at eliciting the answers are the most effective ones. Similar to what the EP says, the NP agrees that comments are useful and necessary in guiding, motivating or demotivating the students. She, however, pays attention to writing the least extreme, short, and concise comments and those that foster natural language use.

The best written feedback practices for the EP are those that reveal students' strengths and weaknesses and utilize direct feedback and comments to motivate students. However, she believes there is no perfect way of responding and teachers should alter their feedback practices based on the content of paragraphs. Both the EP and NP seem to be satisfied with the codes although both emphasized that codes were not sufficient when a paper is full of grammatical and content-related errors. The NP emphasized that process writing is one of her favorite practices because it motivates and improves students in writing.

As for the reasons why students fail in writing regardless of teachers' written feedback and efforts, the EP thought that this was because students were lazy, lack critical thinking skills in addition to school's hectic schedule and writing policy. Similarly, the NP blamed the students as they depended heavily on translation, lacked capacity and had only one source of information, which was the teacher. Moreover, like the EP, she accused the school schedule and policies. In brief, both the EP and NP did not blame themselves or their practices for student failure.

5.1.2. Research question 2

The second research question sought an answer to the question how the experienced and novice teacher responded to learners' writings and what challenges they encountered in the process. Class observations, feedback analysis and stimulated recall interviews together with some data from semi-structured interviews were used to answer the research question.

The findings regarding teachers' foci revealed that although the way the experienced participant responded did not vary throughout the term, her explanations behind the practices changed significantly. Initially, the EP stated that she varied her focus based on the content of a specific writing handout and did not focus on each error but only on those that specific writing handout introduced. She said that she gave feedback heavily on content and then grammar. In her later comments, she indicated that she corrected every grammatical error so that she could familiarize students with these structures. At the end of the semester, her feedback analysis indicated that she corrected every error, which she explained as something that depended on students' level again. This was contradicting what she explained at the beginning of the term as she had indicated that she corrected everything no matter what the level of the student was. The NP, on the other hand, stated that she used specific comments and focused on content, grammar and formality of the language while responding. If there were lots of errors in a paragraph, she corrected major ones only. Sometimes, she was also observed to correct the grammar of sentences which were meaningless and irrelevant. In brief, she was observed to focus mostly on grammar, which she found easy to correct, and secondly content, which she considered more difficult.

Regarding teachers' practices in the second drafts, the EP preferred to write notes, give examples to exemplify the correct use of the errors, focus on content, and correct every error with symbols in writing. That is, in addition to comments, she focused on content and language in writing. Moreover, it was clear that she varied her use of symbols in different papers. Like the EP, the NP stated that she focused mostly on grammar by correcting almost every error in the second drafts. Although she did not believe in their effectiveness, she did the corrections with codes because of the school policy. In addition, she dwelled on the meaning and organization in paragraphs and did not focus on vocabulary because she thought even native speakers had difficulty in this aspect. Her practices on student papers were also various and flexible. Organizational errors were not corrected as she thought they should be corrected only after students master grammar. Moreover, she did not allow students to add their own sentences into the paragraphs in any way. Lastly, she criticized students harshly with her comments when she encountered plagiarism.

In the final drafts, the EP checked whether her feedback was taken seriously and corrections were made accordingly. She gave comprehensive feedback at first to all students but she claimed to have stopped carrying on the practice with those who were not interested in her feedback. However, she was still writing comments on some papers and making corrections when she thought the student deserved them. Like the EP, at the beginning, the novice participant focused on grammar by correcting each error in the final drafts. Nevertheless, because she did not know how to make corrections, expected students themselves to correct, did not believe in the efficiency of the feedback on the final drafts and did not want to discourage students by writing everything, she remarked that she started to lessen the amount of her written feedback gradually. Similar to the EP, she checked whether the students

corrected their errors and drew smiley faces on papers where there was progress. Unlike the EP, she wrote few comments on the final drafts due to the lack of student interest.

Written comments were also used by the teachers. Because she believed that comments were a means of communication with students, the EP paid considerable attention to writing comments and she was also careful in starting a comment with something positive for student motivation. Furthermore, she stated that she wrote specific comments to encourage students to take more risks and thus improve themselves in writing. By means of her comments, she also aimed to improve students' language and vocabulary skills. Because of time constraints and the number of students, she could not give oral feedback. Thus, she preferred to give detailed written feedback by asking questions, writing positive, negative and specific comments, giving examples and mini-lectures to compensate for the oral feedback. As for the NP, she was careful to write short and specific comments with simple grammar and daily language. She also considered students' personality and capacity when writing comments and avoided students' mother tongue because she did not want to be a bad model to them. Although she indicated that she preferred writing comments mostly on second drafts, it was observed that she did not write many comments in general and those she wrote were mainly on grammar. Even though she regarded comments as means of motivation, she used few ones, mostly smileys and ticks on good paragraphs, which was because she did not want students to overestimate their success and give up studying. She also varied her feedback slightly by helping less proficient students more. Her comments, she indicated, aimed to get students take more risks, use a natural language and break prejudices. Her other practice was that she wrote more end comments than marginal ones.

Regarding plagiarism, she took a firm stand against it and warned the students directly with her comments.

Teachers were also asked to recount their written feedback practices if there was no enforcement due to school policies. The EP stated that lots of things in addition to writing needed to be changed in the institution. However, similar to students, both the EP and NP “strongly believed that [their] feedback is of utmost importance to improve students’ writing” and thus, they would still give written feedback no matter what the school administration required (Zacharias, 2007, p. 51). The EP was content with the codes but she would use them in multi drafts until students discovered all their errors themselves. She emphasized her boredom with the institution’s grammar focused syllabus and wished for more free and creative writing activities where students would express their opinions and feelings freely without the need to conform to any pre-determined structure. She would also give students more individual feedback and provide them with the written feedback type they wanted. Similar to the EP, the NP complained about the writing practices in the institution as they were spoon-feeding the students and not allowing creativity. Therefore, like the EP, she would like to do more free writing activities and depending on students’ wish, she would provide written feedback. She liked process writing, using drafts and codes; however, she would make alterations in the process writing so that it would become more learner-centered. Additionally, because she was curious about the sources behind students’ problems, she would give more individual oral feedback, which she believed would result in permanent learning. Moreover, in spite of complaining about too much guidance and lack of a learner-centered approach, she indicated that she would help the students more while they were writing and keep the time between the input and writing longer. She would

also change the coding list by adding new codes to make her feedback more specific. Moreover, because she thought she lacked a theoretical background, she emphasized that she was always open to improvement and changes in written feedback.

Another finding of the present study is about the challenges teachers face during the process of responding to writing. Teachers were found to face various problems while responding to students' writings. When the papers are full of errors, the EP struggles to find a good way to make corrections and she really tries hard to avoid rewriting such papers, which is quite challenging and annoying as well as time-consuming for her. Moreover, regardless of her efforts, time and feedback, she observes no student progress, which is another challenge and frustration she faces. Yet another challenge she mentioned is when students use translation heavily, it causes a chaos in writing and because codes are not adequate in correcting every error, she feels helpless. Additionally, because students do not come from a culture where they are held responsible for making corrections in writing themselves, they cannot understand the rationale behind the codes and this makes teachers' efforts useless. In other words, as Lee (2004) states "If throughout students' language learning experience their English teachers have marked their errors comprehensively and done the corrections for them, students may feel that these are the right things to do and that it is the teacher's job to correct errors" (p. 302). Furthermore, no matter how ridiculous or illogical students' ideas in writing are, she feels the need to respect the ideas but holding herself from commenting on content or ideas is a big challenge for her. In addition, starting her comments with something positive becomes challenging when there is nothing positive in a paragraph. Despite the huge amount of time she devotes to writing comments, she

loses her belief in their effectiveness because the students add new mistakes each time they write let alone showing improvement, which causes resentment, frustration and disappointment for her.

Regarding the challenges the NP faces, being a novice teacher with a lack of adequate pre-service education on feedback, she encountered various problems. For example, when she first started teaching, she emphasized the fact that she had no idea about written feedback and how it should be practiced. In spite of her time and energy spent on giving written feedback, when students do not show improvement, she feels helpless, frustrated and desperate. Other challenges she faces are about the codes. To begin with, she has problems differentiating among codes, which supports Ferris (2002), in that “error identification ...can also be —cumbersome for the teacher and confusing for the student” (p. 67). Other difficulties stem from the insufficient number of codes and the ineffectiveness of codes while responding. Lastly, vocabulary correction is hard for her as she has trouble judging the appropriateness of words in paragraphs. She also finds responding on content and coherence to be demanding and challenging.

5.1.3. Research question 3

The aim of the third question was to find out the factors which might have influenced university preparatory school writing teachers’ feedback practices. Data for this section came mainly from class observations, feedback analyses and stimulated recall interviews.

Both the novice and experienced participant thought that writing was a necessity. However, while the EP thought that it was an important way to express beliefs and opinions, the NP considered it to be a way of showing a person’s mastery

in a language and it was practical in daily life. That is, the EP approached writing as part of human nature whereas the NP's approach was quite practical. As for the characteristics of good writing, the EP indicated that it should be coherent, fluent and rich in vocabulary. Similarly, the NP indicated that conveying the message was very important in addition to grammar and other structural issues, to which she gave equal importance while grading the papers. The EP approached students and their errors in writing in a quite positive way. During the class observations, her approach to students was very friendly and this was close to what she did while giving written feedback as she stated that she varied her written feedback according to students' level and personality. Like the EP, the NP was helpful and approachable in the class and her opinions regarding errors were that errors were quite natural and good indicators for teachers to see what to correct and thus, get feedback about students' progress. She indicated that she changed her written feedback considering students' level and that her opinions and feelings about the students did not affect her practices. Interestingly, the NP thought that she was the source of everything, so she felt the need to give feedback on every aspect of writing. Additionally, giving direct feedback in the final draft was something she thought to be quite natural as students needed to see their mistakes explicitly. Furthermore, because she knew how students would feel after receiving a paper full of red ink, she avoided much feedback. In short, teachers' attitude towards various issues like errors, students etc. affected their feedback practices.

Teachers' previous education was found to be another factor that affected their practices. Both the EP and NP emphasized that they did not get any training in terms of written feedback as their pre-service education was based on theory not practice. That is, like many other teachers, they were left to struggle with various

issues including written feedback when they started the profession. They both concluded that the pre-service education they received was inadequate in preparing them to respond to students' writings, which created numerous difficulties for them at the beginning of their career. However, they stated that the theories they learned then were effective in some of their practices. For example, the EP mentioned her practices regarding motivation and writing positive comments to be the result of the theories she read about during her undergraduate studies. The NP, however, referred back to her education frequently while explaining the sources behind her practices because she was a good observer and thus, she used some of her previous teachers' written feedback techniques in her own practices. Although she was novice, the NP thought that experience was crucial in helping teachers become better at responding but she stated that the in-service training she received was not adequate at all in helping her handle the issue of written feedback.

In addition to previous education, teachers mentioned the impact of institutional policies on their practices as yet another source. As Goldstein (2006) stated "teachers' commenting practices are affected by the institution they work in and the program within which the writing, commenting, and revision takes place", which was obvious in EP and NP's many written feedback practices (p. 187). The EP, for example, stated that she feels as if she were a mailman in writing because she does whatever the school policies necessitate, which, like the NP, she finds too mechanical and non-creative. She, in a way, echoed the participant in a study by Crocco and Costigan (2007) who stated that s/he does not "appreciate being transformed into an automaton" (p. 525). Similarly, the NP claimed that her practices regarding giving grammar focused feedback and deleting sentences the students produced themselves were due to school's regulations. Moreover, because

every writing and input session are specifically designed to make students practice particular grammatical rules, the EP thought what they do is not real writing, which naturally affects her written feedback practices. In addition, because in the final drafts, the school tells her to make direct corrections, she feels that she does not have the freedom to practice whatever she wants. She, however, still writes comments to overcome that feeling. Regarding her practices in the second and final drafts where she gave comprehensive written feedback, she explained that this was because of the school policy, which confirms what Lee (2011) and Bailey and Garner (2010) found regarding the impact of school policies on teachers' feedback practices. Still, the EP thinks that school policies regarding writing need to be changed because she observes no student improvement irrespective of such comprehensive feedback. Another effect of the school policy is on the grading process, which makes the EP focus more on the structures the writing handouts aim to elicit from the students. Moreover, the EP thinks there is a conflict between the process writing applied throughout the semester and the product based approach to writing in exams. A different aspect was mentioned by the NP about the policies. She thinks that the grading process carried out in the institution is very subjective and as teachers, they cannot be fair to the students.

On the other hand, there are some aspects of the school policy regarding writing that the teachers were satisfied with. The EP and NP, for instance, like the codes and process writing. However, they both agreed that the way process writing is carried out in the institution should be changed. Besides, while the EP still believed that school's approach to writing should be changed and teachers should have more freedom in applying their practices in writing, the NP thought that she needed some kind of enforcement from the school at the beginning of her career as

she was a novice teacher and did not know what to do regarding written feedback. She added that if it had not been for the school policies, coping with written feedback would have been a lot more difficult and challenging for her.

5.1.4. Research question 4

The last research question sought an answer to the question to what extent the novice and experienced writing teachers' beliefs about written feedback were congruent with their observed practices. To answer this question, teachers', novice and experienced, written feedback throughout the semester was examined by referring to the student portfolios and using the scale (Ferris, 2007) recommended. Results were then compared with teachers' stated beliefs.

The findings revealed that although to a different extent, there were convergences and divergences between what the novice and experienced participant believed and practiced. The experienced participant's belief that end comments were better because of having more space, being direct and enabling students to see the link easier matched her practice. Moreover, because her aim was to encourage student revision and help them get good grades from the final drafts, she gave most of her feedback on the second drafts, which again matched her beliefs. With the hope that students would use her feedback in the following handouts, she also wrote comments on the final drafts, which was in line with her beliefs. Furthermore, she had indicated that praising the students and thus, motivating them was highly important for her and the analysis revealed that the highest number of her comments were on praise. However, there were quite a few practices that did not match her previously stated beliefs. To illustrate, from the beginning of the term until the end, her feedback was observed to focus heavily on grammar as was confirmed in the

study by Vengadasamy, (2002) where he stated that “many teachers treat the teacher response stage as a copy editing stage where they embark on an error hunt” (p. 2). However, her belief was that the priority should be to correct the structures presented in that specific handout and that her corrections were about familiar structures. In addition to this mismatch, her belief that elicitation technique was effective in written feedback was not in parallel with her practices. Besides, she had indicated that her comments were personalized and specific. However, the results revealed that only about 8% of her feedback was specific while the rest were “rubber-stamped or generic sounding” (Ferris, 2007, p. 169). Moreover, her beliefs that codes should be supported with examples and clarification did not match her actual practices.

As for the novice participant, most of her beliefs were found to match her practices. To begin with, she indicated that she avoids writing comments directed at students’ personality, which was what she did in her written feedback. For her, grammar corrections should be specific enough to help students understand the exact problem, which was in alignment with her actual practices. Another practice was about giving priority to grammar in her feedback, which was also the case uncovered in the portfolio analysis and this matched her stated belief that she needed to conform to the institution’s grammar focused writing aims. It was clear that the novice teacher was affected by the context of work (Lee, 2008; Li, 2012; Paiva, 2011). Moreover, her belief that teachers should not write lots of written feedback was in parallel with her practice as she, in general, did not write numerous comments. She did not consider vocabulary to be significant while responding and it was clear that she did not pay attention to it in her practices. On the other hand, although she believed that motivating students by using praise or drawings was

important, the findings revealed that she only drew five smileys on papers throughout the semester. Besides, most of her feedback was generic not specific and that was contradicting her belief that specificity was important while writing comments.

5.2. Implications of the study

Writing is an important component of a language and how it is done has a huge impact on the outcome. In this respect, written feedback and the role of the teachers during that process cannot be underestimated. The current study considered these aspects and the findings have some important implications for teachers, teacher educators and institutions.

One of the implications of this study is related to pre-service writing teacher education. The results of the study revealed that both the novice and experienced teacher did not receive explicit training or courses on written feedback at university. Although the EP stated that she learned about the importance of motivation and praise in written feedback from the methodology books she read in her pre-service education, she still criticized the theory and memorizing-based aspect of her previous education. The way the NP learned how to give written feedback, on the other hand, reminded the “apprenticeship of observation” notion Lortie (1975) put forward (p. 61). That is, thanks to being a careful observer, she synthesized the written feedback she received from her pre-service teachers and thus came up with her own way of approaching the issue. Like the EP, she also criticized the theory-based education she received. Although, as Borg (2003) indicated, the relationship between what teachers believe and practice is not a straightforward one, the findings from this study support the need expressed in previous studies for explicit, practical

and professional pre-service writing teacher education regarding written feedback (Ferris, 2007, 2011; Hochstetler, 2007; Lee, 2008, 2010). Therefore, the pre-service education should focus on educating future teachers regarding written feedback and in addition to theory; the emphasis should be on practice so that teachers can have real experiences that would prepare them more to the reality of the classroom. Moreover, during pre-service education, future teachers can be informed about common institutional policies so that they do not get confused or shocked when they commence teaching.

The results indicated another important aspect regarding in-service teacher education and educators. The novice participant as well as the experienced one stated the difficulties they encounter during the process of giving written feedback. Although both feel helpless and frustrated when they cannot see any improvement in students and thus, lose their belief in what they are spending most of their class and office time on, especially the novice participant needed help and guidance at those times, which brings up the issue of in-service training. She repeatedly stated the lack of training she received and consequently, her desperate situation concerning written feedback. Thus, it is necessary that the institution carry out sound professional help and advice about written feedback and assessment for novice teachers in particular to help them cope with their problems. The training should make teachers aware of the current trends in response practices, the practices the institution requires them to do together with how such practices can be carried out by involving the teachers in the decision making process. As Stanulis et al. (2002) suggested, “effective induction support can benefit student learning, as competent, collaborative teachers who are energized, feel professionally supported, and feel competent are best positioned to meet the needs of children” (p. 80).

It is also important to make teachers aware of the written commentary they write on student papers because some of their beliefs contradicted their practices. Since writing commentary is “demanding and difficult”, time-consuming and often not well-taught to the practitioners, it is necessary to make teachers realize what and how they are responding and whether changes need to be done in their practices (Bruno & Santos, 2010, p. 118). Thus, the scale by Ferris (2007) can be used so that teachers could observe what they are commenting on mostly and what they got in return at the end of the semester or year.

Furthermore, the findings regarding school policies confirmed the previous studies in that such enforcements have a significant influence on teachers’ beliefs and practices (Bailey & Garner, 2010; Lee, 2011; Paiva, 2011; Price et al., 2010). Teachers in the present study indicated that school policies regarding writing in this case make it too mechanical, artificial, non-creative and grammar-focused. This affected teachers’ attitude towards writing, written feedback and the school itself. The EP, in particular, felt restricted by the policies and thus, was trying to find a way of satisfaction in her job. That is, both teachers expressed their desire for autonomy to a certain extent. Therefore, it would be fair to suggest that although mandated policies work to some extent especially for novice teachers, school policies regarding writing in the institution where the study was conducted should have some flexibility to ensure standardization and teacher autonomy simultaneously. This would not only contribute to teacher satisfaction and autonomy but also student motivation and creativity.

In addition, teachers blamed the institution and students for the lack of student improvement in writing, which might be due to the time constraints between the writing handouts or the drafts. Therefore, the school syllabus can be revised to

allocate more time to the process writing, which would give teachers and students alike enough time to provide written feedback, revise and digest the newly acquired structures. Another reason why students do not show improvement in writing may be, as the novice participant hinted, because they cannot understand why they are writing. That is, what they are writing about in the class does not reflect the practical or real function of writing in daily life. Thus, teachers or the institution itself can focus on genre-based approaches as these “get students into new discourse communities by making them aware of the characteristically patterned ways that people in the community use language to fulfil particular communicative purposes in recurring situations” (Kern, 2000, p. 183). Students can be presented with some topics related to daily life, which might help them realize the practical use of writing and therefore enjoy it. This would probably lead to more learning, enthusiasm and fun on the side of the students.

Yet another implication is that students in the institution fill a self-reflection form where they express their opinions about the (in)effectiveness of the writing they did throughout a span. That is, they indicate what structures they learned, improved and need to focus on in these self-reflections. Therefore, students can be asked to reflect on the writing handouts in general, the topics they wrote about and their effect on their proficiency in writing and in English in general, which would, in return, help the institution revise its practices and act accordingly. In addition, if students are also required to comments on their teachers’ feedback practices, this would definitely give the teachers an idea about what they are really doing and how their practices influence students because written feedback is not a one way route. That is, since “how teachers teach can have a direct impact on how students learn”, student reflections would be an effective tool for teachers to get feedback about their

efforts (Lee, 2010, p. 143). Besides, as Ferris (2014) expressed, “having put so much effort into constructing oral or written commentary, teachers should take the final step of ensuring that students can and do utilize it effectively” (p. 21).

5.3 Limitations of the study

One of the main limitations of the present study is related to its size. That is, because the study was carried out with one experienced and one novice teacher, an increase in the number of the participants might have an effect on the results.

In addition, at the end of the study, ten student portfolios of each instructor were collected and the feedback each teacher had given on the second and final drafts was analyzed. Although teachers were asked to provide all the student portfolios to the researcher and the researcher chose ten portfolios randomly, analyzing the whole class, which was 24 students at the time of the study, could have an impact on the results.

Last but not least, teachers were observed and interviews for a whole semester. Because teacher beliefs are hard to detect in a relatively limited time, different results might have been attained if the study had been carried out for a whole year.

5.4 Recommendations for further research

The present study was designed to uncover the beliefs, sources behind the beliefs, practices and (mis)match between beliefs and practices of one novice and one experienced university level teacher. That is, the number of the participants is one of the limitations of this study. Therefore, a large scale study can be carried out with more than two participants, namely three novice and three experienced participants. Thus, the results can be more generalized.

Moreover, this present study was conducted in an institution where teachers are expected to respond to writing in pre-determined ways. Additionally, process writing approach is implemented in this university. Thus, the current research can be replicated in an institution where there is no policies regarding teachers' written feedback practices. In other words, what experienced and novice teachers do in a totally rule-free environment might be observed and their challenges in such environments can be examined.

A further study can also investigate the reasons why students do not integrate written feedback because the teachers in the present study complained very much about the lack of student improvement regardless of their written feedback. Thus, the reasons can be revealed in a future study.

Lastly, because data for the present study were gathered within four months, further studies can observe the teachers and collect the data for an entire academic year. This would yield a broader picture regarding teachers' beliefs and practices.

REFERENCES

- Akpınar, C. (1996). *A comparison between native-speaker teachers and non-native speaker teachers in their attitudes to feedback on writing*. MA Thesis, Bilkent University, Turkey.
- Almarza, G. (1996). Student foreign language teachers' knowledge growth. In D. Freeman and J. C. Richards (eds), *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (pp. 50-78). Cambridge: CUP.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 227-257.
- Atkins, L. & Wallace, S. (2012). *Qualitative research in education*. London: Sage publications.
- Bailey, K. D. (1994). *Methods of social research* (4th edn). New York: The Free Press.
- Bailey, R. & Garner, M. (2010). Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(2), 187-198.
- Baleghizadeh, S. & Rezaei, S. (2010). Pre-service teacher cognition on corrective feedback: A case study. *Journal of Technology and Education*, 4(4), 321-327.
- Baxter, P. & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(4), 544-559.

- Beuningen, C. G., Jong, N.H. & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the Effectiveness of Comprehensive Error Correction in Second Language Writing. *Language Learning* 62(1), 1-41.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409-431.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214.
- 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, 191-205.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (2nd edn). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher Cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe and do. *Language Teacher*, 36(2), 81-109.
- Bruno, I. & Santos, L. (2010). Written comments as a form of feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation* 36, 111-120.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th edn). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Conrad, S. M. & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 147-179.

- Connors, R. J. & Lunsford, A. A. (1993). Teachers' rhetorical comments on student papers. *College Composition and Communication*, 44, 200-223.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, 267-296.
- Chanock, K. (2000). Comments on Essays: Do students understand what tutors write? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(1), 95-105.
- Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: Using grounded theory. *Social Science and Medicine*, 30, 1161-1172.
- Clements, P. (2006). *Teachers' feedback in context: A longitudinal study of L2 writing classrooms*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, United States.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Crocco, M. S. & Costigan, A. T. (2007). The narrowing of curriculum and pedagogy in the age of accountability: urban educators speak out. *Urban Education*, 42(6), 512-535.
- Davis, H. & Andrzejewski, C. (2009). Teacher beliefs. In E. Anderman & L. Anderman (eds), *Psychology and classroom learning: An encyclopedia* (Vol. 2, pp. 909-915). Detroit: McMillan.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(1), 28-42.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21, 193-204.

- Entwistle, N., Skinner, D., Entwistle, D. & Orr, S. (2000). Conceptions and Beliefs about 'Good Teaching': An integration of contrasting research areas. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19(1), 5-26.
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J. & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written Corrective Feedback: Practitioners' Perspectives. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47-77.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). The novice teacher experience. In A. Burns and J. C. Richards (eds), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 182-189). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2012). Novice- service language teacher development: bridging the gap between pre-service and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 435-448.
- Fathman, A. K. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fazio, L. L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority- and majority-language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(4), 235-249.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C. & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher written commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 155-182.
- Ferris, D. R. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.

- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: where are we and where do we go from here? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(13), 49- 62.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds), *Feedback in second language writing: Context and issues* (pp. 81-104). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 165-193.
- Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6-23.
- Ferris, D. R. & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process, and practice*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H. & Rabie, B. (2011). 'The job of teaching writing': Teacher views of responding to student writing. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 39-77.
- Fleer, M. (1999). The science of technology: young children working technologically. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 9, 269-91.
- Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 27-45.

- Gass, S. M. & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated Recall Methodology in Second Language Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161-182.
- Goldstein, L. (2005). *Teacher written commentary in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor: Michigan.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: contextual, teacher and student variables. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 185-205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hancock, D. & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Harrell, M. C. & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data Collection Methods: Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups*. Pittsburgh: RAND Corporation.
- Henderson, L., Henderson, M., Grant, S. & Huang, H. (2010). What are users thinking in a virtual world lesson? Using stimulated recall interviews to report student cognition, and its triggers. *Journal for Virtual Worlds Research*, 3(1), 1-22.
- Hirvela, A. & Belcher, D. (2007). Writing scholars as teacher educators: exploring writing teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 125-128.
- Hochstetler, S. (2007). The preparation of pre-service secondary English teachers in writing instruction: A case study of three California colleges' education programs. *Action in Teacher Education*, 29(2), 70-79.
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185-212.

- Jenkins, J. (2012). English as a Lingua Franca from the classroom to the classroom. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 486-494.
- Jodaie, M., Farrokhi, F. & Zoghi, M. (2011). A comparative study of EFL teachers' and intermediate high school students' perceptions of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 36-48.
- Jones, A. & Moreland, J. (2005). The importance of pedagogical content knowledge in assessment for learning practices: A case-study of a whole-school approach. *Curriculum Journal*, 2(16), 193-206.
- Junqueira, L. & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the Relationship between Training, Beliefs, and Teachers' Corrective Feedback Practices: A Case Study of a Novice and an Experienced ESL Teacher. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(2), 181-206. doi:10.3138/cmlr.1536.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A moral and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
- Kern, R. (2000). *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35, 537-560.
- Kramsch, C. & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 199-212.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 216-237.

- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69-85.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13-22.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 143-157.
- Lee, I. (2011). Working smarter, not working harder: revisiting teacher feedback in the L2 writing classrooms. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 67(3), 377-399.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (ed.) *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. New York: Cambridge, 57-67.
- Li, J. (2012). *University tutors' beliefs about and practices in assessing undergraduates' writing - A New Zealand case study*. Doctoral Thesis, the University of Waikato, New Zealand.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365.
- Llurda, E. (2006). *Non-native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. USA: Springer science + business media, LLC.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lyle, J. (2003). Stimulated recall: A report on its use in naturalistic research. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(6), 861-878.

- Manchón, R. M. (2009). Introduction: Broadening the perspective of L2 writing scholarship: The contribution of research on foreign language writing. In R. M. Manchón (ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 1-22). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Min, H. T. (2011). An EFL Writing Teacher's Beliefs about Feedback: A Self-Study. *English Teaching & Learning*, 35(3), 1-50.
- Morgan, G. & Smircich, L. (1980). The Case for Qualitative Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(4), 491-500.
- Montgomery, J. L. & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 82-99.
- Noor, K. (2008). Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 1602-1604.
- Orsmond, P. & Merry, S. (2011). Feedback alignment: Effective and ineffective links between tutors' and students' understanding of coursework feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(2), 125-136.
- Ortega, L. (2009). Studying writing across EFL contexts: looking back and moving forward. In R. Manchon (ed.), *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching and Research*. Multilingual Matters, New York, pp. 209-231.
- Paiva, K. S. F. D. M. (2011). Brazilian English as foreign language teachers' beliefs about grammar-based feedback on L2 writing. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.

- Park, S. (2008). *Native and non-native English speaking tutors' feedback on college-level ESL student writing*. (MA, University of Maryland, Baltimore County). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (304414702).
- Parr, J. M. & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing, 15*, 68-85.
- Polio, C., Fleck, C. & Leder, N. (1998). 'If I only had more time': ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 43-68.
- Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J. & O'Donovan. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(3), 277-289.
- Rahimi, A. & Gheitasi, P. (2010). The interface between English teachers' sense of efficacy and their feedback on learners' writing, and learners' writing achievement. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 1932-1938.
- Reichelt, M. (2009). A critical evaluation of writing teaching programmes in different foreign language settings. In R. Manchón (ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 183-206). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 83-95.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication, 33*, 148-156.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 255-283.

- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 103-110.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar teaching and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-258.
- Shute, V. J. (2007). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of education research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- Smith, B. O. (ed.). (1971). *Research in teacher education: A symposium*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sperling, M. (1994). Constructing the perspective of teacher as reader: A framework for studying response to writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 28, 175-203.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stanulis, R. N., Fallona, C. A. & Pearson, C. A. (2002). 'Am I Doing What I am Supposed to be Doing?': Mentoring novice teachers through the uncertainties and challenges of their first year of teaching. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 10(1), 71-81.
- Stern, L. A. & Solomon, A. (2006). Effective faculty feedback: The road less traveled. *Assessing Writing*, 11, 22-41.
- Treglia, M. O. (2008). Feedback on Feedback: Exploring Student Responses to Teachers' Written Commentary. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 27(1), 105-137.
- Treglia M. (2009). Teacher-written commentary in college writing compositions: How does it impact student revisions? *Composition Studies*, 37(1), 67-86.

- Truscott, J. (1996). Review Article: The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for 'the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes': A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 111-22.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 1-18.
- Vandercook, S. (2012). Exploring the Relationship between English Composition Teachers' Beliefs about Written Feedback and Their Written Feedback Practices, Doctoral dissertation, University of New Orleans Theses.
- Vengadasamy, R. (2002). Responding to student writing: motivate, not criticize. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and Student Attitudes toward Teacher Feedback. *RELC Journal*, 38(1), 38-52.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Individual and institutional factors related to the socialization of beginning teachers. In G. A. Griffin & H. Hukill (eds), *First years of teaching: What are the pertinent issues?* (pp. 1-59). Austin: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Zhu, H. (2010). An Analysis of College Students' Attitudes towards Error Correction in EFL Context. *Canadian Centre of Science and Education*, 3(4), 1-4.

APPENDECES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear colleague,

This is a bio-data questionnaire designed to uncover L2 writing teachers' perceptions regarding written feedback. The data collected through this questionnaire will be used only for research purposes and the responses will be kept confidential. Please give your answers sincerely as this is very important for the success of the study. Participation is voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.

For further information, please do not hesitate to contact the following e-mail: kgul@metu.edu.tr. Thank you very much for your help ☺

GÜL KARAAĞAÇ
MA Student, ELT, METU-NCC

I agree to participate in this study totally on my own and give consent for the use of information I provide for scientific purposes only.

Name & Surname

Date

Signature

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

1. PERSONAL INFORMATION & EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND Name & Surname	
2. Gender	<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female
3. What is your native language?	
4. Please circle the highest degree you obtained?	<input type="checkbox"/> BA <input type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Ph.D Other
5. Year /month(s) of ESL/EFL language teaching experience	
6. Which department did you graduate from?	
7. What is the level you are currently teaching?	
8. Which of the following best describes your existing error feedback practice? (Select all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> I do not mark students' grammatical errors in writing (tense, article, preposition etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> I mark all the grammatical errors in students' writing (tense, article, preposition etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> I mark all repeated errors that interfere with communicating ideas <input type="checkbox"/> I mark students' grammatical errors selectively <input type="checkbox"/> I mark no errors and respond only to the ideas expressed in the writing (comments) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL/Interview #1

Gül KARAAGAC/Fall 2013

Brief introduction

1. MA student at METU NCC
2. Research interest in teachers' written feedback practices in general
3. Aim of the study

Major Focus #1:

To assess instructors' previous education regarding written feedback

1. What's your teaching and academic background?
2. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
3. Have you taken any classes or done any workshops that focused on error correction?
4. When you were in your graduate program, what type of training did you receive in responding to students' work?
5. Do you remember any particular activities or techniques that you thought would be useful in providing corrective feedback in your classroom in your graduate program?
6. Do you feel that your previous education background has prepared you to deal with corrective feedback in your teaching?
7. What are the written response techniques that you are familiar with now?
8. What do you consider to be the best practices for responding to students' writing?
9. What is the source behind your belief regarding the best practices?

Major Focus #2:

To assess instructors' broad beliefs in the purpose of writing

1. What do you believe the purpose of writing to be?
2. What is the role of the teacher in writing? (teacher-as-reader vs. teacher-as-grader)

Major Focus #3:

To assess instructors' perspectives of their written feedback response practices

1. What do you believe is good writing for your students?

2. Do you give students written feedback on their assignments?
3. What is your purpose of giving feedback?
4. What do you think is a good practice of giving feedback?
5. Could you tell me the focus of your feedback? Why?
6. Do you use any strategies or techniques while giving feedback?
7. Do you give feedback on drafts?
8. How much time do you spend on each assignment?
9. Do you think your feedback is effective? Why?
10. Could you tell me the sources of this belief?
11. What is your teaching philosophy about learner errors in writing?
12. What do you believe the role of corrective feedback is in writing during language learning?
13. What do you hope to accomplish with your corrective feedback?
14. What is your opinion regarding comments to students' writing? What are the comments intended to do?
15. Disregarding the assessment method used in this institution, how would you like to respond or would you respond at all to students' writing?
16. How do you think your response practices reflect your beliefs about the role of the teacher in the writing process?
17. What do you think about written feedback practices of the institution?

APPENDIX C

Attitudes to teaching writing

1. Could you tell me whether your approach to teaching writing has changed now compared to the beginning of the term?

Approach and attitudes to giving feedback

1. How helpful do you think teacher written feedback is for improving students' writing?
2. What do you think is your main role when you respond in writing to a student's draft?
3. What do you think is your main role when you respond to a student's completed writing?
4. When you respond to drafts of student paragraphs, are there any aspects of the texts which you focus on more than others? What are they? Why?
5. Do you focus on the same aspects when responding to final drafts?
6. Do you think that teacher feedback is more helpful on a draft during the writing process or on completed writing? Why do you think so?
7. What do you pay attention to when you write a comment?
8. Do you know what is important when writing a comment to students?
9. When you give feedback, which of your comments do you expect to be most useful to students to help them improve their writing?
10. What do you feel or think when students make no or little progress in the final draft regardless of your feedback?
11. If you were free to do whatever you want while giving feedback, what would your practices be?
12. Do you think that your pre-service education at university has prepared you enough to be a competent feedback giver?

Attitudes to other forms of feedback

1. Do you think teacher feedback given orally, i.e., in an individual conference or while walking around the class, is more or less helpful than written feedback or are they about as helpful as each other? Why?

Expectations of student behavior

1. How do you expect students to use the written feedback you give them on their writing?

Reflections on own experiences of feedback

1. Could you describe an occasion where you felt that you have given a very successful feedback? This might be to an individual or to a whole class. It might involve one episode or a treatment carried on over a whole course.

2. If you were to pass one piece of advice about giving effective feedback to a teacher, what would that be?

APPENDIX D

ANALYTIC MODEL & CODES FOR TEACHER COMMENTARY

COMMENT LENGTH (NUMBER OF WORDS)

1: short (1-5 words)

2: average (6-15 words)

3: long (16-25 words)

4: very long (26+words)

COMMENT TYPES

2. Ask for information/question

Exp: did you work out this problem with your roommates?

3. Direction/question

Exp: can you provide a thesis statement here---what did you learn from this?

4. Direction/statement

Exp: this paragraph might be better earlier in the essay.

5. Direction/imperative

Exp: mention what Zinsser says about parental pressure

6. Give information/question

Exp: most states do allow a waiting period before an adoption is final---do you feel that all such laws are wrong?

7. Give information/statement

Exp: Iowa law favors parental rights. Michigan and California consider the best interests of the child.

8. Positive comment/statement or exclamation

Exp: a very nice start to your essay! You have done an impressive job of finding facts and quotes to support your arguments.

9. Grammar/mechanics comment/question, statement or imperative

Exp:

Past or present tense?

Your verb tenses are confusing me in this paragraph.

Do not forget to spell-check!

HEDGES

0: no hedge

1: hedge included

*lexical hedges: 'maybe, please, might, etc'

*syntactic hedges: e.g.: can you add an example here?

*positive softeners: 'you have raised some good points , but'

TEXT SPECIFIC COMMENT

0: generic comment (could have been written on any paper)

Exp: nice intro.

1: text specific comment

Exp: why is the American system better for the children, in your opinion?

Analysis charts

Comment #	Length	Type	Hedge	Text-specific

Total comments	
Short	
Average	
Long	
Ask for information	
Request/question	
Request/statement or imperative	
Give information/any form	
Positive	
Grammar	
#of hedges	
# of text-based	

APPENDIX E

Examples of process writing topics


INPUT	WRITING TOPIC												
Analyzing causes: Linkers	You are going to write a paragraph on the causes of changes in personality.												
Analyzing effects: Linkers	You are going to write a paragraph on the <u>positive</u> effects of texting on teenagers.												
Language expressing <u>contrast</u> - (Talking about differences)	In about 150-180 words, compare the designs and explain which one is more advantageous than the others by giving reasons. While writing, you can revisit the input section of the handout for the appropriate language structures.												
Adding information: Linkers	You are going to write about the most important rules of DBE. First, you may want to plan your writing.												
Comparison of the present simple and present continuous tense	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><u>Weekly routine</u></th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><u>This week</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Monday</td> <td style="text-align: center;">go to a language course (14:00-16:00)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Monday</td> <td style="text-align: center;">clean the house</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Tuesday</td> <td style="text-align: center;">work part-time at a cafe</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Tuesday</td> <td style="text-align: center;">do laundry</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(Abbreviated table)</p> <p>Study the information in the chart and write about her weekly routine and this week's activities. Use The Simple Present and The Present Continuous Tense. Look at the grammar box on page 84.</p>	<u>Weekly routine</u>		<u>This week</u>		Monday	go to a language course (14:00-16:00)	Monday	clean the house	Tuesday	work part-time at a cafe	Tuesday	do laundry
<u>Weekly routine</u>		<u>This week</u>											
Monday	go to a language course (14:00-16:00)	Monday	clean the house										
Tuesday	work part-time at a cafe	Tuesday	do laundry										

APPENDIX F

An example to the experienced participant's feedback practice

FIRST DRAFT

Buses, Metro and ^{ts} Taxi are there means of transportation in Istanbul. Buses are the first popular means of transportation in Istanbul. Although it is a uncomfortable, it is a very crowded because it is a very cheap. Buses stop very often, so people don't like it. Metro is the second popular forms of transportation in there. It is a fast and cheap since people convenient. Last common, it is a taxi. It is an expensive, but it is a comfortable. It has traffic jam, so drivers are very angry. To sum up, ~~them~~ are there ³ forms of transportation in Istanbul.



Buses, Metro and Taxis are ^{w.w} these means of transportation in Istanbul. Buses are the first popular means of transportation in Istanbul. Although ^{buses} it is a uncomfortable ^{buses} it is ~~is~~ very crowded because ^{buses} it is ~~is~~ very cheap. Buses stop very often, so people don't like it. Metro is the second popular forms of transportation ~~in~~ there. It is ~~is~~ fast and cheap since people ^{verb + object} convenient. Last common ^{means of transportation} ~~is~~ a taxi. It is ~~is~~ expensive, but it is ~~is~~ comfortable. It has traffic Jam, so drivers are very angry. To sum up, ^{w.o} there are 3 forms of transportation in Istanbul.

reference: (e.g. Buses (plural) --- they are --- they are...)
 (Metro (singular) ... it is ... it is ...)

Asli, be careful with ~~it is~~

FINAL

Buses, Metro and Taxis are ^{three} these means of transportation in Istanbul. Buses are the first popular means of transportation in Istanbul. Although they are uncomfortable, they are very crowded because they are very cheap. ^{good sentence} Buses stop very often, so people don't like it. Metro is the second popular form of transportation there. It is fast and cheap, ^{so} people ^{find it} are the convenient. ^{Finally,} ~~last common means of~~ Taxi ^{is} the third popular means of transportation there. ^{is} It is expensive, but it is comfortable. It has traffic Jam, so drivers are very angry. To sum up, there are 3 forms of transportation in Istanbul. ^{good}

APPENDIX G

An example to the novice participant's feedback practice

FIRST DRAFT

The invention of the car is the most important thing in our life. Firstly, invention of the car cause of developing to transportation. For instance, transportation with vehicle easier than walking. Furthermore, this is more safety than walking. ^{secondly} the cars are my life style. Since they are the most precious in my life. The cars are the most important things of my life. After that, they can be your hobby. To illustrate, if you buy a car. It will be your best friend. You will be with it your life time, if you want that. Moreover, we have many car brands to buy those such as BMW, Porsche, Aston Martin, Cadillac, Chevrolet, Dodge, Lamborghini, etc. In short, having a car, driving a car, seeing a car are my dreams and they useful for our life. B.S.

SECOND DRAFT

Write your second draft and hand it in to your instructor. When you get it back, do the reflection section.

The invention of the car is the most important thing in our life. Firstly, invention of the car caused ~~of the~~ ^{the} development of transportation. For instance, transportation with vehicle ~~is easier~~ ^{is} easier than walking. Furthermore, this is ~~more~~ ^{low} safety than walking. Secondly, the cars are ^{or} my life style. Since they are the most precious ^{what?} in my life. The cars are the most important things ^{of} my life. After that, they can be your hobby. To illustrate, if you buy ^{wr} a car, it will be your best friend. You will be with it ^{wr} your life time, if you want that. Moreover, we have many car brands to buy ~~those~~ such as BMW, Porsche, Aston Martin, Cadillac, Chevrolet, Dodge, Lamborghini, etc.

In short, having a car, driving a car, seeing a car are my dreams and they useful for our life.

- In your concluding sentence, you should write about why it is the most important invention.
- Be careful about the grammar! ²

FINAL DRAFT

Revise your work and write your final draft.

The invention of the car is the most important thing in our life. Firstly, invention of the car caused the development of transportation. For instance, transportation ~~with~~ by vehicles is easier than walking. Furthermore, this is safer than walking.

Secondly, the cars are my life style. Since they are the most precious things in my life, the cars are the most important for me. They can be your hobby. To illustrate, if you buy a car, it will be your best friend. You will be with it ~~for~~ ^{for} your life time, if you want that. Moreover, we have many car brands to buy such as BMW, Porsche, Aston Martin, Cadillac, Chevrolet, Dodge, Lamborghini, etc.

The cars are very important, as they are useful for our life. In short, having a car, driving a car, seeing a car are my dreams and they ---.

- I see that you don't care about your writing handouts!