THE EFFECT OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TYPES ON L2 WRITING ACHIEVEMENT AND EFL LEARNERS' VIEWS ON THESE FEEDBACK TYPES

DOĞRUDAN VE DOLAYLI DÜZELTİCİ GERİ BİLDİRİM TÜRLERİNİN İNGİLİZCE YAZMA BAŞARISI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN BU GERİ BİLDİRİM TÜRLERİ HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Hüsnü GÜMÜŞ[1]

Abstract: The present study was conducted to investigate the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback types on a group of EFL learners' writing achievement. It also aimed at investigating their views on these feedback types. The participants of the present study included 40 preparatory school students studying English at a state university in Turkey. The writing instructor, also the researcher of the current study, provided the participants with both direct and indirect corrective written feedback types which were investigated in this study. The study adopted a pretest - posttest design to measure the effects of direct and indirect CF types. The overall findings of the current study revealed that the participants who were provided with direct corrective feedback attained higher test scores compared to the indirect corrective feedback group participants. The participants also mentioned a number of benefits for the feedback types they received during their writing courses.

Key Words: *corrective feedback, writing, direct feedback indirect feedback*

Özet: Bu çalışma, doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin İngilizce öğrenmekte olan bir grup öğrencinin ikinci dilde yazma başarısına etkisini araştırmak amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Buna ek olarak, bu öğrencilerin aldıkları farklı geri bildirim türüyle ilgili görüşleri de araştırılmıştır. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinde hazırlık programında İngilizce öğrenen 40 katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Yazma derslerini veren eğitmen, katılımcılara yazma dersleri esnasında doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türleri vermiştir. Bu iki farklı düzeltici geri bildirim türünün katılımcıların yazma başarısına etkisini kıyaslamak için, Öntest-Sontest araştırma deseni kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonunda, doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim alan öğrencilerin yazma dersindeki testlerden daha yüksek puanlar aldıkları görülmüştür. Katılımcılar ayrıca aldıkları dönüt türlerinin yazma dersi için çeşitli faydalar sağladığından bahsetmişlerdir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: *düzeltici geri bildirim, yazma, doğrudan geri bildirim, dolaylı geri bildirim*

Introduction

Writing is considered an essential but challenging skill for learners to master. It is highly important for learners to convey their ideas and thoughts in today's communication era. However, it can be difficult to create a well-organized written text as a great number of scholars have claimed before. A written work of a second language (L2) learner is expected to be cohesive, logical, and properly structured in addition to comprising a sufficient range of vocabulary and efficient use of mechanics (Hall, 1988; Jacobs, 1981). Therefore, writing is viewed as a complex cognitive process in which

---

[1] English Language Instructor, Pamukkale University, School of Foreign Languages, Denizli, Turkey, E-mail: husnug@pau.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-4055-8805

learners have to manage different variables which might stem from particular interest of the writer as well as their different psychological, cognitive and linguistic phenomena (Dar & Khan, 2015; Haider, 2012). Considering these issues, many students naturally have problems to reflect their ideas and feelings in written form. Throughout the writing process, these students are likely to produce texts that contain different types of errors related to grammar and rhetoric.

One of the most common ways to deal with learners' errors is to provide them with corrective feedback (CF) (Ferris, 1997). Over the past decades, several scholars and researchers have been conducting studies to investigate the effects of CF on students' errors and explore students' views toward certain CF types. Regarding this issue, there are two main opposing views that were attributed to Truscott (1996) and Ferris (1997). According to Truscott (1996), CF in L2 learning is ineffective and it can even cause harm for learners let alone helping them. Therefore, it should be abandoned. Contrary to this claim, Ferris (1997) stated that CF is essential for L2 learners in that it serves as aid and enable them to produce more accurate texts in the target language. The debate regarding the role of CF still persists since little attention has been given to the effectiveness of CF in the long term, and studies have produced contradictory results (Ferris, 2004). Another popular issue concerning CF is whether explicit or implicit types of CF are more beneficial for learners. Russell and Spada (2016) categorized CF considering the factors that might have an impact on the efficiency of CF. One of these factors is whether CF is provided in an explicit or implicit way (i.e. direct or indirect way). The main difference between these two CF types is: "While indirect corrective feedback only consists of an indication of an error (i.e. by underlining the error or providing an error code), direct error correction identifies both the error and the target form" (Van Beuningen, 2008, p. 282). The impact of these two feedback types on L2 learners' writing skill and learners' views and expectations regarding these CF types need to be investigated (Schulz, 1996). However, very few studies in Tukey have investigated the effect of direct and indirect CF types on L2 learners' writing skill as well as exploring learners' views and expectations regarding these feedback types. In Turkey, it is widely observed that writing, which is regarded as a productive skill, is usually ignored in course books in schools (Kizildag,2009). Although certain course books include writing sections, most teachers tend to skip these and mostly focus on grammar, reading and vocabulary teaching since major exams in Turkey include questions related to these areas. In addition, most teachers seem to complain about their workload and thus ignore teaching writing since writing is a process-oriented skill and require a lot of time, effort and feedback sessions

(Baker,2014). As a result, teachers may not be aware of how to provide appropriate feedback in their writing classes when necessary. Considering these issues, this study will provide greater insights into the impact of direct and indirect CF on L2 learners' writing achievement and fill the gap in the literature by exploring the views and expectations of L2 learners regarding these feedback types.

Literature Review

Language teachers tend to provide their students with various types of corrective feedback to deal with their errors in accordance with the levels and needs of their students. There have been many studies conducted regarding corrective feedback (CF), and these studies mostly investigated the effect of direct CF and indirect CF (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998 Chandler,2003; Ellis, 2009). The sections below include both theoretical background for the present study and introduce several empirical studies that were conducted on the two types of CF. According to Bitchner et al. (2005) direct or explicit CF aims to highlight the error as well as providing the correct form for the learner. Russell and Spada (2006) defines explicit or direct CF as indication and description of various errors produced by learners in order that they can use the language more accurately. In addition, Bitchener (2008) maintained that direct CF could be delivered by omitting a word or phrase that is considered unnecessary, or by providing the correct forms of the errors. On the other hand, an implicit or indirect CF indicates that learners have produced some incorrect forms, and they need to deal with these errors on their own. In other words, while direct CF puts the responsibility on teachers to demonstrate the correct forms or structures, indirect CF makes learners deal with the errors drawn to their attention by themselves. Bitchener and Knoch (2008) have maintained that such practice of learners is likely to foster a more profound engagement in the language processing, which results in guided learning and problem solving. Therefore, learners might experience a long-term acquisition in the target language.

There have been many studies conducted to investigate the effects of direct and indirect CF types on learners' errors. In his study, Lalande (1982) included two different methods of CF in the writing lesson of intermediate level college students studying German. In the first method, the teacher was expected to correct all of the learners' errors while in the other one one the teacher only highlighted the errors by certain codes. In this way, learners had to find the correct forms on their own. The findings of the study revealed that the learners who were given indirect CF had fewer errors at the

end of the term. In another study, Chandler (2003) also tried to find out whether it is better for teachers to demonstrate the correct forms of learners' errors or merely indicate these errors and leave the correction to the learners. The study found that direct correction contributed more to the learners' writing performance in follow-up revision sessions than the other feedback types. In addition, the participating students stated that receiving direct CF was the most practical and beneficial way for them since they were able to resolve their errors in a short time. In a study regarding CF types in Turkish context, Erel and Bulut (2007) investigated the effects of feedback on students' performances in EFL writing courses. In their study, they focused on directly and indirectly coded feedback types. The participants of the study were placed in two different groups. The study revealed that the participants who received indirect feedback made fewer errors when the first phase of the treatment ended although the difference observed was not significant between the two groups. At the end of the remaining two periods, however, the significance level increased in favor of the indirect group. Regarding the CF issue, Liu (2008) conducted a study with university ESL students to investigate the efficiency of direct and indirect CF. At the end of the study, Liu found that the number of the errors produced by participants in the direct feedback group were lower than the participants in the indirect feedback group in their immediate revision papers. In another study, Binglan and Jia (2010) tried to find out whether direct CF together with error description would have a positive impact on the writing accuracy of learners in the long term. The study, which was conducted with 44 second year Chinese EFL university students, revealed that the students attained a remarkable success in their writing classes when they received direct CF accompanied with error description. At the end of their descriptive study in Turkish context, Bozkurt and Çamlıbel Acar (2017) revealed that direct CF was the most favored type of feedback by undergradtuate students. These students claimed that they benefited from teacher feedback more effectively when it is provided in an explicit manner. In a more recent study, Suzuki et al. (2019) investigated whether the explicitness of CF and certain structures in the target language have an interactional effect on the writing accuracy of learners' revision and their follow-up pieces of writing. The study, which included 88 Japanese university students, found that there was a significant effect of the explicitness of CF on students' revisions for the use of past perfect tense, but not on follow-up pieces of writing. Therefore, it could be suggested that the efficiency of CF does not merely depend on its degree of explicitness, and there could be other factors affecting the writing performances of learners. In another Turkish context, Berkant, Derer and Derer (2020)

conducted a study to find out the effects of different types of written CF on students' texting mistakes in English lessons. The study, which was conducted with 27 students in a secondary school, revealed that as far as the quantitative data are concerned, underlined feedback turned out to be the most effective one. However, the qualitative data indicated that the coded error correction accompanied with explanation is the most effective type. Uzun and Köksal (2020) tried to find out whether direct or indirect written CF was more effective for writing errors. The participants were 28 students studying English at the preparatory school of a state university in Turkey. The findings of the study revealed that the participants benefited from both types of written corrective feedback. However, indirect feedback turned out to be more appropriate for in-class practices as it also required direct feedback for final drafts. Lastly, Mafulah and Basthomi (2021) investigated whether direct or indirect CF has a more beneficial effect on a group of Indonesian EFL learners' writing quality. The study revealed that providing direct CF helped learners produce more accurate writings.

It is a well-known fact that there are individual differences and different expectations of learners in an EFL classroom. As CF plays a crucial role for the improvement of learners in writing classes, language teachers need to be aware of different types of CF types and their effects on their learners' writing achievement. Therefore, this study aims to reveal the effect of direct and indirect CF on the writing achievement a group of EFL learners studying at the preparatory program of a public university in Turkey. In addition, the study will explore the views and expectations of these learners regarding these feedback types. The study addresses the following research questions.

1. Is there a difference between the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback methods in the writing achievement of the participants?

   1a. Is there a statistically significant difference in the participants' test scores after receiving direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback?

2. What are the participants' views and opinions on the implementation and effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback?

   2a. What benefits are mentioned by the participants regarding the corrective feedback types that they received during their writing courses?

Method

Research Design

The present study employed a mixed-method sequential research design. The quantitative part involved a pretest, a treatment stage where different types of corrective feedback were provided, and a posttest while the qualitative part consisted of written semi-structured interviews. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of direct and indirect CF on the writing achievement a group of EFL learners studying at the preparatory program of a state university in Turkey. In addition, the study will explore the views and expectations of these learners regarding these feedback types.

Participants

For the present study, 40 preparatory school students studying English at a public university were chosen as participants. These students were placed in two different B1 level classes based on their placement test results. There were 21 students in the experimental group who received direct corrective feedback while the control group who received indirect corrective feedback included 19 students. These participants were selected for the current study due to their availability to the researcher. In other words, convenience sampling method was adopted since this selection method is "easy, affordable and the subjects … readily available" to the researcher. (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016, p. 2).

Data Collection

For the present study, the data were collected through a number of instruments. First, a researcher-made writing test (See Appendix 1) was given as a pretest at the beginning of the term so that the existing knowledge of the participants' regarding paragraph writing could be determined. The content of the pretest was determined based on the syllabus of the participants, and another colleague who holds a PhD degree in the field also checked the content of the pretest. By doing so, the intelligibility and clarity of the pretest was ensured. After the treatments, a posttest (See Appendix 2) was given to both groups to measure the effectiveness of each feedback type on the writing achievement of the participants. The posttest was an equivalent of the pretest in terms of content (i.e. paragraph writing). In fact, the same pretest was applied as the posttest with minor

modifications (i.e. different topics from the pretest). The same procedures regarding the content and intelligibility were carried out for the posttest as well. As the last step, written semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 of the participants (i.e. seven participants from each group) to explore their views on direct and indirect corrective feedback types.

Treatment Procedure

The treatment process lasted eight weeks (i.e. one module), and the participants of the current study had 5 hours of writing classes each week during which they were supposed to produce four different paragraph types. The participants of the study stated that they had never had a systematic paragraph writing course in their previous school lives. Keeping this in mind, a researcher-made writing test was administered as a pretest at the beginning of the module so that the existing knowledge of the participants' regarding paragraph writing could be determined. During the module, the participants had weekly assignments, and they were expected to revise their papers utilizing certain types of CF given by their writing instructors. The module started on the 21st of February, and in the first week, general information on how to write a well-organized paragraph was given to the participants. In addition, key issues like topic sentence, supporting sentences and concluding sentence were explained. In the second week, the participants learned how to write an opinion paragraph. Naturally, the participants had difficulty in writing a well-organized paragraph, and made different types of mistakes. Therefore, the writing instructor, also the author of the current study, provided the participants with the predetermined corrective feedback types (See Appendix 3) which were investigated in this study. The instructor provided direct corrective feedback in the experimental group. In other words, when the participants made a mistake, the instructor provided the correct form for them. On the other hand, the participants in the control group received indirect feedback types for their errors throughout their writing lessons. The instructor employed two types of indirect feedback types, which are underlining and describing the error and underlining the error only. As the module continued, the participants learned how to write different types of paragraph. During the third and fourth week, the participants learned how to write a compare and contrast paragraph. Then they had an exam week. During the sixth and seventh week, the participants learned how to write a cause and effect paragraph. The participants were asked to make revisions on their weekly assignments and keep all the drafts in a portfolio. At the end of the treatment, the instructor collected and assessed the participants' portfolios, which were then graded by the teacher

as a scoring procedure of the institution. As for the current study, a posttest was given to both groups to measure the effectiveness of each feedback type on the writing achievement of the participants. Both the pretest and posttest scores of the participants were determined based on a rubric (See Appendix 4) developed by Hughes (2013). To increase the reliability of the scoring, a colleague who holds a PhD degree in the field also marked two thirds of papers as suggested by Creswell (2007).

Data Analysis

The current study adopted a pretest - posttest design to measure the effects of direct and indirect CF types. The pretest and posttest data were statistically analyzed by means of SPSS 17.0 to find out the effect of the two types of CF. First, a pretest was administered to determine the participants' knowledge of how to write a well-organized paragraph. Since the study included less than 50 participants, the p values of Shapiro-Wilk tests were checked. As the p values were bigger than 0.05, it was decided that there was a normal distribution in the data. Therefore, an independent samples t-test was employed to determine whether there was a significant difference between the pretest scores of the two groups. Furthermore, a paired-samples t-test was applied to see whether there was a difference between the mean scores of the participants in the direct CF group on the pretest and posttest to reveal the effectiveness of the procedure. Likewise, another paired-samples t-test was conducted to find out the effectiveness of indirect CF on the participants. Next, the between group comparisons of the posttest scores were conducted by means of independent samples t-test to reveal whether a significant difference is observed between the mean scores of the participants in both groups. In this way, it would be possible to find out which CF type was more effective for the participant's progress in writing end of the treatment process. As the last step, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 of the participants to get more in-depth data regarding the effectiveness of both CF types as well as gathering the views of the participants on these CF types. The interviews, which were conducted in Turkish, were translated into English by the researcher and cross-checked with the help of another colleague. The data, which was transcribed, was subjected to content analysis through pattern- coding process (Miles & Huberman. 1994) so that the recurrent themes could be identified. Following the coding process, the similar codes were grouped under the same category while redundant or overlapping codes were excluded.

In order to increase the reliability of the analysis of the qualitative data, a colleague who holds a PhD degree in the field also analyzed a quarter of the data as suggested by Creswell (2007).

Results

R.Q.1: Is there a difference between the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback methods in the writing achievement of the participants?

To answer the first research question, several t-tests were conducted. Firstly, the results of the pretest scores showed that the difference between the two groups were not significant (t (0.44), p=0.66) prior to the treatment (see Table 1). The mean scores of both groups also indicate that the existing knowledge of both groups didn't differ significantly in terms of paragraph writing skills.

Table 1

Results of the Independent Samples T-test for the Pretest Scores

		N	Mean	S	df	t	p
Pretest	Control Group	19	64.3	7.18	38	.44	.66
Scores	Experimental Group	21	65.3	7.31			

Next, a paired-samples t-test was carried out to compare the mean scores of the participants in each group on the pretest and posttest to reveal the effectiveness of each corrective feedback type. Table 2 and Table 3 below demonstrate the descriptive statistics and the results of paired samples t-test for the indirect corrective feedback (i.e., control) group.

Table 2

Paired Samples Statistics for the Control Group

	N	Mean	S	S.E
Pair I				
Pretest	19	64.3	7.1	1.64
Post-test	19	69.8	6.5	1.49

Table 3

Paired-Samples T-test Results for the Control Group Paired Differences

	Mean	S	S.E	t	df	sig(2-tailed)
Pair I Pretest-Posttest	-5.5	1.64	.37	-14.6	18	.000

Table 2 indicates that the mean score of the post-test (69.8) is higher than the one obtained on the pre-test (64.3). In addition, Table 3 indicates that there is a significant difference between the scores obtained from the pretest and posttest (p=.00). Hence, it can be concluded that providing indirect feedback has a significant effect on the participants' writing achievement.

Another paired-samples t-test was run to find out the effects of direct corrective feedback on the participants' writing achievement. Table 4 and Table 5 show the descriptive statistics and the results of paired samples t-test for direct corrective feedback (i.e., experimental) group.

Table 4

Paired Samples Statistics for the Experimental Group

	N	Mean	S	S.E
Pair I				
Pretest	21	65.3	7.3	1.59
Posttest	21	74.5	7.1	1.55

Table 5

Paired-Samples T-test Results for the Experimental Group Paired Differences

	Mean	S	S.E	t	df	sig(2-tailed)
Pair I Pretest-Posttest	-9.1	3.7	.81	-11.3	20	.000

Table 4 indicates that the mean score on the post-test (74.5) is much higher than the one obtained on the pre-test (65.3). Furthermore, Table 5 shows that there is a significant difference between the

scores obtained from the pretest and posttest (p=.00). Considering these statistics, it can be concluded that providing direct corrective feedback has also a significant effect on the participants' learning of target forms. Overall, it could be stated that that even though both groups made progress after receiving certain corrective feedback types, the participants who were provided direct corrective feedback attained higher exam scores compared to the participants who received indirect corrective feedback.

R.Q.1a: Is there a statistically significant difference in the participants' test scores as a   result of receiving direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback?

To answer the research question stated above, comparisons of the post-test scores between groups were conducted based on independent samples t-test to find out if these two groups differed significantly in terms of their posttest scores. Table 6 and Table 7 shows the descriptive statistics and the results of paired samples t-test for both groups.

Table 6

Independent Samples T-test Statistics for Both Groups

		N	Mean	S	SE
Post-test	Control Group	19	69.8	6.5	1.4
Scores	Experimental Group	21	74.5	7.1	1.5

Table 7

Independent samples t-test statistics for posttest scores

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances					
	F	Sig	t	df	sig(2-tailed)	Mean D.
Score	.608	.440	2.1	38	.037	-4.6

Equal variances

Assumed

As Table 6 indicates, the obtained mean score belonging to the experimental group (i.e. direct feedback group) (M=74.5) is higher than that of control group (i.e. indirect feedback group) (M=69.8). Furthermore, Table 7 shows that there is a significant difference between the posttest scores of the two groups (p=.037). Hence, it could be stated that providing direct corrective feedback contributed more to the participants' writing achievement compared to indirect corrective feedback.

Findings from Interview

R.Q. 2. What are the participants' views and opinions on the implementation and effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback?

In order to answer the research question stated above, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 of the participants (i.e. 7 participants from each group). The interview questions listed below were formed the basis of the last research question of this study:

> 1- Do you think receiving corrective feedback from your teacher is necessary? Explain in detail, please.
> 2- What types of feedback did you receive from your teacher during your writing courses?
> 3- Do you think these feedback types were useful for you? Did you notice any improvement in your writing skill as a result of receiving these feedback types? Explain in detail, please.

The interviews were conducted in Turkish, and thus they were translated into English by the researcher. A content analysis was conducted by the researcher together with another rater to reach more reliable results. The themes gathered as a result of the content analysis are shown below in Table 8.

Table 8

Emerging Themes about Corrective Feedback Types

Participants	Themes
P1, P2, P3, P4, P6,	Facilitating Factors
P1, P3, P4, P5,P7	Saving Time
P8,P9,P11,P14	Opportunity for Self-Correction

Theme 1: *Facilitating Factors*

The participants who received direct correction stated that this type of feedback helps them deal with their errors efficiently, and thus facilitate their learning. Regarding this issue, P1 said, "*I liked receiving direct corrective feedback. These corrections were made me realize my mistakes easily. I made fewer errors as the time passed*." In addition, P3 said "I *want my teacher to correct my mistake. I am learning more easily in this way*." Finally, P6 said" *When my teacher corrects my mistakes, I feel that I am still learning and making progress thanks to these corrections*."

Theme 2*: Saving Time*

The participants who were provided direct corrective feedback also mentioned that this type of feedback has an immediate effect and thus saves time. Related to this issue, P4 said "*My favorite feedback type is direct correction. I noticed my errors quickly*." Furthermore, P7 said "*I sometimes waste a lot of time while trying to realize my errors on my own. This makes me feel frustrated*."

Theme 3: *Opportunity for Self-Correction*

On the other hand, the participants who received indirect corrective feedback stated that this feedback type gave them a chance to deal with their errors on their own, which created an opportunity for self-correction. For instance, P9 said "*I only want to see my errors underlined. I want to do some search on them or discuss these errors with my classmates. In this way, I feel I learn from my mistakes.*" In parallel with this claim, P11 said*, "Underlining and describing the error is my favorite feedback type. When my teacher underlines my errors and explains them to me, I put effort to correct the errors myself. I think this creates more permanent learning." Lastly,*

P14 said *"If my teacher only underlines my errors, I generally feel puzzled. I would like to see some descriptions or comments related to my errors."*

Discussion and Conclusion

The overall findings of the current study revealed that the participants who were provided with direct corrective feedback attained higher test scores compared to the participants in indirect CF group. A number of previous studies obtained similar results (Chandler, 2003; Liu, 2008, Binglan & Jia, 2010; Suzuki,2019). Chandler (2013) found that direct correction contributed more to the learners' writing performance in follow-up revision sessions than the other feedback types within a short period of time. Similarly, the participants of the current study reported that receiving direct corrective types facilitated their writing processes and saved time for them. Furthermore, Liu (2008) revealed that receiving direct correction enabled learners to produce fewer errors in their immediate revisions while Binglan and Jia (2010) found that direct CF together with error description had a positive impact on the writing accuracy of learners in the long term. Lastly, in their descriptive study, Bozkurt and Çamlıbel Acar (2017) found that direct CF was preferred more by undergraduate students in Turkey. Similarly, Mafulah and Basthomi (2021) conducted a study with a group of Indonesian EFL on their writing quality and revealed that providing direct CF proved to be more effective for the participants.

On the other hand, there were some studies which produced contrasting findings and claimed that indirect CF is superior to direct CF. Lalande (1982) included two different methods of CF in the writing lesson of intermediate level college students studying German. At the end of the study, it was found that indirect CF was more effective for the students to deal with their errors. Likewise, Erel and Bulut (2007) conducted a study in Turkish context and focused on directly and indirectly coded feedback types. At the end of the study, they found that the participants who received indirect feedback made fewer errors when the first phase of the treatment ended. In fact, the significance level increased in favor of the indirect group at the end of the remaining two periods. Lastly, Berkant, Derer and Derer (2020) found that, based on their quantitative data, the most effective type of feedback is the underlined feedback while the qualitative findings indicated that the coded error correction accompanied with explanation is the most effective type. Similarly, Uzun and Köksal (2020) tried to find out whether direct or indirect written CF was more effective for writing errors. The findings of the study revealed that the participants benefited from both types of written

corrective feedback while indirect feedback turned out to be more appropriate for in-class practices as it required direct feedback for final drafts.

As mentioned above, there have been several studies conducted to find out the effectiveness of various corrective feedback types. Some of these studies concluded that direct corrective feedback is more beneficial for learners while others found that providing indirect corrective feedback for learners yield better results. These contradictory results indicate that some other factors might play a role in the effectiveness of corrective feedback types. The participants, error types, length of the study, or duration of the study might all affect the outcome of these studies. To conclude, it can be stated that research findings have not been conclusive concerning the efficiency of corrective feedback types.

The findings of the current study could have certain pedagogical implications for language teachers in Turkey. It can be suggested that providing corrective feedback is crucial in helping students deal with their errors whether it is done in a direct or indirect manner. In Turkey, students are observed to be dependent on their teachers for the explanation and correction of the errors on their papers. It is observed that teachers tend to employ direct feedback more because most students have a low proficiency level of English and thus providing indirect feedback might leave unresolved issues for such learners in terms of their corrections. In addition, most teachers have a great amount of workload and providing direct feedback saves time for them. As for students, they also seem to favor direct feedback more since it has a more explicit nature and easy to comprehend. When they receive direct corrective feedback, they feel more secure concerning their corrections. However, some autonomous students who have a relatively high level of English proficiency might prefer indirect CF types. Therefore, language teachers need to explore the feedback preferences of their students and provide corrective feedback accordingly. They could do also observe the progress of their students in the writing lessons and might adjust their feedback implementation when necessary. Otherwise, students might not be able to benefit from the feedback practices at a desired level.

Lastly, it is necessary to mention the limitations of the current study. The first limitation could be the sample size since only 40 students participated in the study. Hence, it would be to wrong to generalize the findings to all English language learners. Another limitation could be the duration of the treatment. 8 weeks may not be a sufficient time to obtain accurate results. Therefore, a longer

and more detailed study could yield different results. Finally, this study only focused on the immediate effects of certain feedback types. A further study could investigate the long-term effects of such feedback practices on students' achievement.

References

Berkant, H., Derer, N. & Derer, O. (2020). The effects of different types of corrective feedback on students' texting mistakes. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal,3*, 174-187.

Baker, N. L. (2014). "Get it off my stack": Teachers' tools for grading papers. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 36-50.

Binglan, Z., & Jia, C. (2010). The impact of teacher feedback on the long-term improvement in the accuracy of EFL student writing. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 28–30.

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.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research,12*(3), 409-431.

Bozkurt, S., & Çamlıbel Acar, Z. (2017). EFL students' reflections on explicit and implicit written corrective feedback. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences (EPESS), 7*, 98-102.

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*(3), 267-296.

Dar, M. F., & Khan, I. (2015). Writing anxiety among public and private sectors Pakistani undergraduate university students. *Pakistan Journal of Gender Studies*, *10* (1), 121–136.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal 1*(1), 3-18.

Erel, S., & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 22*(1), 397-415.

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 315–339.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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*, *13,* 49–62.

Haider, G. (2012). An insight into difficulties faced by Pakistani student writers: Implications for teaching of writing. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2*(3), 17–27.

Hall, D. (1988). *Writing well*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Jacobs, & L, H. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach. English composition program.* Newbury House, Massachusetts.

Kizildag, A. (2009). Teaching English in Turkey: Dialogues with teachers about the challenges in public primary schools. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 1*(3), 188–201. Retrieved from https://files. eric.ed.gov/full text/EJ1052035.pdf.

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

Mafulah & Basthomi (2021). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students' writing quality. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 624*.

Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 language grammar. In J. M. Norris. & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Schulz, R. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29,* 343-364.

Suzuki, W., Nassaji, H., & Sato, K. (2019). The effects of feedback explicitness and type of target structure on accuracy in revision and new pieces of writing. *System, 81*, 135-145.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46,* 327-369.

Van Beuningen, C., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 156*, 279–296. https://doi.org/10.2143/itl.156.0.2034439.

Uzun, K. & Köksal, H. (2020). Direct vs indirect written corrective feedback: *an action research. Trakya Eğitim Dergisi, 10*(1), 169-182.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Giriş

Yazma becerisi, öğrencilerin bir yazar olarak ilgi alanları, psikolojik, bilişsel ve dil olgularından kaynaklanabilen pek çok farklı değişkeni yönetmeleri gereken karmaşık bir bilişsel süreç olarak görülmektedir. Bu konular düşünüldüğünde, pek çok öğrenci doğal olarak duygu ve düşüncelerini yazılı olarak yansıtmakta zorluk yaşamaktadır. Yazma sürecinde, bu öğrenciler dil bilgisi ve etkili yazma ile ilgili farklı hatalar içeren yazılar üretebilmektir. Öğrencilerin yaptığı bu tarz hatalarla baş etmenin en yaygın yollarından birisi onlara yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim sağlamaktır. Son yıllarda, pek çok uzman ve araştırmacı, yazılı düzeltici geri bildirimin öğrencilerin hataları üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmak için çalışmalar yapmış ve öğrencilerin bu yazılı geri bildirim türlerine yönelik görüşlerini incelemişlerdir. Bu konuyla ilgili, uzmanlar genel olarak iki karşıt görüşü temsil eden araştırmacılar olarak ortaya çıkmışlardır. Bazılarına göre, düzeltici geri bildirim, yabancı dil öğrenmede faydasızdır ve hatta öğrenciler için zararlı olabilmektedir. Bu yüzden, öğrencilere düzeltici geri bildirim vermekten vazgeçilmelidir. Bu görüşün aksine, bazı uzmanlar düzeltici geri bildirimin yabancı dil öğrencileri için önemli olduğunu ve bu öğrencilere yabancı dilde daha hatasız yazılar yazma konusunda yardımcı olduğunu belirtmektedir. Düzeltici geri bildirimin yabancı dil öğrenmedeki rolü hala tartışılmaktadır ve yapılan çalışmalar geri bildirimin uzun vadedeki etkileri konusunda çelişkili sonuçlar üretmiştir.

Amaç

Yukarıdaki bilgiler ışığında, bu çalışma doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinin hazırlık programında İngilizce öğrenen bir grup öğrencinin yazma başarısına etkisini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Buna ek olarak, bu öğrencilerin aldıkları farklı geri bildirim türüyle ilgili görüşleri de araştırılmıştır**. Çalışmanın araştırma soruları aşağıda belirtilmiştir:

1. Doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim yöntemlerinin, katılımcıların yazma başarısı üzerindeki verimliliği açısından bir fark var mıdır?

   1a. Katılımcıların test puanlarında, doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim aldıktan sonra önemli bir fark oluşmuş mudur?

2.   Katılımcıların, doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim yöntemlerinin uygulanması ve verimliliği hakkındaki fikir ve görüşleri nelerdir?

2a. Katılımcılar, yazma derslerinde aldıkları doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin sağladığı yararlar konusunda neler söylemişlerdir?

Yöntem

Bu çalışmada karma yöntem araştırma modeli kullanılmıştır. Nicel kısımda bir öntest, farklı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin yer aldığı uygulama aşaması ve bir sontest yer almaktadır. Nitel kısım ise, 14 katılımcı ile yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerden oluşmaktadır. Çalışmada, Türkiye'de bir devlet üniversitesinin hazırlık programında İngilizce eğitimi alan 40 katılımcı yer almıştır. Bu katılımcılar, sene başında uygulanan düzey belirleme sınavına girerek B1 seviyesinde eğitim almak üzere sınıflara yerleştirilmişlerdir. Doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerini alan deney grubunda 21 öğrenci yer alırken, dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinden yararlanan kontrol grubu 19 öğrenciden oluşmuştur. Çalışmanın uygulama aşaması sekiz hafta sürmüştür.

Sonuç ve Tartışma

Çalışmanın genel sonuçları, doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim alan katılımcıların dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim alan katılımcılara göre daha yüksek test puanları aldığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Daha önce gerçekleştirilen pek çok çalışma da benzer sonuçlar elde etmiştir. Yapılan bazı çalışmalar, doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin kısa vadede diğer düzeltici geri bildirim türlerine göre daha etkili olduğunu vurgularken, diğerleri doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türleri aldıklarında öğrencilerin yazılarında daha hatasız yazılar ürettiklerini belirtmiştir. Aynı şekilde, bazı diğer çalışmalar doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin, yapılan hataların açıklamasıyla birlikte verildiğinde uzun vadede öğrencilerin yazma başarısı üzerinde daha olumlu bir etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir. Son olarak, bu çalışmalar doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin öğrencilerin yazma kalitesi üzerinde daha olumlu bir etkisi olduğunu vurgulamıştır.

Yukarıda belirtilen bulguların aksine, daha önce gerçekleştirilen bazı çalışmalar farklı sonuçlar elde etmiş ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türünün doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türünden üstün olduğunu iddia etmiştir. Yapılan bir çalışmada, iki düzeltici geri bildirim türü incelenmiş ve dolaylı

düzeltici geri bildirim türünün hatalarla baş etmede daha etkili olduğunu ortaya çıkarılmıştır. Aynı şekilde Türkiye'de yapılan bir çalışmada, dolaylı olarak kodlanan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin öğrencilerin daha az hata yapmalarını sağladığı sonucuna varılmıştır. Bir diğer çalışma ise, yazma hatalarının giderilmesinde hangi tür düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin daha etkili olduğunu araştırmış ve sınıf içi yazma uygulamalarında dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türünün daha uygun olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Yukarıda da bahsedildiği üzere, doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerini araştıran pek çok çalışma yapılmıştır. Bazı çalışmalar doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin öğrenciler için daha yararlı olduğunu ileri sürerken, diğerleri dolaylı geri bildirim türlerinin daha olumlu sonuçlar sağladığını iddia etmiştir. Bu çelişkili sonuçlar düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin verimliliğinde bazı diğer faktörlerin de rol oynayabileceğini göstermektedir. Katılımcıların özellikleri, hata türleri, çalışmanın yeri ve süresi gibi değişkenler yukarıda bahsedilen çalışmaların farklı sonuçlara ulaşmasında etkili olmuş olabilir. Sonuç olarak, daha önce yapılan çalışmalar, doğrudan ve dolaylı düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin verimliliği konusunda farklı sonuçlar ortaya çıkarmıştır. Son olarak mevcut çalışma, Türkiye'deki yabancı dil öğrenen öğrenciler için yazma derslerinde düzeltici geri bildirim almanın önemini ortaya koymuş ve öğrenciler için doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerinin daha verimli olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Aynı şekilde öğrencilerin de daha çok doğrudan düzeltici geri bildirim türlerini tercih ettiği belirtilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, öğrencilerin yabancı dil seviyesi, hata türü ve diğer bazı değişkenlere göre, yazma derslerinde öğrencilere sağlanan düzeltici dönüt türlerinde esnek olunması gerektiği tavsiye edilmiştir.

ETİK BEYAN: "*Doğrudan ve Dolaylı Düzeltici Geri Bildirim Türlerinin İngilizce Yazma Başarısı Üzerindeki Etkisi ve Öğrencilerin Bu Geri Bildirim Türleri Hakkındaki Görüşleri*" başlıklı çalışmanın yazım sürecinde bilimsel, etik ve alıntı kurallarına uyulmuş; toplanan veriler üzerinde herhangi bir tahrifat yapılmamıştır ve veriler toplanmadan önce Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu'ndan 11.03.2022 tarih ve E-93803232-622.02-182045 sayılı etik izin alınmıştır. Karşılaşılacak tüm etik ihlallerde "Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Yayın Kurulunun" hiçbir sorumluluğunun olmadığı, tüm sorumluluğun Sorumlu Yazara ait olduğu ve bu çalışmanın herhangi başka bir akademik yayın ortamına değerlendirme için gönderilmemiş olduğunu taahhüt ederim.

Appendix 1

PRE-TEST

PART A: Complete the missing parts of the paragraph. (5 pts)

Online education

_____. The most important advantage of online education is it is easy and comfortable. For example, students don't have to leave their houses to get to school. Also, they don't need to get dressed for school. Secondly, _____. In other words, you can join the lesson no matter where you are. To give an example from my own life, I was in my village during the pandemic. Thanks to online education, I was able to join the lessons easily. In addition, it was possible to submit my assignments through email. Lastly, it is economical to study online. Students don't need to pay for transportation or food. Moreover, they can access to the course materials online. In short, _____.

PART B: Choose __ONE__ of the topics below and write a paragraph. (20 pts)

- **Advantages of living in a big city**
- **Disadvantages of studying abroad**
- **Benefits of doing online shopping**

_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix 2

POST-TEST

PART A: Complete the missing parts of the paragraph. (5 pts)

Effects of Smoking

_____. Most importantly, if people smoke too much, this leads to several health problems. For example, heavy smokers might suffer from diseases such as lung cancer, throat cancer or skin disorders. Secondly, heavy smokers spend too much money on cigarette, so they have financial problems. For instance, my uncle spends half of his salary on cigarette. As a result, he has a lot of arguments with his wife. Lastly, _____. Therefore, they might need professional help from a doctor. However, the treatment of an addiction is very difficult. To sum up, _____.

PART B: Choose <u>ONE</u> of the topics below and write a paragraph. (20 pts)

- **Advantages of staying at a dormitory**
- **Disadvantages of living in a small city**
- **Benefits of going to the gym**

_____

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix 3

Corrective Feedback Types

A) Direct correction

There are several <u>effect</u> of pandemic on students. (Student)

effects √ (Teacher)

B) Only underlining and describing the error, but not correcting it.

<u>First of all </u>students suffer from stress. (Student)

1

1- "After transition signals, we use comma." (Teacher)

C) Underlining the error only

According to a study <u>which carried</u> out in England, failure rate has increased by 40% in high schools during the pandemic. (Student)

The teacher only underlines the error here.

Appendix 4

Rubric for B1 LEVEL

CONTENT (40 Marks)

(33-40) VERY GOOD	Ideas expresses fully, covering **all content elements** with appropriate **elaboration** and minimal digression. **Completely relevant** to the assigned task. Interesting and **informative**
(26-32) GOOD	Ideas expressed covering all content elements with **some elaboration**. There may be some **minor repetition or digression**. Relevant to the task and **require minimal effort** to read. Informative and somewhat interesting.
(15-25) ADEQUATE	A simple account with **little elaboration** or with **some repetition and digression** from the task. One or two content elements may have been ignored. Content may have been covered, however, **not very interesting, but monotonous**.
(6-14) INADEQUATE	**Not enough information**. Student is **jumping from one point to the other**. **Noticeable** digression and **irrelevance** to the task. Requires considerable effort to follow.
(3-5) POOR	Totally **irrelevant** to the assigned task or information is **too little** to assess.

ORGANIZATION (20 Marks)

(16-20) VERY GOOD	Ideas **clearly stated**, supported by **various examples, facts, or details**. Well-organized and developed. Fully **cohesive.**
(11-15) GOOD	Main ideas stand out but **loosely organized** or **somewhat** supported by various examples, facts or details. Still cohesive.
(6-10) ADEQUATE	**Only topic sentence** and some factual information have been expressed. **Limited** support. **Non-fluent. Lack of cohesion**.
(3-5) INADEQUATE	Ideas **confused** or **disconnected**. **No cohesion** at all.
(0-2) POOR	Ideas do not communicate. **No organization** or **not enough** to assess.

VOCABULARY (20 Marks)

(16-20) VERY GOOD	**Effective** word choice and **appropriate** usage **fully relevant** to the task. A **wide range** of vocabulary has been used and even there may be idiomatic expressions.
(11-15) GOOD	**Quite precise** use of vocabulary but still **occasional inappropriate** usage without obscuring meaning.
(6-10) ADEQUATE	**Adequate usage** of vocabulary with **some hesitation**. **Some repetitions** and searching for a word. Students **may not remember** some words but replaces with the ones from L1.
(3-5) INADEQUATE	Vocabulary focused on **basic objects**, places, and common words. **Frequent inappropriate** usage of words.
(0-2) POOR	**Not enough** usage of vocabulary to assess.

ACCURACY (15 Marks)

(13-15) VERY GOOD	Good control and **confident use** of language including **complex statements** and range of structures. There may be **few errors** of agreement, tense, number, articles or prepositions.
(9-12) GOOD	Effective but **simple** constructions including **minor problems** in complex structures, **a few errors** of agreement, tense, number, articles or prepositions.
(5-8) ADEQUATE	**Major problems** in structure and sometimes require careful reading. Meaning is **sometimes obscured**. **Several errors** of agreement, tense, number, articles or prepositions.
(3-4) INADEQUATE	**Difficult to follow** due to **frequent grammatical errors**. **Poor** sentence construction or so much translation of syntax **from L1**
(0-2) POOR	**No mastery** of sentence structure or **not enough** information to assess.

MECHANICS (5 Marks)

(4-5) EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD	Demonstrates **mastery** of conventions; **few errors** of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but **meaning not obscured**.
(2-3) FAIR TO POOR	**Frequent errors** of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; poor handwriting; **meaning confused or obscured**.
(0-1) VERY POOR	**No mastery** of conventions; **dominated by errors** of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; handwriting illegible; or **nor enough to evaluate**.

Hughes, A. (2003). Testing for language teachers. *Cambridge University Press.*