Understanding Written Teacher Feedback in L2 Writing in Higher Education: Perceptions, Emotions and Practices of Pre-service English Language Teachers

Fatma KAYA [a*] **(ORCID ID - 0000-0002-4040-0194)**

[a]Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Education/Türkiye

Article Info	**Abstract**
	This study aimed to explore pre-service English language teacher's performance in revising their writing assignments based on written teacher feedback. Moreover, the participants' perceptions and emotions were investigated in addition to their writing self-efficacy levels. A total of 15 pre-service teachers took part in the study. Data were collected through teacher written feedback, students' drafts, an open-ended survey and a semi-structured interview with the participants. Both qualitative and quantitative data analysis tools were employed in the study. Quantitative data analysis results revealed that the participants were more successful in revising direct teacher feedback compared to indirect teacher feedback, and there was not a positive correlation between the participants' feedback revision success and self-efficacy levels. The results of qualitative data analysis showed that the pre-service teachers were in favor of written teacher feedback and considered it a necessity for the L2 writing class. Moreover, they opted for indirect feedback and feedback on all errors. Finally, they experienced both positive and negative emotions although negative emotions were more prevalent.

Yüksek Öğretimde Yazılı Öğretmen Dönütünü Anlama Üzerine Bir Çalışma: İngilizce Öğretmen Adaylarının Düşünce, Duygu ve Performansları

Makale Bilgisi	**Öz**
	Bu çalışma, İngilizce öğretmen adaylarının yazılı öğretmen dönütüne dayalı yazma ödevlerini gözden geçirme ve düzeltme performanslarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır. Katılımcıların yazma öz-yeterlik düzeylerine ek olarak öğretmen dönütü ile ilgili düşünceleri ve deneyimledikleri duyguları da incelenmiştir. Ayrıca, katılımcıların yazma öz-yeterlik düzeyi ile dönüt düzeltme performansları arasındaki ilişkide incelenmiştir. Araştırmaya toplam 15 öğretmen adayı katılmıştır. Çalışma için gerekli veriler, öğretmen yazılı dönütü, öğrenci taslakları, açık uçlu anket ve katılımcılarla gerçekleştirilen yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme yoluyla toplanmıştır. Araştırmada hem nitel hem de nicel veri analiz araçları kullanılmıştır. Araştırmadan elde edilen bulgulara göre, katılımcıların dolaylı öğretmen dönütlerine göre doğrudan öğretmen dönütlerini gözden geçirmede daha başarılı oldukları sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bununla birlikte, nicel veri analizi sonuçları katılımcıların dönüt düzeltme başarıları ile özyeterlik düzeyleri arasında pozitif bir ilişki olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Nitel veri analizinin sonuçları, öğretmen adaylarının yazılı öğretmen dönütünden yana olduklarını ve bunu ikinci dil yazma dersi için bir gereklilik olarak gördüklerini göstermiştir. Ayrıca, katılımcılar dolaylı öğretmen dönütünü doğrudan öğretmen dönütüne tercih ettiklerini belirtmişlerdir ve belirli türden hatalara odaklı öğretmen dönütü yerine tüm hatalar ile ilgili dönüt almanın daha faydalı olacağını belirtmişlerdir. Son olarak, katılımcılar öğretmen dönütü aldıkları süreçte olumsuz duyguları daha yaygın olarak deneyimlemelerine rağmen hem olumlu hem de olumsuz duyguları bir arada deneyimlediklerini belirtmişlerdir.

***Corresponding Author:** ftkaya@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

Introduction

Teacher feedback has relatively a long history in the field of teaching L2 writing as ideal forms of teacher feedback and how students can get maximum benefit from it have been an ongoing subject of inquiry in the relevant field (Ellis, 2009). While teacher feedback can vary as different classifications have been proposed with regard to it (Dlaska & Krekeler, 2017; Ellis, 2009; Ene & Upton, 2014), its necessity for improving students' L2 writing has been acknowledged in the relevant field (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). It is the case that learners expect to get feedback from the teachers on their written works (Lee, 2004). On the other hand, providing feedback is a challenging work on the part of the teachers, and there is no guarantee for student benefit as a result of teacher feedback, which raises questions related to the status of teacher feedback (Lee, 2004; Truscott, 2007). Still, teacher feedback is beneficial when it requires student involvement and appeals to students' needs and expectations (Havnes et al., 2012). As stated by Hyland and Hyland (2006), written teacher feedback has a crucial role in helping students to become confident and successful L2 writers. Thanks to written teacher feedback, students are more likely to learn and produce new L2 language forms (Atmaca, 2016).

Although a good number of studies were conducted related to written teacher feedback, more studies are needed to find out what kind of and how much feedback students need based on the context they are learning L2 writing because these are the issues that still need clarification (Ferris, 2010). Moreover, students' perceptions and emotions should be searched in depth to have a better understanding of the effectiveness of the written teacher feedback as their cognitive and affective responses to the written teacher feedback can inform the research with regard to the effectiveness of teacher feedback in L2 writing class. Therefore, this study aims to find out what kind of teacher feedback students receive and how they respond to written teacher feedback cognitively and emotionally in an L2 writing class.

Teacher feedback

Teacher feedback refers to comments and directives given by the teacher on a student's paper. It also involves corrective feedback which is targeted at promoting grammatical/structural aspects of a student's work (Ene & Upton, 2018). In this study, teacher feedback refers to teacher comments and corrections on the following categories: content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. As stated above, various feedback forms are available for teachers to employ (Dlaska & Krekeler, 2017; Ellis, 2009; Ene & Upton, 2014). Several dichotomies were proposed by the researchers including focused/unfocused, explicit/implicit, and direct/indirect feedback. In unfocused feedback, the teacher is expected to provide feedback related to almost all errors in a student's paper while focused feedback refers to correcting mistakes related to only specific language points (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2011). According to Dlaska and Krekeler (2017), students can benefit more from focused feedback because it does not challenge students' capacity to comprehend feedback and help learners to focus on specific errors. On the other hand, the implicit/explicit dimension is "related to how the learner is being let know that his/her usage differs from the target" (Ene & Upton, 2014, p.91). While implicit feedback includes strategies like recasts and negotiations and aims at pointing out the errors in an implicit way, explicit feedback refers to explicit correction and letting students know that they overtly made mistakes (Li, 2010). Li (2010) adds that explicit feedback is better for students because it is easier to understand for them.

Among these, the direct/indirect dichotomy is the one which took prominent attention among the researchers (Tang & Liu, 2018). In direct feedback, the teacher provides the correct form whereas he/she just indicates that an error has been made by means of a code or mark in indirect feedback (Ene & Upton, 2018). The research reveals that teachers prefer providing direct feedback to indirect feedback (Dlaska & Krekeler, 2017; Guénette & Lyster, 2013; Lee, 2004). However, it is claimed that teachers need to employ more practical and less demanding feedback types, and indirect feedback is more applicable (Park et al., 2016). Furthermore, indirect feedback is considered more beneficial for students in the long run. However, it is also noted that it may not work for students with low level proficiency since they may fail to revise when they are not provided with direct feedback (Srichanyachon, 2012). In fact, there are also contradictory results related to learner preferences for direct/indirect feedback. Liu and Wu's (2019) study revealed that students with high proficiency levels were more in favor of indirect feedback

compared to students with low proficiency level. In another study, it was found that students with low-proficiency levels opted for indirect feedback (Li & He, 2017). When it comes to the effectiveness of direct/indirect feedback types on students' performances, in their study, Jamalinesari et al. (2015) found that indirect feedback had a primary role in facilitating learners' L2 writing, and direct feedback was less effective compared to indirect feedback. In a similar vein, Latifah et al. (2018) found that indirect feedback was more likely to contribute to the L2 writing of students.

With the advent of computer technology and its integration into language classes, online feedback has been an alternative for teachers as they frequently prefer to use computer technology for receiving students' papers and providing feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Sherafati & Mahmoudi Largani, 2023). Studies related to the usage of online teacher feedback revealed that it improved learner uptake and success in writing, and was favored by students (Ene & Upton, 2014, 2018; Han & Shin, 2017; Sherafati & Mahmoudi Largani, 2023). A distinction is made by Ene and Upton (2014) between computer-facilitated feedback and computer-generated feedback: teachers and students use the computer as a medium through which students submit their works and teachers provide feedback electronically in computer-facilitated feedback whereas feedback is given automatically by computer software in computer-generated feedback. In this study, the teacher provided computer-facilitated online feedback.

Writing Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to one's beliefs related to how well he/she can do to achieve the tasks given (Bandura, 2006). Writing self-efficacy is defined by Pajares and Valiante (2001, p. 369) as "students' judgments of their confidence that they possessed the various composition, grammar, usage, and mechanical skills appropriate to their academic level". It is acknowledged that there is a strong relationship between self-efficacy and student performance in L2, and higher self-efficacy yields better results in language learning (Ruegg, 2018). Moreover, success in L2 writing requires higher self-efficacy as writing is a demanding skill for students (Tsao, 2021). Students with lower self-efficacy have difficulty engaging in writing tasks and have less motivation to participate in the writing class (Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015). Students' reaction to teacher feedback is also affected by their self-efficacy level. In their study, Price et al. (2011) found that self-efficacy had a crucial role in students' responses to feedback as students with lower self-efficacy were more likely to reject and unable to use teacher feedback. Similarly, the study conducted by Tsao (2021) revealed that higher self-efficacy for writing self-regulation had a positive impact on students' L2 writing as it caused students to be more eager to receive and respond to teacher feedback. The relationship between self-efficacy and students' success in writing or feedback uptake is also mutual. The longitudinal study carried out by Sherafati and Mahmoudi Largani (2023) showed that students' self-efficacy level increased when they received teacher feedback through the medium of a computer.

As stated above, teacher feedback was widely researched as it was an integral part of L2 writing (Ellis, 2009). Studies related to students' perceptions, preferences with regard to teacher feedback, effects of online teacher feedback, and corrective feedback were conducted in the Turkish context, too (Arslan, 2014; Atmaca, 2016; Bakla, 2020; Bozkurt & Acar, 2017; Buckingham & Aktuğ-Ekinci, 2017; Çınar, 2017; Han & Sari, 2022; Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015). However, there is still a need for a comprehensive study to understand the feedback process and how students cope with the revision process cognitively and emotionally, and how students' revision performance relates to students' self-efficacy perceptions in L2 writing. To this end, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

-How successful are the students in revising teacher feedback?

-What are students' perceptions related to teacher feedback?

-What are students' emotions related to teacher feedback?

-Is there a relationship between students' revision success and their L2 writing self-efficacy levels?

Method

Case study research design was adopted in this study as it enables the researcher to investigate a problem from multiple perspectives using a wide range of methods and helps the researcher to attain a deeper understanding of the issue (Simons, 2009).

Context and Participants

The setting for the study was a state university in the southeastern part of Türkiye. Ethical Approval was obtained from the Ethics Committee of the university. The participants recruited for the study were 15 student teachers majoring in English Language Teaching. While they took courses related to basic language skills (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) and grammar and vocabulary courses in their first year in the program they also had courses which aimed at increasing students' pedagogical knowledge related to English language teaching in the following years of the program. This study was conducted when students took L2 writing class. Students were familiar with essay writing as they wrote a good number of essays with different genres in their first-year writing class. However, they did not get any teacher written feedback related to their writing assignments. The instructor only mentioned some common mistakes made by the majority of the students during class hours after reading and evaluating the assignments as stated by the participants. Voluntary participation was adopted in the present study; those who wanted to participate took part in the study. Thus, the participants' consent was taken. They were informed about the study and ensured that their information would be kept confidential.

Data Collection Tools

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were exploited in the study in order to have an in depth understanding of the issue. Students' first drafts and revised drafts (after receiving teacher's feedback), an open-ended survey and a semi-structured interview comprised the data collection tools for this study. The study took place in L2 writing classes where genre-process based approach to writing was employed. The following process was adopted: first of all, the participants were introduced a specific genre and familiarized with it via sample essays; then, they were required to write an essay and send it to the teacher through an online learning management system in a week. The teacher asked students to send their essay files as MS word because she was to provide feedback through using "inserting comments" and "tracking changes" functions of MS word. After receiving students' essays, the teacher evaluated them by providing written teacher feedback using the aforementioned functions of MS Word in the following week and sent them back to the students through the learning management system (LMS) in order for them to revise their essays based on the teacher feedback and send them back to the teacher, which took another one week.

Upon receiving teacher's written feedback, the students were expected to revise their essays and send them (final drafts) in a week. Finally, the teacher scored their final drafts and announced them to the students. The whole process lasted for 5 weeks. The data was collected when this process was followed for argumentative writing, which was the first genre introduced to the students during the class. Upon receiving teacher's written feedback, participants were required to complete an open-ended survey in order to learn about their perceptions, reactions and feelings related to teacher feedback. At the end of the process, they were also interviewed to elaborate on their open-ended survey responses. Open-ended surveys and semi-structured interview questions were adapted from Zheng and Yu (2018) and Lee (2004). Questions like "how did you feel upon receiving written teacher feedback?", "What do you think about teacher feedback?", "What are the advantages and disadvantages of written teacher feedback?", "Did you understand written teacher feedback?" were included in the open-ended survey and semi-structured interview sessions. Both open ended surveys and semi-structured interviews were conducted in Turkish in order to eliminate possible problems which might result from inefficiency in L2.

Data Analysis

While quantitative data were analyzed through MS Excel and SPSS, the qualitative data were analyzed through content analysis. Ene and Upton's (2014) coding scheme for the target of teacher's feedback was

adopted to analyze feedback points on students' papers. This coding scheme included content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The types of teacher feedback were categorized based on this scheme. The dichotomy of direct/indirect feedback (Ene & Upton, 2014) was also considered while analyzing feedback points. The participants' performance in revising teacher feedback was analyzed based on a scheme which included the following categories: successful revision, unsuccessful revision, and no revision (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Mahfoodh, 2017). Their performance with regard to the directness and indirectness of the teacher feedback was also analyzed based on the aforementioned scheme. After finding out frequencies and percentages of each teacher feedback type and the participants' success in revising teacher's feedback with regard to direct/indirect dichotomy, Kendall's tau-b test, a non-parametric test, was applied in order to reveal whether there was a relation between participants' revision success and their writing self-efficacy. Similar to Ruegg's (2018) study, they were asked to evaluate their writing proficiency based on the categories included in the coding scheme (eg. content, organization, grammar etc.) when they were required to complete the open-ended survey. After students rated their writing proficiency for each category one by one, the mean score of them was calculated, and was accepted as the students' perceived writing-self efficacy. The small sample size was the major reason for preferring Kendall's tau-b test.

As for qualitative data analysis, content analysis was employed to analyze the data obtained from the open-ended survey and semi-structured interviews. The data was read and re-read several times for the purpose of getting familiarized with the data and having a thorough understanding of the data as a whole (Elo and Kyngas, 2008). Then, the following steps were carried out respectively: creating codes, categorizing them, and interpreting them (Lindgren et al., 2020). Codes were grouped under the following categories:

-pre-service teachers' perceived self-efficacy levels with regard to L2 writing,

-feedback points revised by the pre-service teachers and strategies they adopted while making revisions,

-pre-service teachers' perceptions of clarity of the written teacher feedback,

-pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding the merits of written teacher feedback,

-pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding the drawbacks of written teacher feedback,

-pre-service teachers' preferences related to feedback on all types of errors/selective feedback dichotomy and reasons for their preferences,

-pre-service teachers' preferences related to direct feedback/indirect feedback dichotomy and reasons for their preferences,

-emotions experienced by pre-service teachers upon receiving teacher feedback and reasons for them,

-suggestions for teacher feedback.

In order to ensure reliability, the same process was conducted by a colleague and similar results were found. Moreover, codes on which the researcher and the colleague disagreed were discussed and after resolving the disagreements, they finalized coding and categorization. In order to maintain validity, multiple data collection tools were used including an open-ended survey and semi-structured interviews as counting on several pieces of evidence increases the validity of the qualitative inquiry (Creswell & Miller, 2000).

Findings

In this case study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools were used by the researcher. First, the results of the quantitative data analysis are presented, which is followed by the qualitative data analysis results.

Participants' Feedback Revision Performance

Table 1 shows the frequencies, percentages and mean scores of each feedback type given by the teacher. As demonstrated in Table 1, students received feedback most frequently on grammar (M= 7.67), which was followed by vocabulary (M= 4.47), mechanics (M=3.40), and organization (M= 2.73), respectively. Content (M= 1.87) and giving praise (M=.600) were the least frequently feedback types provided by the teacher.

Table 1.

Total Numbers, Percentages, and Mean Scores of Each Type of Feedback Provided by Teacher

Teacher Feedback Types	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Content	28	9%	1.87	.990
Organization	41	13%	2.73	1.831
Grammar	115	37%	7.67	2.992
Vocabulary	67	22%	4.47	2.850
Mechanics	51	16%	3.40	1.882
Giving Praise	9	3%	.600	.910
Total	311	100%	20.13	5.566

Table 2 highlights students' performance in doing revisions upon receiving written feedback from the teacher by frequencies, percentages and mean scores. It is demonstrated that successful revision comprised 86% (259) with a mean score of 17.27 surpassing the other components which are unsuccessful revision (5%) and no revision (9%) to a great extent. The category of giving praise was removed as it did not require students to take action.

Table 2.

Participants' Revision Success After Receiving Teacher's Feedback

Status of Revision	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
Successful Revision	259	86%	17.27	5.612
Unsuccessful Revision	16	5%	1.07	.884
No Revision	27	9%	1.80	1.014

As shown in Table 3, the number of direct feedback (212) provided by the teacher was far more than the indirect feedback (90) she gave. When it comes to the student's success in revising their papers based on the teacher's written feedback with regard to the direct/indirect dichotomy, students showed better performance in revising direct feedback (91%) successfully with a mean score of 12.80. While the sum of unsuccessful revision and no revision in direct feedback constituted 9% (20), it was 26% (23) in indirect feedback.

Table 3.

Participants' Revision Success with Regard to Direct/Indirect Dichotomy

		Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
	Successful revision	192	91%	12.80	5.017
	Unsuccessful revision	9	4%	.60	.507
Direct Feedback	No revision	11	5%	.73	.594
	Total	212	100%	14.13	4.897
	Successful revision	67	74%	4.47	1.302
	Unsuccessful revision	7	8%	.47	.640
Indirect Feedback	No revision	16	18%	1.07	.884
	Total	90	100%	6.00	1.254

The participants were asked to rank their writing proficiency from 1 and 10 to learn about their writing self-efficacy. The majority of the participants (n= 9) rated their writing proficiency as 6 while only two participants rated their writing proficiency as 7 with 3 participants rating their proficiency as 5. In order to find out whether there is a relationship between students' revision success and self-efficacy levels,

Kendall's tau-b test was applied. As displayed in Table 4, there was not a positive correlation between students' revision success and self-efficacy levels, with p-value= .952.

Table 4.

Kendall's tau-b Correlation Between Students' Revision Success and Their Self-Efficacy

		Revision Success	Self-Efficacy Level
Revision Success	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.013
	Sig. (2-tailed	.	.952
	N	15	15
Self-Efficacy Level	Correlation Coefficient	.013	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed	.952	.
	N	15	15

Participants' Perceptions and Emotions related to Teacher's Written Feedback

In order to shed light on the process by asking students about their perceptions, emotions, and reactions, an open-ended survey was administered to the participants, which was followed by interviews with the participants to clarify their open-ended survey responses.

For this purpose, the participants were asked to rank their writing proficiency from 1 and 10 and mention the reasons for the ratings to learn about their L2 writing self-efficacy. All of the participants agreed that they had limited grammatical knowledge as represented in the answers of P3 and P10:

"I am unable to convey my thoughts thoroughly because I do not have a good command of English grammar." (P3)

"My sentences do not sound academic because I am unable to make complex sentences" (P10).

Limited vocabulary knowledge and limited knowledge about essay writing rules with regard to specific essay genres were among the reasons for inefficiency in writing according to several participants, respectively:

"I have difficulty in writing the thesis statement and supporting it. Moreover, it is difficult to discuss a topic from different points of view." (P1)

"I know a limited number of English vocabulary and I also have difficulty in using some of them since I do not know how to use them within the context." (P7)

The participants also reported whether they did all the revisions asked by the teacher and how they did the revisions. All of the participants stated that they did their best to complete the revisions asked by the teacher. The majority of them (n= 10) claimed that they corrected their grammatical mistakes pointed out by the teacher immediately by themselves. Moreover, nearly half of the participants (n=7) did some research and examined sample essays on the Internet to edit and improve their thesis statements and body paragraphs based on the feedback provided by the teacher. Several participants (n= 5) did some internet research to correct their mistakes related to grammar and vocabulary. Lastly, some participants (n= 4) asked for help from their peers and got peer support to edit mistakes related to the content and organization as they had difficulty understanding the teacher's feedback or did not know how to correct it.

Although all the participants indicated that they understood the teacher feedback, and found it clear, it took some time for several participants (n= 4) to understand and accept some teacher feedback especially feedback related to content and organization as mentioned above. Moreover, some other participants (n:4) found it difficult to understand teacher feedback in general as they were not familiar with the format: the teacher provided feedback through the word tracking feature of the MS Word, and it was the first time they encountered this feature of the word. After multiple readings, they were able to understand the teacher's feedback.

The participants were also asked about the merits and drawbacks of receiving teacher feedback and whether they were in favor of teacher feedback. All of the participants agreed that teacher feedback provided them with the opportunity to see their mistakes and correct them and improve their writing proficiency. Therefore, they supported that it should have a place in writing classrooms. According to some participants, teacher feedback was necessary because they were hesitant about asking for feedback even if they needed it:

"If the teacher did not provide feedback on my paper, I would never ask her anything about my paper even if I wanted to do so because I always hesitate to ask questions to the instructors related to the classes or my performance". (P6)

"We are expected to do a lot of assignments in other classes, and we do not receive feedback related to the assignments. It is generally the case that I get lesser scores than I expect on my assignments, and I do not have the courage to ask for feedback or why I received lower grades, which makes me feel helpless. Therefore, it should be not only in writing class, in other classes too" (P13)

Furthermore, some participants claimed that teacher feedback encouraged them to promote their writing skills:

"The teacher feedback shows that the teacher values his/her students and cares about their learning through allocating time for revisions, which is a motivating reason to improve." (P9)

"Seeing that the teacher spent her time on providing feedback on our essays reading line by line increased my respect to the instructor and urged me to do more to improve my writing." (P5)

As for drawbacks, two participants stated that receiving feedback through a digital platform and on word tracking format challenged them as they needed peer support and multiple readings to understand the feedback. Therefore, they opted for face-to-face teacher feedback. Few participants (n= 2) indicated that they preferred the teacher to write explanations for the praise she provided, too. Thus, they could see their strengths in essay writing as explanations or reasons were provided for mistakes but there were not any explanations or reasons mentioned by the teacher related to the praise in their essays.

Another question directed at participants was whether they wanted the instructor to provide feedback on all types of errors and every error or provide selective feedback. The majority of them (n= 9) reported that it would be better for the teacher to provide feedback on all mistakes because of the following reasons:

"The teacher should provide feedback on all errors because I only focused on the errors pointed out by the instructor and tried to revise them successfully since this was what was expected from me." (P1)

"I think all the errors should be pointed out by the instructor because it is not easy for me to notice my mistakes and revise them if they are not marked by the teacher." (P4)

"I prefer the teacher to mark all my mistakes especially the ones related to content and organization because it is less likely for me to notice and revise my mistakes related to these issues because I am not a competent writer." (P6).

Several participants (n= 3) claimed that they did not want the teacher to provide feedback on all mistakes as it would be demotivating and discouraging for the students to see that all mistakes were marked by the teacher, especially when they made a lot of mistakes. Lastly, the other three participants preferred to get selective feedback:

"I think it should not be the teacher's responsibility to mark all errors, I also should be able to find some mistakes in my paper to be actively involved in the process of editing and revising. However, I can only do this with regard to grammatical mistakes; therefore, it would be better for me if the teacher did not provide feedback on all grammatical errors." (P14)

In addition, the participants mentioned whether they preferred direct or indirect written teacher feedback. Ten of the participants claimed that they preferred indirect feedback posing similar reasons as mentioned below:

"Indirect feedback is more beneficial for us to improve L2 writing; if direct feedback is given by the teacher all the time, the student will not think about his/her mistakes and will not need to do research to correct them" (P3).

"Indirect feedback is better for me because I feel better and more satisfied when I correct the mistake pointed out by the teacher by myself. I feel like I achieved something." (P7)

"Direct feedback is likely to make students passive as there will not be much for the students to do but it should be the student's responsibility to correct his/her mistakes; therefore, I prefer indirect feedback." (P10)

While only one participant (P4) preferred both direct and indirect feedback relying on the complexity of the mistake, four participants opted for direct written teacher feedback:

"I think direct feedback is better so that I can see the correct form of the mistake and learn better." (P8)

"There is a possibility of misunderstanding the teacher feedback and not being able to find the correct form; therefore, I opt for direct feedback". (P13).

The participants were also asked how they felt when they received written teacher's feedback. A total of 21 negative emotions (disappointed, shocked, unhappy, ashamed, angry and anxious) were reported by the participants whereas 13 positive emotions (happiness, feeling satisfied, feeling relieved or motivated and self-confident) were experienced by them. The disappointment was the most frequently experienced negative feeling by the participants mostly because they made a lot of mistakes, which they did not expect. This was among the main reasons for other negative feelings including shock, unhappiness, shame, anger or anxiety. Other reasons for negative emotions indicated by the participants were as follows:

"When I received teacher feedback, I felt stressed because it was like most parts of the essay was marked by the teacher, and I was not sure whether I would be able to correct the mistakes pointed out by the teacher" (P8)

"Upon receiving teacher feedback, I noticed that I made very simple mistakes related to spelling, therefore, I was angry at myself because those mistakes had resulted from my carelessness." (P7)

"I felt ashamed when I saw my paper because I misunderstood the essay type and organization as pointed out by the teacher, and I was anxious because I had concern whether I would be able to deal with these huge mistakes" (P3)

As for positive emotions, most participants stated that they were happy upon receiving feedback from the teacher since they had the chance to correct their mistakes as they were pointed out by the teacher, and thus, to improve their writing. The participants also felt satisfied, relieved, motivated or self-confident because of the following reasons:

"Although I was disappointed upon receiving teacher feedback as I made a lot of mistakes which teacher marked, the disappointment turned into self-confidence after correcting my mistakes and checking them with friends" (P5)

"I felt relieved when I checked my friends' papers upon receiving teacher feedback because they also made a lot of mistakes marked by the teacher and mine was not worse than their papers." (P12)

"When I realized my mistakes upon receiving teacher feedback, I felt motivated because I knew what to do next; teacher feedback was a kind of guidance for me to improve my essay" (P14)

The last question addressed to the participants was about whether they had any suggestions related to teacher feedback. Four participants stated that it would be better if they received peer-feedback in addition to teacher feedback so that they had to chance to see their papers being evaluated by different perspectives (the teacher and the peer), and could make a comparison between them, which they believed that it would improve their L2 writing. Majority of the participants (n= 9) claimed that they wanted to see encouraging words or praise in their papers because of similar reasons:

"I would be more motivated and eager to correct my mistakes if there was any praise in my paper." *(P1)*

"Seeing only the mistakes I made was demotivating for me; I would be happy if there was an encouraging word in my paper." *(P3)*

"I think I would be more encouraged to face my mistakes if there was a motivating word on paper. (P7)

Discussion & Conclusion

This study was conducted at a state university where the participants did not receive any written teacher feedback related to their writing assignments beforehand. It was the first time they received written teacher's feedback when this study was conducted. Considering the novelty of the experience for the students, it can be said that the participants were successful in revising their essays. However, their performance was better in revising direct feedback provided by the teacher. Similarly, Conrad and Goldstein (1999) and Ene and Upton (2014) found that students were more successful in revising direct teacher feedback. The participants were also asked to rate their self-efficacy in order to learn their perceived self-efficacy levels and whether there was a relation between their self-efficacy levels and revision success Surprisingly, no relationship was found between the participants' revision success and their self-efficacy levels. The following conclusions can be drawn from this finding: the participants may have a low level of writing self-efficacy as they consider writing as a challenging work, which is not uncommon in the EFL context (Erkan & Saban, 2011; Şener & Erol, 2017) or their success in revision may be related to the explicitness of teacher feedback as the feedback provided by the teacher was mostly direct. Studies conducted by Ene and Upton (2014) and Conrad and Goldstein (1999) acknowledge that students were more successful in revising direct feedback.

In order to have a better understanding of the feedback revision process of the participants, they were asked to complete an open-ended survey which was followed by semi-structured interviews with the participants. It was found that the participants did their best to revise their papers based on the feedback. Likewise, Mahfoodh (2017) found that students were eager to revise their papers based on the written teacher feedback as they believed that it would improve their writing. The study conducted by Çınar (2017) had similar results as she found that students considered teacher feedback useful and benefited from it. Moreover, when the participants in the present study were asked whether they understood the teacher's feedback, they answered yes. However, some of them had difficulty understanding feedback related to content and organization at first glance and got peer help to understand the feedback. In a similar vein, Erkan (2022) found that teacher feedback was difficult to understand for some students.

The participants were also asked whether they found teacher's written feedback beneficial. All of the students responded that they did. All the participants acknowledged that they had the opportunity to see their mistakes and improve their writing. It was well acknowledged in various studies that students were in favor of teacher's feedback (Arslan, 2014; Bakla, 2020; Ene & Upton, 2018). Some participants claimed that written teacher feedback increased their respect to the teacher as the authority because it showed that the teacher cared about their writing performance, and thus, motivated them. A similar finding was reported by Zheng and Yu (2018) as they found that students felt gratitude for their teacher's sparing her/his time for providing feedback, which showed that the teacher valued their work.

On the other hand, several drawbacks were also reported by the participants. Some participants were not content with the online format, and they opted for face-to-face feedback. It could be explained

by the novelty of e-feedback in addition to teacher feedback, which made the situation more challenging for the students. In his study, Bakla (2020) also found that the students felt uneasy when they were first introduced to digital feedback. Some other studies also confirmed that students had difficulty in accepting e-feedback at once (Ene & Upton, 2018; Tuzi, 2004). Furthermore, some participants who got praise from the teacher preferred the teacher to provide explanations for the praise, too as they needed to hear more about the strengths of their essay writing performance. The majority of the participants opted for teacher feedback on all types of errors and all errors as they thought that they were unable to spot their mistakes when they were not indicated by the teacher, and they said that they only focused and would focus on the points for which teacher provided feedback. In the studies conducted by Seker and Dincer (2014) and Çınar (2017), it was also found that students wanted the teacher to provide feedback on all errors. However, according to Loan (2017), this is likely to arouse a problem: "overreliance on teacher feedback", which is common in the EFL context.

Although the participants were less successful in revising indirect written teacher feedback, the majority of the participants were in favor of indirect teacher feedback since they believed that they could think about their mistakes and would be more active and thus satisfied with the revision process. It can be concluded that students had awareness related to the value of indirect feedback as it is more likely to lead to permanent learning in the long run (James, 1998). This finding corresponds with the finding of the study conducted by Westmacott (2017) as he found that EFL students opted for indirect feedback because they benefited from indirect feedback to a great extent.

The participants were also asked about the emotions they experienced during the whole process: negative emotions were more prevalent although positive emotions were also reported by the participants. The majority of the participants had negative emotions at first, but they were followed by positive emotions. The main reasons for the negative emotions were making a lot of mistakes as pointed out by the teacher and being worried whether they could correct their mistakes and revise their essays successfully. Furthermore, novelty of the written teacher feedback including e-feedback and the participants' low self-efficacy levels may have contributed to arousal of negative emotions. The study by Elwood and Bode (2014) also revealed that students had negative emotions and were less self-confident when they were introduced to new tasks. On the other hand, the participants in this study had positive emotions because they had the chance to improve their essays and were able to revise their essays, which was acknowledged in several studies too (Mahfoodh, 2017; Zheng & Yu, 2018). Moreover, they had the opportunity to compare their papers with their peers. Lastly, the participants gave suggestions related to teacher feedback. The majority of the participants wanted to see encouraging words or praise as they needed them to do their best. The importance of praise for encouraging students was also revealed in Mahfood's (2017) study: the students liked praise and claimed that praise encouraged and motivated them to revise and improve their writing. Finally, some participants claimed that it would be better if they received peer-feedback in addition to teacher feedback as they would have the chance to compare different perspectives related to their papers. Likewise, participants in the studies conducted by Vasu et al. (2016) and Maarof et al. (2011) were in favor of both teacher feedback and peer feedback as both of them had the potential to improve their writing skills.

All in all, this study investigated how students at a state university reacted to written teacher's feedback, and their perceptions and emotions with regard to written teacher feedback in order to have an in-depth understanding of the issue as teacher feedback has a crucial role in L2 writing classes. It was found that students were successful in revising teacher feedback and found teacher feedback necessary and useful. They were aware of the benefits and value of teacher feedback. However, there was no correlation between their revision success and self-efficacy levels. Furthermore, they had some criticisms related to written teacher feedback. The main criticism directed towards teacher feedback was that they needed to be encouraged by the teacher to be able to revise their essay more confidently as they felt anxious and frustrated when they saw their papers with teacher feedback. Although they had positive emotions with regard to teacher feedback, they came after the negative emotions they experienced when they were able to revise their essays.

This study lasted for five weeks during which a genre was introduced to students, and they were asked to write an essay based on the genre, which was followed by written teacher feedback and student revision. More longitudinal studies can be conducted to understand whether there are any changes in students' beliefs, emotions or reactions when they are familiarized with teacher feedback as it was a new experience for the students in this study. Moreover, teacher and peer-feedback can be used together to see whether and how they complement each other and affect students' performances, beliefs and emotions in future studies as students in this study wanted peer-feedback in addition to teacher feedback as they thought that peer-feedback would help their revision process.

Ethical Declaration

All rules included in the "Directive for Scientific Research and Publication Ethics in Higher Education Institutions" have been adhered to, and none of the "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" included in the second section of the Directive have been implemented. Ethics committee approval was obtained for the study from Dicle University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee (Approval Date: 04.03.2022, Document Number: 48).

Conflict Statement

The author declares no competing interests.

References

Arslan, R. Ş. (2014). Integrating feedback into prospective English language teachers' writing process via blogs and portfolios. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *13*(1), 131–150.

Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: Written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 12*(2), 166–182.

Bakla, A. (2020). A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing. *Language Learning & Technology, 24*(1), 107–128. https://doi.org/10125/44712

Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares, & TS Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307–337). Information Age Pub.

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

Buckingham, L., & Aktuğ-Ekinci, D. (2017). Interpreting coded feedback on writing: Turkish EFL students' approaches to revision. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 26*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2017.01.001

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80126-X

Creswell, J., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice, 19*(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2

Çınar, S. (2017). The Efficacy of Corrective Feedback on L2 Writings of EFL Students. *European Journal of Language and Literature, 3*(2), 110–120. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejls.v8i1.p110-120

Dlaska, A., & Krekeler, C. (2017). Does grading undermine feedback? The influence of grades on the effectiveness of corrective feedback on L2 writing. *The Language Learning Journal, 45*(2), 185–201. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.848226

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62*(1), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System, 42*, 333–343. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.023

Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2014). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. *System, 46*, 80–95. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.011

Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 41*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005

Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. İ. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 13*(1), 164–192.

Erkan, G. (2022). The impact of teacher e-feedback on students' writing: A waste of time or a road to success? *Focus on ELT Journal, 4*(1), 46–59. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.2022.4.1.4

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Guénette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written corrective feedback and its challenges for pre-service ESL teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*(2), 129–153. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.1346

Han, T., & Sari, E. (2022). An investigation on the use of automated feedback in Turkish EFL students' writing classes. *Computer Assisted Language Learning,* 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2067179

Han, S., & Shin, J. A. (2017). Teaching google search techniques in an L2 academic writing context. *Language Learning and Technology, 21*(3), 172–194.

Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 38*(1), 21–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.04.001

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

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

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis.* Longman.

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

Kirmizi, Ö., & Kirmizi, G. D. (2015). An investigation of l2 learners' writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety and its causes at higher education in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education, 4*(2), 57–66. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n2p57

Latifah, Y., Suwarno, B., & Diani, I. (2018). The effect of teachers' direct and indirect feedback on student's writing ability. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature), 3*(2), 47–58. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v3i2.6846

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001

Li, H., & He, Q. (2017). Chinese secondary EFL learners' and teachers' preferences for types of written corrective feedback. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p63

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Lindgren, B. M., Lundman, B., & Graneheim, U. H. (2020). Abstraction and interpretation during the qualitative content analysis process. International *Journal of Nursing Studies, 108,* 103632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2020.103632

Liu, Q., & Wu, S. (2019). Same goal, varying beliefs: How students and teachers see the effectiveness of feedback on second language writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 11*(2), 299–330. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2019.11.02.03

Loan, N. T. T. (2017). A case study of combined peer-teacher feedback on paragraph writing at a university in Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(2), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i2.8345

Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Li, K. L. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 15*(1), 29–35.

Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2017). "I feel disappointed": EFL university students' emotional responses towards teacher written feedback. *Assessing Writing, 31*, 53–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.07.001

Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (2001). Gender differences in writing motivation and achievement of middle school students: A function of gender orientation? *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 26*(3), 366–381. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.2000.1069

Park, E. S., Song, S., & Shin, Y. K. (2016). To what extent do learners benefit from indirect written corrective feedback? A study targeting learners of different proficiency and heritage language status. *Language Teaching Research, 20*(6), 678–699. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815609617

Price, M., Handley, K., & Millar, J. (2011). Feedback: Focusing attention on engagement. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(8), 879–896. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.483513

Ruegg, R. (2018). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students' writing self-efficacy. *The Language Learning Journal, 46*(2), 87–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.958190

Seker, M. &Dincer, A. (2014). An insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching, 7*(2), 73–83. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p73

Sherafati, N., & Mahmoudi Largani, F. (2023). The potentiality of computer-based feedback in fostering EFL learners' writing performance, self-regulation ability, and self-efficacy beliefs*. Journal of Computers in Education, 10*(1), 27–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40692-022-00221-3

Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446268322

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies (Former Name Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), 12*(1), 7–17.

Şener, S., & Erol, İ. K. (2017). Motivational orientations and self-efficacy beliefs of Turkish students towards EFL learning. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 16*(67), 251–267. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.67.15

Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs indirect written corrective feedback: Students' perceptions. *İkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 22*(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02

Tang, C., & Liu, Y. T. (2018). Effects of indirect coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on L2 writing performance, learner uptake and motivation. *Assessing Writing, 35*, 26–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.12.002

Tsao, J. J. (2021). Effects of EFL learners' L2 writing self-efficacy on engagement with written corrective feedback. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 30*(6), 575–584. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00591-9

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(4), 255–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003

Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition, 21*(2), 217–235. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003

Vasu, K., Ling, C. H., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2016). Malaysian tertiary level ESL students' perceptions toward teacher feedback, peer feedback and self-assessment in their writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 5*(5), 158–170. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.5p.158

Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing, 37*, 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001