

ABSTRACT

INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES

FATMA ENGÜL

MA Program in English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Asst. Prof.Dr.HanifeBensenBostancı

June 2018, 171 pages

For students to have good command of writing skills indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) is a key factor (Almasi&Tabrizi, 2016). In order to improve English as a foreign language learners (EFL) writing skills, this study aims to find out the most effective agent that provides IWCF, the impact of the gender factor when receiving IWCF from these different agents and also the participants' perceptions towards the agent that they received IWCF. A quasi-experimental design was adopted in which three classes of EFL learners were employed at a private university's preparatory school. One of the classes was named as class A in which only recieved instructor IWCF; another class B, in which only recieved peer IWCF and the last class C, where only collaborative IWCF was provided to the participants for a period of five weeks. Each class produced five written texts each week at the same time. The data were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively through the texts the participants produced, interview questions that the participants were asked and the questionnaire, that the participants were requested to complete. The results of the written text analyses were compared within and among the classes, and then compared among the classes based on the participants' gender. Then, the questionnaire results were also compared among the classes based on the agent that they received IWCF.

Afterwards, the interview results were used to support the written text and questionnaire data. The findings indicated that the participants of class C who received only collaborative IWCF improved their writing skills significantly compared to the other classes that received instructor and peer IWCF. In terms of gender it was revealed that the male participants performed better than the females in class A, and the female participants in class B and C produced better written texts compared to the male participants. Further, all the participants put forth that they felt more confident, motivated, knowledgeable and comfortable when they received IWCF. Furthermore, the participants who received instructor and collaborative IWCF stated that they felt more proud and relaxed when they received IWCF. Lastly, it was revealed that all the participants had positive attitudes towards collaborative IWCF.

Keywords: Gender, Indirect Written Corrective Feedback, English as a Foreign Language Learners, Writing Improvement, Perceptions.

ÖZET

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERE SINIFTA DOLAYLI YOLDAN YAZILI DÜZELTİ GERİBİLDİRİM VERİLMESİ

Fatma engül

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

Haziran 2018, 171 sayfa

Yazma becerisine hakim

olabilen öğrencilerinde dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim sağlanmasının bir faktördür (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016).

Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin yazma becerilerinin geliştirilmesi için, bu araştırma netlikli dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim verene ilişkin iyileştirme faktörünü belirlemek için ileri tarafında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim verilmesi üzerindeki etkisini, ve aynı zamanda katılımcılarında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim aldıkları için iyileştirme faktörlerini belirlemek için yapılmıştır. Bu araştırma, özel bir üniversitenin hazırlık okulunda yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen öğrencilerin bulunduğu üçüncü sınıfta katılımlı ve yarı deneysel model benimsenerek gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Be haftalık bir süreç boyunca,

yalnızca öğretmen tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim sağlanan sınıf A grubu olaraklandırılırken,

yalnızca arkadaşları tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geri bildirim sağlanan sınıf B grubu olaraklandırılmış ve hem

ö retmen hem de arkada larında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verdiklerisınıf ise C grubu olaraklandırılmıştır. Her grup, her hafta aynı zamanda yazılı metin üretmiştir.

Katılımcıların ürettikleri yazılı metinler,

röportaj soruları ve katılımcıların tamamlaması talepedilen anket verileri hem niteliksel hem de nicel olarak analiz edilmiştir.

Yazılı metinlerin analiz sonuçları grup içerisindedir ve gruplar olarak ılaştırılmıştır ve daha sonra gruplar katılımcı cinsiyetlerine göre karşılaştırılmıştır. Dahasonra,

anket sonuçlarındafarklı etkenlerdendolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan gruplar halinde karşılaştırılmıştır. Bunun yanında,

röportaj sonuçları ise yazılı metin ve anket sonuçlarını desteklemek için kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, hem ö retmen hem de arkada larında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan C

grubunun yazma becerilerini,

sadece ö retmenden ve sadece arkada larında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan gruplar akıyasla önemli ölçüde geliştirdiğini göstermiştir.

Cinsiyet açısından ise A grubunda bulunan erkek öğrencilerin kadıncatılımcılara oranladahaiyiperformans gösterdiği bilgisine ulaşılmıştırken, B ve C

grubunda bulunan kadıncatılımcıların erkekkatılımcılara oranladahaiyiyazılı metinler ürettiklerisaptanmıştır. Ayrıca, katılımcıların tümü aldıkları dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirimiledaha da

kendinden emin, motive olmuş, bilgilivesakin hissettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Buna ek olarak,

sadece ö retmenden ve hem ö retmen hem de

arkada larında dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan katılımcıların busüreç içerisinde daha gururlu ve rahat hissettikleribilgisine ulaşılmıştır. Son olarak,

bütün katılımcıların birlikçidolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim ekarınolumlututumları içerisindedebulduklaritespitedilmiştir.

AnahtarKelimeler: Cinsiyet, DolaylıYoldanYazılıDüzelticiGeribildirim,

YabancıDilOlarak İngilizceÖ renimiGörenÖ renciler, YazmaGeli imi, Algular.

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSES**

MASTER THESIS

FATMA ENGÜL

NICOSIA

JUNE, 2018

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

**INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSES**

MASTER THESIS

FATMA ENGÜL

Supervisor: Asst. Prof.Dr.HanifeBensen Bostancı

NICOSIA

JUNE, 2018

Approval of the Graduate School of Educational Sciences

Assoc. Prof.Dr.FahriyeAltınayAksal

Director

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

Assoc. Prof.Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of Department

It is certified that we have read the thesis submitted by Fatma engül “Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in English as a foreign language classes” and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Asst. Prof. Dr. Çelen Dimililer

Asst. Prof. Dr. Doina Popescu

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

DECLARATION

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

Name and Last Name: Fatma engül

Signature:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My deep gratitude goes first to my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı, who expertly guided me through my thesis with her valuable and constructive suggestions and always being there and supporting me when I need a help. In addition, I would like to thank my committee members Asst. Prof. Dr. Çelen Dimililer and Asst. Prof. Dr. Doina Popescu.

I also wish to express my appreciation to the department of the English Language Teaching and the English Preparatory School at Near East University, all the staff members, instructors and especially the head of department. Thank you for all the assistance that you have provided me during my education and thesis process.

I owe a deep sense of gratitude to my parents for their encouragement, both financial and spiritual support and unconditional love. I am really thankful to my family and all of my instructors who helped me to become the person I am today and always inspiring me to be better.

ABSTRACT**INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASSES****FATMA ENGÜL****MA Program in English Language Teaching****Supervisor: Asst. Prof.Dr.HanifeBensen Bostancı****June 2018, 171 pages**

For students to have good command of writing skills indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) is a key factor (Almasi &Tabrizi, 2016).In order to improve English as a foreign language learners (EFL) writing skills, this study aims to find out the most effective agent that provides IWCF, the impact of the gender factor when receiving IWCF from these different agents and also the participants' perceptions towards the agent that they received IWCF.A quasi-experimental designwas adopted in which three classes of EFL learners were employed at a private university's preparatory school. One of the classes was named as class A in which only recieved instructor IWCF; another class B, in which only recieved peer IWCF and the last class C, where only collaborative IWCF was provided to the participants for a period of five weeks. Each class produced five written texts each week at the same time. The data were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively through the texts the participants produced, interview questions that the participants were asked and the questionnaire, that the participants were requested to complete. The results of the written text analyses were compared within and among the classes, and then compared among the classes based on the participants' gender. Then, the questionnaire results were also compared among the classes based on the agent that they received IWCF. Afterwards, the interview results were used to support the written text and questionnaire data. The findings indicated that the participants of

class C who received only collaborative IWCF improved their writing skills significantly compared to the other classes that received instructor and peer IWCF. In terms of gender it was revealed that the male participants performed better than the females in class A, and the female participants in class B and C produced better written texts compared to the male participants. Further, all the participants put forth that they felt more confident, motivated, knowledgeable and comfortable when they received IWCF. Furthermore, the participants who received instructor and collaborative IWCF stated that they felt more proud and relaxed when they received IWCF. Lastly, it was revealed that all the participants had positive attitudes towards collaborative IWCF.

Keywords: Gender, Indirect Written Corrective Feedback, English as a Foreign Language Learners, Writing Improvement, Perceptions.

ÖZET

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERE SINIFTA DOLAYLI YOLDAN YAZILI DÜZELTİCİ GERİBİLDİRİM VERİLMESİ

Fatma Engül

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Hanife Bensen Bostancı

Haziran 2018, 171 sayfa

Yüksek düzeyde yazma becerisine hakim olabilen öğrenciler için dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim sağlanması anahtar bir faktördür (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016). Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenimi gören öğrencilerin yazma becerilerini geliştirmek için, bu araştırmada en etkili dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim veren etken kişiyi ve cinsiyet faktörünün bu etken kişiler tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verilmesi üzerindeki etkisini, ve aynı zamanda katılımcıların dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim aldıkları etken kişiyeye karşı olan algıları hakkında bilgiye ulaşmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu araştırma, özel bir üniversitenin hazırlık okulunda yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenimi gören öğrencilerin bulunduğu üç sınıfın katılımıyla ve yarı deneysel model benimsenerek gerçekleştirilmiştir. Beş haftalık bir süreç boyunca, yalnızca öğretmen tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim sağlanan sınıf A grubu olarak adlandırılırken, yalnızca arkadaşları tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim sağlanan sınıf B grubu olarak adlandırılmış ve hem öğretmen hemde arkadaşlarının dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verdikleri sınıf ise C grubu olarak adlandırılmıştır. Her grup, her hafta aynı zamanda beyaz yazılı metin üretmiştir. Katılımcıların ürettikleri yazılı metinler, röportaj soruları ve katılımcıların tamamlaması talep edilen anket verileri hem niteliksel hem de nicel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Yazılı metinlerin analiz sonuçları grup

içerisinde ve gruplarla karşılaştırılmış ve daha sonra gruplar katılımcı cinsiyetlerine göre karşılaştırılmıştır. Daha sonra, anket sonuçlarında farklı etkenlerden dolayı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan gruplar halinde karşılaştırılmıştır. Bunun yanında, röportaj sonuçları ise yazılı metin ve anket sonuçlarını desteklemek için kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, hem öğretmen hem de arkadaşlarının dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan C grubunun yazma becerilerini, sadece öğretmen ve sadece arkadaşlarından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan gruplara kıyasla önemli ölçüde geliştirdiğini göstermiştir. Cinsiyet açısından ise A grubunda bulunan erkek öğrencilerin kadın katılımcılara oranla daha iyi performans gösterdiği bilgisine ulaşılmışken, B ve C grubunda bulunan kadın katılımcıların erkek katılımcılara oranla daha iyi yazılı metinler ürettikleri saptanmıştır. Ayrıca, katılımcıların tümü aldıkları dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim ile daha da kendinden emin, motive olmuş, bilgili ve sakin hissettiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Buna ek olarak, sadece öğretmen ve hem öğretmen hem de arkadaşlarından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan katılımcıların bu süreç içerisinde daha gururlu ve rahat hissettikleri bilgisine ulaşılmıştır. Son olarak, bütün katılımcıların işbirlikçi dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirime karşı olumlu tutumlar içerisinde buldukları tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyet, Dolaylı Yoldan Yazılı Düzeltici Geribildirim, Yabancı Dil

Olarak İngilizce Öğrenimi Gören Öğrenciler, Yazma Gelişimi, Algılar.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL	1
DECLARATION	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	3
ABSTRACT	4
ÖZET	6
TABLE OF CONTENTS	8
LIST OF TABLES	12
LIST OF APPENDICES	14
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	15
CHAPTER I	16
INTRODUCTION	16
Introduction	16
Background of the Study	17
Turkish Cypriot Context	20
Problem of the Study	20
Significance of the Study	21
Aim of the Study	23
Limitations of the Study	24
Definition of Key Terms	24
Difference between error correction and corrective feedback	24
Written corrective feedback	24

Direct error correction.	25
Indirect error correction	25
Agent factor in the corrective feedback process	25
Instructor IWCF	26
Peer IWCF	26
Collaborative IWCF.	26
CHAPTER II	27
LITERATURE REVIEW	27
Introduction	27
Writing	27
Error Correction	27
Feedback	29
Indirect Written Corrective Feedback	29
Agent Factor	32
Instructor	33
Peer	34
Instructor versus Peer	39
Collaborative	41
Gender and IWCF	44
CHAPTER III	46
METHODOLOGY	46

	10
Introduction.....	46
Research Design and Procedures	46
Participants and Sampling.....	50
Pilot Study	51
ELT Participants’ Preferences	51
ELT Participants’ Perceptions: Advantages and Disadvantages.....	52
ELT Learners’ Perceptions: ELT Learners’ Feelings	53
Data Collection.....	55
Written Texts.....	55
Questionnaire	56
Interview	57
Data Analysis.....	59
Written Text Analysis.....	59
Questionnaire Analysis.....	69
Interview Analysis.....	70
Ethical Considerations	70
CHAPTER IV	72
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	72
Introduction.....	72
Written Text	72
Instructor	73

	11
Peer	73
Collaborative	74
Effects of Gender	75
Instructor	76
Peer	77
Collaborative	78
EFL Learners' Preferences towards the Agent Factor	79
Instructor	80
Peer	81
Collaborative	82
EFL Learners Perceptions towards the Agent Factor	84
Feelings.....	84
Advantages and disadvantages of IWCF	86
CHAPTER V	89
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
Introduction.....	89
Practical Implications for Education	90
Recommendations for Further Research	91
REFERENCES	92
APPENDICES	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: ELT Learners' Preferences	52
Table 2: ELT Learners' Perceptions: Advantages and Disadvantages of the IWCF	53
Table 3: Instructor vs Researcher's Scores	14951
Table 4: Interrater Reliability Test IIWCF Task 1	60
Table 5: Interrater Reliability Test IIWCF Task 2	60
Table 6: Interrater Reliability Test IIWCF Task 3	61
Table 7: Interrater Reliability Test IIWCF Task 4	62
Table 8: Interrater Reliability Test IIWCF Task 5	62
Table 9: Interrater Reliability Test PIWCF Task 1	63
Table 10: Interrater Reliability Test PIWCF Task 2	63
Table 11: Interrater Reliability Test PIWCF Task 3	64
Table 12: Interrater Reliability Test PIWCF Task 4	65
Table 13: Interrater Reliability Test PIWCF Task 5	65
Table 14: Interrater Reliability Test CIWCF Task 1.....	66
Table 15: Interrater Reliability Test CIWCF Task 2.....	66
Table 16: Interrater Reliability Test CIWCF Task 3.....	67
Table 17: Interrater Reliability Test CIWCF Task 4.....	68
Table 18: Interrater Reliability Test CIWCF Task 5.....	68
Table 19: Written Text Analysis of the Class A, B and C	72
Table 20: Written Text Analysis and Gender Factor in Class A, B and C.....	76

Table 21: EFL Learners' Preferences and Thoughts.....	80
Table 22: EFL Learners' Perceptions: Advantages and Disadvantages of the IWCF	87
Table 23: EFL Learners' Perceptions: EFL Learners' Feelings	149
Table 24: ELT Learners' Perceptions: ELT Learners' Feelings	168

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Ethical Approval Form	106
APPENDIX B: Informed Consent Form.....	107
APPENDIX C: Error Correction Codes	109
APPENDIX D: Written Samples	110
APPENDIX E: Evaluation Criteria	115
APPENDIX F: Written Texts of the EFL Learners	125
APPENDIX G: Class A Questionnaire	140
APPENDIX H: Class B Questionnaire	143
APPENDIX I: Class C Questionnaire	146
APPENDIX J: EFL Learner's Perceptions	149
APPENDIX K: Pseudonyms	150
APPENDIX L: Instructor vs Researcher's Scores	151
APPENDIX M: Interview Transcript.....	155
APPENDIX N: ELT Learner's Perceptions	168
APPENDIX O: Turnitin Report	169

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English as a Second Language

ELT: English Language Teaching

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

WCF: Written Corrective Feedback

IWCF: Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

CIWCF: Collaborative Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

PIWCF: Peer Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

IIWCF: Instructor Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Nowadays, writing has become the prominent skill of language learning as an evaluation for academic achievement in the education sector. Learners spend more time studying their writing skills in order to have full control over their writing skills, and thus, learn to act as a decision maker of their writing process in their language learning classes (Jahin, 2012). Owing to these, having a good command of writing skills in language learning plays a crucial role in reaching academic achievement. For students to have good command of writing skills written corrective feedback (WCF) is a key factor. Two distinctive WCF strategies which are commonly used by instructors have been introduced into the language learning classes (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016). These two major strategies that are used by the instructors in order to respond to the learners' errors can be indicated as direct and indirect WCF (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Regarding the question to the agent giving the feedback, researchers stated different preferences and some of them believed that instructor WCF "affects learner autonomy, whereas learners feel more comfortable with peer" WCF (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 145). In fact, it is believed that, both instructors' and peers' guidance is necessary and collaborative WCF is reviewed as beneficial for the English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' native and foreign language learning from a pedagogical perspective (Elola & Oskoz, 2010). Thus, collaborative WCF is believed to play a major role in the EFL learners' language learning process (Khatri, 2013). This chapter presents information about the background of the study. Further, it discusses information regarding the Turkish Cypriot context. Next, it presents the problem of the study part and provides information regarding the significance of the study. Afterwards, in the following parts it

separately discusses the aim of the study and limitations of the study. Lastly, this part of the study presents the definition of the key terms.

Background of the Study

Raja, Albasher and Farid (2016) imply that “foreign language learning is a process of hypothesis and trial and error occurrence is inevitable” (p. 3). Error correction has invariably been a crucial issue (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Further, Shoja and Narjes (2017) pointed out that “learners’ errors have been an indispensable part of language learning, and the way language instructors deal with them has changed by the advent of new ideas in the realm of language learning” (p. 80). Researchers also pinpoint that instructors consume too much time in order to correct and comment on the learners’ writings (Soja & Narjes, 2017). Next, it is stated that students wait for feedback on their written works, on account of having knowledge about their aptitudes and weak sides (Zaman & Azad, 2012). According to some instructors, error correction is a delicate subject which might be harmful for the learners’ moral uprightness, assertiveness and learners’ attention to the language learning process. For this reason, it is believed that instructors should pay more attention to the error correction process and deal with these errors in a very careful and cautious way (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Likewise, the strategies that instructors use in order to deal with these errors, can be considered as the focus of the language learning and teaching process (Cloete, 2014). This feedback process can be viewed as “an important skill and a valuable part of any language course” (Tangkiengsirisin & Kalra, 2016). Additionally, it plays an essential role on the learners’ language skills and academic achievement (Petchprasert, 2012). Thereby, feedback can be considered as one of the most important ingredients of the language learning process (Yoon, 2011). In this respect, instructors need to include the feedback process into their language teaching.

Consequently, instructors are searching for the best way of providing feedback to the learners. As Rahimi (2015) believes, by the help of noticing the individual differences in terms of the characteristics of the learners and the roles of these differences in the EFL learners' language learning process, instructors could be better able to plan their instructional methods and design the most appropriate writing tasks and error correction techniques that meet their learners' needs. WCF is regarded as one of the most important tools for the language learning process. In order to find out the most appropriate strategies to address the learners' strengths and weaknesses, it can be used as a tool, which helps the learners to develop their writing skills and could be used as "a functional method for language learning" (AbuSeileek & Abualshar, 2014). In short, WCF can be defined as "making positive and negative comments to the learners' errors and mistakes" (Al-Olimat & AbuSeileek, n.d, pp. 3-30).

Above all, WCF helps learners to see their errors and teaches the learners to deal with these errors on their own (Sajjadi, Khabbazi & Sajjadi, 2015). In the same way, WCF sessions are believed to assist the EFL learners during the foreign language learning process and support them to develop their "independent abilities" (Ene & Upton, 2014, p. 81). Due to the positive effects of WCF on the learner's language learning process, it can be concluded that WCF encourages and motivates the learners. Initially, WCF sessions can be viewed as important in both the native and foreign language learning processes (Adel & Alwi, 2014).

In the same way, "the type of corrective feedback affects accuracy in EFL writing" (Hosseiny, 2014, p. 671). In this respect, two well-known types of error correction techniques have been named as direct error correction and indirect error correction (Horbacauskiene & Kasperaviciene, 2015). Regarding this, the main point differentiating these error correction techniques is the learners' participation during the feedback process (Hosseiny, 2014). Moreover, direct error correction involves the indication of the error and

changing it with the correct linguistic form, while indirect error correction only indicates the error that is done by the learners, by underlining or circling it or using symbols and codes to highlight the error (Hosseiny, 2014). In this way, direct error correction helps the learners to see the corrected version of their errors, while indirect error correction puts emphasis on the error and lets the learners to think about their errors and pushes them to find the correct version of the error on their own (Hosseiny, 2014).

In addition to these, certain factors such as gender differences may affect the learner preferences regarding the use of direct and indirect error correction in the language learning process (Pakbaz, 2014). During the error correction and feedback process, in order to find the best WCF type for the learners, instructors need to take the gender differences into consideration. In addition to the effect of some variables such as the gender factor on the error correction process, the agent giving the WCF may affect the process too. Nowadays, one of the most important issues that researchers, instructors and learners debate about in language teaching and learning is the question to who is responsible for providing feedback to the learners. Most of the time the instructor is the one who provides feedback to the learners, and alternatively, s/he might ask the learners to give feedback to each other. However, it is observed that, in both cases there is no significant improvement in the EFL learners' writings. One reason for this "may be the way peers offer their suggestions or corrections, which is usually unsystematic, occasional, and sometimes aggressive" (Zarei & Mahdavi, 2014, p. 92). Furthermore, some learners might prefer to be corrected by their instructor, while others might prefer to be corrected by their peers (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016). Apart from the two agents aforementioned, collaborative feedback may also affect the feedback process in a positive way and "it has been theoretically and empirically acknowledged that collaborative feedback is beneficial to learning achievement" (Dang, 2016, p. 141).

Turkish Cypriot Context

As the feedback process gains a great deal of importance in the worldwide contexts, English language teaching (ELT) instructors have started to pay more attention to the feedback process in the Turkish Cypriot context. There were limited number of researches about the feedback process in the Turkish Cypriot context (Bozyi it & Ek i, 2017; Debrel i & Onuk, 2016; Rezaei & Shokrpour, 2017). In contrast to these, a few researchers in general have focused on the effects of the agent factor in the feedback process (Azevedo et al. 2012; Marzban & Shrijami, 2014; Mowlaie, 2014). Similarly, the number of researches about both EFL learner perceptions and effects of the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) process are quite limited in the worldwide context (Li & He, 2017; Sato, 2013; Srichanyachoni, 2012). As a result of these, instructors are not aware of the importance and effects of the agent factor during the IWCF process. Especially in the Turkish Cypriot context, it seems from my understanding that instructors do not pay attention to provide effective and constructive feedback to the learners. In general, EFL learners receive traditional instructor feedback, where direct error correction is provided by the instructor. Nowadays, some universities have started to provide IWCF to the EFL learners by the use of their departments' own writing correction codes. Additionally, some of them have started to provide peer feedback and a few of them have started to provide collaborative feedback. In order to universalize the use of different agents during the feedback process, we need to point out its effects on the learners' performance. In short, we need to focus more on the issues and dilemmas related with the feedback process in the Turkish Cypriot Context.

Problem of the Study

Primarily, as Shoja and Narjes (2017) indicated "learners' errors have been an indispensable part of language learning, and the way language instructors deal with them has changed by the advent of new ideas in the realm of language learning" (p. 80). Further,

WCF is the process that both instructors and learners are better able to meet their aims and objectives while learning and teaching the language (Petchprasert, 2012). In short, WCF provides help to both learners and instructors in the language learning and teaching process. Similar to these, the agent factor is another important factor that provides help to the learners and instructors, during the feedback sessions and learning process. Consequently, in order to increase the interaction between the learners during the WCF process, we need to learn more about the EFL learners' perceptions toward the WCF process (Sato, 2013, p. 626).

As I experienced during my education, instructors do not focus on the feedback processes and the ones that do, provide traditional instructor feedback to the learners in which the instructor directly corrects the learners' errors. So that, some of the learners do not take the given feedback into consideration, as they know that the instructor is the only agent, who will always check and correct their errors. EFL learners in this specific context seem to be aware of their errors but do not focus on them and do not take them into consideration. Thus, they keep making the same errors and these errors become fossilized. The majority of the learners see the instructor as the only source of feedback and information and they seem to believe that their peers are not as professional and experienced as the instructor to provide feedback, so they do not accept their peers' correction as they do not trust it. On the other hand, during my education, I noticed that I can easily learn and remember the information that the instructor taught, when I collaborate with my peers. However, collaborative feedback in EFL classes had not yet been considered as a feedback technique in this context.

Significance of the Study

As it is revealed, feedback plays an important role in the language learning process (Yoon, 2011). Therefore, supplying corrective feedback to the learners during their writing sessions, "enhances students' ability to find out errors, correct them, and develop their writing performance" (Al-Olimat & AbuSeileek, n.d, p. 13). As a result, they are better able to improve

their language learning skills, especially their writing skills. So that, it is important for the educators to know what kind of feedback is more useful for their learners' language learning process.

More than these, learners' preferences might show some significant differences. For instance, learners might prefer to receive IWCF and there might be the effect of the gender variable. In the same way, until now, none of the experimental studies on these problems have provided any definite answers to these questions. Particularly, by the help of the individual differences and the importance of it in the language learning process, instructors will be better able to design their instructional methods and propose the most appropriate writing tasks and correction techniques that best compensates their learners' weaknesses (Rahimi, 2015).

In the field of English language teaching, the implementation of providing feedback on the learners' writing is one of the most important characteristics of the teaching and learning process (Cloete, 2014). Thus, it will provide a clue about the reason behind why most of the researchers focused on the effects of feedback in the language learning and teaching process in their studies (Dang, 2016). We need to indicate that the feedback process is one of the key factors of the language learning process. In addition to these, how to provide efficient feedback has been a key inquiry in the process-oriented writing instruction for decades (Su, 2011).

In brief, in the Turkish Cypriot context, an investigation needs to be carried out regarding the effects of the agents on the EFL learners writing skills, during the feedback process. Equally as important, the agent factor on the EFL learners writing skills during the IWCF needs to also be investigated. It is also crucial to find out the effects of the collaborative feedback process on the learners and its effects on the learners' performances. Nowadays, there are not many studies about the EFL learners' perceptions towards the agent

factor during the IWCF process in general and none in the Turkish Cypriot context in particular. Therefore, another key element of this study will be related with the EFL learners' perceptions which will help the researchers, pre-service and in-service instructors to better understand the learner needs and increase the quality of the writing process and the education system in the Turkish Cypriot context. In order to do these, we need to focus more on the EFL learners' perceptions toward the agent factor on the learners' writing skills during the IWCF process. Researchers need to focus on the IWCF process taking into account the agent factor and the effect of the gender variable on the learners' writing improvement. Addressing these areas will contribute to the efficacy of feedback in writing classes.

Aim of the Study

As aforementioned, gaining awareness of the IWCF process in the EFL classroom especially with regard to the agent factor is of vital importance. For this reason, this study intends to reveal the most effective agent factor employing IWCF on students' writing improvement and the effects of the gender variable in general, and thereby reveal the students' attitudes towards the IWCF received by different agents in particular.

In order to achieve the aim, the following research questions are asked as a part of the research:

1. Which agent improves students' writing skills the most when indirect written corrective feedback is employed?
2. What are the students' preferences and perceptions regarding the agent giving indirect written corrective feedback?
3. Do the English as a foreign language learners' writing improvement, preferences and perceptions towards the agent factor differ based on their gender?

Limitations of the Study

This research is limited to the Turkish Cypriot context. Thenceforward, the research results might be different acquired to contexts as a result of cultural differences. Therefore, it cannot be generalized to the whole population both in and out of North Cyprus. Another limitation might be the choice of the topics of the written texts may also have an effect on the participants' writing performances and attitudes towards IWCF. In addition, the collected written texts used in this study, have not provided any information regarding the most frequent error types, it has only focused on the errors committed in general. Even though the related literature has introduced two types of written corrective feedback, this study has only employed IWCF. In addition, this study only focuses on three possible agents (instructor, peer, collaborative) to correct errors, self-correction is only fostered through indirect error correction. Likewise, this research is limited with adult elementary level EFL learners. Hence, the research results might be different if it is carried out to different proficiency levels and age classes. Lastly, the EFL participants' number is limited with only sixteen participants in each class, owing to these, the research findings might change if a study is carried out to a larger sum of participants.

Definition of Key Terms

Difference between error correction and corrective feedback. As it is indicated, error correction is the reaction to the writers' expression which was linguistically or factually incorrect, by the agent who corrects the expression itself, whereas corrective feedback includes both error correction, comments and suggestions of the agent for the writing improvement (Tomczyk, 2013).

Written corrective feedback. Al-Olimat and AbuSeileek (n.d) mentioned that corrective feedback "is about providing learner with data about his/her responses whether these responses positive or negative" (p. 5). Furthermore, Sajjadi, Khabbazi and Sajjadi (2015)

revealed that WCF “helps students notice or be aware of language patterns, teaches them how to self-correct, and provides them with good language models” (p. 27). The term WCF refers to the way of providing feedback to the learners, in order to help them to learn about their errors and learn about the correct version of the errors.

Direct error correction. Almasi and Tabrizi (2016) claimed that direct error correction “is a strategy of providing feedback to students to help them correct their errors by providing the correct linguistic form” (p. 75). As Aghajanloo, Mobini and Khosravi (2016) refer that it is the way that learners receive correction through “crossing out the errors and writing the correct forms above them” (p. 33). Thus, through the help of direct corrective feedback, instructors provide feedback to the learners by changing the learner errors’ with their correct version.

Indirect error correction. Yoke et al. (2013) stated that error correction “is when the instructor identifies the error but does not provide the correct form” (p. 176). Almasi and Tabrizi (2016) added on that instructors can “provide general clues regarding the location and nature or type of an error by providing an underline, a circle, a code, a mark, or a highlight on the error, and ask the students to correct the error themselves” (p. 75). To sum up, indirect error correction refers to the error correction, where the instructor just points out the error through clues, codes, symbols or a comment and asks the learner to correct these errors by the help of these codes, symbols, comments and so on.

Agent factor in the corrective feedback process. Agents can be considered as the source of information that notices the learners’ mistakes and fosters their self-regulatory processes (Azevedo et al., 2012). On the other hand, the Business Dictionary (2016) defines the term ‘factor’ as “a constituent or element that brings about certain effects or results, or indicates a specific multiple, number, or quantity” (p. 1). So that, the term agent in this study,

refers to the people such as a instructor, peer or both instructor and peer, who are the source of feedback that the learners' receive IWCF, whereas the term "agent factor" indicates the effects of the instructor, peer and both instructor and peer on the learners' performance.

Instructor IWCF. As Marzban and Sarjami (2014) pointed out that, without any hesitation, instructors' WCF plays a major role in the writing and language learning classes. Thus, as it is understood from its name, instructor IWCF is the process in which the instructor provides IWCF to the learners.

Peer IWCF. Peer IWCF is the process of the participation between the learners, where they take over the instructors' roles and responsibilities such as commenting, correcting or critiquing each other's writings indirectly (Bijami, Kashef & Nejad, 2013). So, peer WCF refers to the process, where the learners provide IWCF to each other.

Collaborative IWCF. Barnawi (2010) defines the term collaborative as the "collaboration between students and students or students and instructors who are engaged in the act of explaining, arguing, and negotiating their ideas with their peers" (pp. 211-212). Indeed, collaborative IWCF is the process, where the learners and teaches collaborate with each other, in order to find out the errors and share their knowledge about these errors indirectly and participate in the learning process all together.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter of the research, presents the related literature and studies about the importance of writing, error correction, feedback, indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF), the agent factor and the gender factor on the English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' language learning process. Following these the chapter discusses the effects of the agent factor on the IWCF process in detail and puts emphasis on instructor, peer and collaborative IWCF.

Writing

Writing plays a key role in the cognition process which leads, composes, and interchanges one's opinions to the reader (Yugandhar, 2015). In fact, a great deal of researchers believe that writing is one of the most difficult skills to be learned by the learners and taught by instructors (Su, 2011). Researchers also argue that, in order to write effectively, we need to make sure that we include "prewriting, organizing, drafting, revising, editing and documenting the final draft" sessions into our writing process (Yugandhar, 2015, p. 25). According to Sarvestani and Pishkar (2015), IWCF helps the learners to improve their quality of writing and they found that IWCF had a positive effect on the writing accuracy. Hence, instructors are searching for the most effective way of teaching and providing IWCF to the learners in order to help the learners' to improve their writing skills (Su, 2011).

Error Correction

Errors are unavoidable in a language learning environment and EFL learners are consistently aware to make errors during speaking and writing classes. Errors can be classified into two groups as global and local errors. Global error includes the whole structure of a

sentence such as the incorrect use of a preposition, whereas local errors have an effect on a specific constituent such as omission of the preposition (Farrokh, 2011). In particular, global errors have an effect on the comprehension, whereas local errors do not have effect on the comprehension (Soadsaud, 2011). Nowadays, instructors are aware of the significance of learner errors in the language learning process (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Learners' accession to the instructor's correction and/or feedback and their efficient use of it assign a major characteristic of the language learning and writing process. During writing lessons where providing feedback is not a component of the instructor's pedagogical implementations, or where learners are inadequate to get the feedback they receive from the instructor on their work, progressing sufficient writing competency is entirely unfeasible (Agbayahoun, 2016). Learner errors are precious feedback for proficient and good educated instructors. Errors are necessary to the learners as they are tools that learners use owing to learn the language. We can assert that, the language instructor's profession is to attentively analyse the psychological process of his/her learners' experience due to comprehending the characteristics and cause of the errors and to rectify these errors (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Errors can be viewed as the indispensable part of the learning process and foreign language learning. Moreover, errors are unavoidable for instructors as the first agents who reply to the learners' inappropriate language productions (Li & He, 2017). Instructors "find these as guiding stars reflecting upon the learning process of learners" alias, the instructor "today is conscious of the fact that errors reflect how much the learners have learned and guide the instructors what next to focus on in language teaching" (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016, p. 5). For these reasons, error correction is viewed as inevitable in the language learning process.

Feedback

Feedback plays an important role in language learning as it encourages extensive learning (Bijami, 2013). Giving response to the learners' writings is a very important part of the writing process (Agbayahoun, 2016). According to Zaman and Azad (2012), feedback is a major element of the foreign language writing pedagogy and learners wait for feedback on their work, on account of having ideas about their strong and weak points (p. 139). Needless to say, feedback plays a prominent role for the development of the learners' writing skills (Srichanyachon, 2012). Regarding these, we can conclude that, feedback is a necessary process in language learning and teaching. Feedback helps the learners to learn from their mistakes and "encourages learners to look closely and critically at their own performance" (Dang, 2016, p. 141). Alvarez, Espasa and Guasch (2012) believed that "feedback plays cognitive, metacognitive and motivational functions" (p. 388). Additionally, feedback can be used as a tool in order to motivate the learners and increase their linguistic awareness in the language learning process (Tsao, Tseng & Wang, 2017). Further, feedback provides a cooperative language learning environment and increases the interaction between the learners. It is argued that feedback is able to "provide learners the guidance and assurance that they are on the right track and offer indications of which track to get on if they are not" (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 139).

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) define the term corrective feedback as the instructors' responses to the learner errors. The term WCF can be identified as the way of "accommodating the new knowledge into the existing knowledge and prompts the learners to stick the learnt stuff in their long term memory" (Maleki & Eslami, 2013, p. 1255). Clearly, it is one of the prominent instruments used by writing instructors to support and cultivate EFL learners' writing accuracy (Phiewma & Padgate, 2017). As Alharbi (2016) indicated that, instructors'

written corrective feedback (WCF) had positive impacts on the learners' writing performances. Practically, corrective feedback is mostly considered as "a constructive tool or as a noticing facilitator" (Dang, 2016, p. 141). In addition to these, the characteristics of WCF can be ranged as organizing, structuring and modifying "the knowledge as a kind of scaffold" and prompting "the learners to stick the learnt stuff in their long term memory" (Eslami, 2014, p. 451). Correspondingly, as AbuSeileek and Abualsha'r (2014) also revealed that WCF aids "learners' writing development and can act as a functional method for language learning" (p. 77). Similar to these, WCF can be viewed as "a vital element for the three of the five dimensions mentioned revision, personal variation, and assistance from external factors" (Yoon, 2011, p. 237). Khorshidi and Rassaei's (2013) pointed out that the achievement of corrective feedback in the language teaching and learning process is influenced by "its format, the type of error corrected, and certain learner characteristics" (p. 72). Nevertheless, it is believed that, EFL learners prefer to receive WCF "in order to identify their errors, and to improve their grammatical and lexical writing accuracy" (Zareil & Rahnama, 2013, p. 11). With regard to the findings of Abadikhah and Ashoori (2012) "the participants who received written corrective feedback after completing the activities outperformed those who did not receive written feedback" (p. 118).

The extent of the WCF can be divided into two groups as the focused and unfocused WCF (Rad & Ghafournia, 2016). Unfocused WCF can be defined as the process, where the instructors provide WCF to every single language error, whereas during focused WCF process errors are classified in separate categories and instructors put more emphasis on "a single error or error category" (Kassim & Ng, 2014, p. 121). As the Alimohammadi and Nejadansari (2014) stated nowadays the majority of the researchers focused on the effects of the focused and unfocused WCF on learner performance. According to the researchers, no difference was found between the performances of the learners who received focused

and unfocused WCF, and they also agreed that both focused and unfocused WCF helped the participants to improve their writing performances (Kassim & Ng, 2014; Rad & Ghafournia, 2016).

There are two types of WCF strategies more frequently used by instructors in the classroom (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016). These two major strategies that are used by instructors in order to respond to the learners' errors can be indicated as indirect and direct WCF (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016). Correspondingly, the role of direct WCF can be defined as a language tool that is used in order to help the learners to see their errors and corrected version of their errors, especially linguistic forms, by the agent. On the other hand, the role of indirect WCF can be defined as an indication that points out to the learner that "an error has been made" (Hosseiny, 2014, p. 669). Indirect WCF (IWCF) "indicates in some way that an error exists but does not provide the correction, thus leaving it to the student to find" (Eslami, 2014, p. 446). During the language learning process, providing indirect error correction with or without comments to the important points that the learners are expected to comprehend is believed to guide the learners better than the direct WCF strategy (Guenette, 2012). Contrarily, for characteristics that are evidently apart from the field of the students or that have not been the theme of instruction, direct error corrections can be used, or errors can merely be ignored. Next, many researchers revealed that IWCF is efficient in developing learners' language and writing abilities (Alhumidi & Uba, 2016). Due to the fact that, DWCF does not enable the learners to think about the foreign language, it might be useful to the learners that are not adequately professional to do self-correction similar to the sample which is admissible for foreign language learning. In contrast to these, IWCF leads the learners "to question their hypotheses about the language, but they may also lead to frustration" and until now "as the tutors discovered through their experience, both strategies can and should be used" (Guenette, 2012, pp. 121-122).

Information that is gathered from the surveys indicated that IWCF is the most common type between the learners and instructors and prominent distinctions exist among the learners' predilections for direct and indirect WCF (Li & He, 2017). A great deal of researches about the impacts of direct and IWCF on grammatical accuracy advancement and a few research not only concluded that "indirect feedback was more effective than direct feedback in promoting grammatical accuracy, but also found that indirect feedback led to either greater or similar levels of accuracy over time" (Phiewma&Padgate, 2017, pp. 1-2). With regard to the research findings, higher proficiency level students prefer to receive IWCF, while lower proficiency level students prefer to receive direct WCF (Zareil&Rahnama, 2013). The majority of the instructors dissuade to use direct error correction, owing to the fact that it may make the learners "feel embarrassed in front of the whole class and may demotivate him in the long run" consequently, "the instructor may correct globally taking the whole class in general or may use peer correction at time" (Raja, Albasher&Farid, 2016, p. 5). To sum up, different kinds of elements may affect the "effectiveness of corrective feedback in language learning" and these elements can range from "the type of feedback (e.g. direct or indirect), the amount of feedback, the mode of feedback (i.e. oral or written), the source of feedback, learners' proficiency level, learners' attitudes towards feedback, learner's aptitude, motivation and anxiety, learner's age of noticing and interpretation of feedback" (Khorshidi&Rassaei, 2013, p. 72).

Agent Factor

As an instructor, giving IWCF is substantially a decision amongst behaving as the contributor or the promoter (Guenette, 2012). In a broader perspective, writing skills play a vital role in the language learning process. The instructor as a source of feedback nearly comprehends the entire role and giving feedback to the learners' errors is one of the most prominent ones (Raja, Albasher&Farid, 2016). In fact, instructors need to pay more attention to

the different and the most effective ways to provide WCF (Marzban&Sarjami, 2014).As Marzban and Sarjami (2014) proposed that despite the great assistance of time and initiative from instructors and learners, the feedback provision procedure is still distant from aim. Raja, Albasher and Farid (2016) declared that in the traditional methods of language teaching, the instructor was known as the exclusively source of information; and therefore it was only the instructors' responsibility to not only provide information but also correct the learners' errors,while the ultimate methods underline the importance of learner autonomy during the error correction and language learning process. Subsequently, Dang (2016) puts forward the claim that in writing “feedback can be seen as a lens through which to view the gaps or mismatches of language use and it can be classified into instructor feedback (IF), and peer feedback (PF)” (p. 141).Initially, instructor feedback plays a major role in English writing classes (Marzban&Sarjami, 2014). As it is understood, during the feedback process agents can be separated into sub categories such as instructor, peer and both instructor and peer which is known as collaborative feedback. In the following paragraphs, I will provide information about these agents that guide the learners during the feedback process.

Instructor.Significance of the instructor IWCF has extremely been certificated by a substantial frame of study in the fields of English as a second language (ESL) and EFL writing. Both of these fields, particularly in language learning classes in which learning is process-oriented, instructors and learners have approved the critical advantage of the instructor's IWCF (Agbayahoun, 2016). This is why, nowadays, a great deal of studies have been focusing on the instructors' WCF and its' effect on the learners' performance during the foreign language learning process (Wen, 2013). Instructor's IWCF is characterized in the literature as “any comments, questions, or error corrections that are written on student's assignments” and also “it can take variety of forms: questions, error corrections, praises, suggestions, criticisms, and so on” (Agbayahoun, 2016, p. 1896). Researchers, alleged that

instructor indirect written corrective feedback (IIWCF) consists of comments, indications and advice, besides of only error corrections, so that learners perceive it as more positively and by the help of the discussions, they get familiar with the content that they are studying (Alvarez, Espasa & Guasch, 2012). Equally, in accordance with the previous studies in English as a second language learning, IWCF is viewed as a beneficial tool that is used to encourage revision and to stimulate the learning to write. Hence, instructors give IWCF on learner writing to assist the learners' writing advancement and to encourage them to be more responsible for their writing process. The instructors' comments on the learners' tasks provide information to the learners about the quality of their writing and its effect on their writing performance (Agbayahoun, 2016). In their study, Soleimani and Jamzivar (2014) investigated about the effectiveness of instructor based IWCF and according to the research findings instructor direct correction in which the learners mostly receive in the Iranian context was not seen as useful. Regarding the question to "Who should give feedback-instructors or learners?" the researchers stated different preferences. Some of them believed that IIWCF "affects learner autonomy, whereas learners feel more comfortable with peer indirect written correct feedback (PIWCF)" (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 145). As it is believed the traditional learner writes instructor corrects technique which is widespread in the education system is not the only beneficial and convenient technique conversely, there are more convenient practices that might lead to better consequences (Soleimani & Jamzivar, 2014).

Peer. Many researchers explored that IWCF which was given by peers could be more efficient in increasing the writing proficiency of the EFL learners in comparison to IIWCF (Soleimani & Jamzivar, 2014). Accordingly, PIWCF can be used as an alternative option to IIWCF. Therefore, instructors "should try to delegate more duties to their learners in language classes, and apply PIWCF techniques while working" on the writing skill (Soleimani & Jamzivar, 2014, pp. 8-9). PIWCF, appears to be a beneficial and encouraging way

to analyse the problem. Instructors can also use this technique to influence learners' imagination and train them to become more analytical and autonomous learners. PIWCF is viewed as a prominent tool in advancing the process of developing the English language and writing skills. It can also be an option to provide contemporary probabilities for both writer and the agent (Yugandhar, 2015). Nonetheless, the term PIWCF can be viewed as the process in which pairs of students work "together with the instructor's scaffolding" (Barnawi, 2010, p. 211). Many names have been given to PIWCF, like peer feedback, peer editing, peer response, peer review and peer evaluation, and during these processes, we can consider the learners as the only source of knowledge and "interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained instructor, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing" (Bijami, 2013, p. 93).

Besides, the term PIWCF can be called as a substantial dominant tool in advancing the process of learning to write in the English language and it can be considered as a social activity. In contrast to IIWCF, PIWCF is believed to create a more learner centered environment. It helps the learners to be more active in the feedback process and to get more involved in the language learning process, rather than passively receiving the information (Su, 2011). PIWCF is seen to influence learners' "writing performances, which in turn means that the students do incorporate suggestions made by their instructor and/or peers while revising their drafts" to sum up, "peer-reviews in the form of comments and suggestions given by the students on one another's drafts" are proved to be beneficial (Ketabi & Torabi, 2012, p. 99). PIWCF is appreciated by many educators and researchers for encouraging learners' collaboration and independence and it is believed to provide an extensive language learning environment in which learners can take advantage of the feedback and variety of knowledge they receive from other peers (Al-Ghazali, 2015). It is viewed as a substantial powerful

instrument in advancing the process of EFL writing. It is also considered as a social activity (Bijami, 2013, p. 91). It is progressively administered in writing classes thenceforth the commonness of communicative method in modern times, and it has been verified as an efficient method to advance the writing skill, to enhance the motivation to writing, and to become competent in proceeding writing as a social and collaborative work (Yugandhar, 2015).

As it is indicated, PIWCF is a recent method for the subsequent two features. Firstly, in comparison to IIWCF, PIWCF emphasizes the importance of the learners' role. In PIWCF sessions, learners become active reviewers than the passive receivers, where the learners advance their problem solving abilities by themselves and in the long run superior to the more learner autonomy. Another reason is that PIWCF sessions presumably "create a friendly and supportive atmosphere, which can have an effect on students' use of feedback" and "in this environment, PIWCF is less threatening and less authoritative than instructors' comments" so that, "instead of using IIWCF out of deference of authority, students tend to reflect peer comments critically, negotiate with each other freely, show their doubts about the comments, and decide the aspects to revise" (Su, 2011, pp. 366-367). Peer interaction is useful as it provides a friendly, relaxed, a more learner centred and interactive classroom environment. In addition to these, it gives responsibility of learning to the learners so, learners feel more motivated and involved in the learning process, with the sense of achievement (Raja, Albasher & Farid, 2016).

In accordance with the learner perceptions "making mistakes is a part of learning and they can help each other in improving their writings by interacting and collaborating with each other" and also, the interaction and collaboration between students enable them to "learn from each other and make the learning environment less anxious and stressful" (Ç. Yastiba & E. Yastiba, 2015, p. 537). In addition, it is claimed that EFL learners have positive

attitudes toward PIWCF sessions and they find it more useful in terms of developing their writing skills (Cha, 2014). According to the findings of Sato (2013), EFL learners indicated that both peer interaction and PIWCF were efficient for the improvement of the language skills. EFL learners receiving PIWCF in writing lessons are seen to have less writing anxiety, enhanced self-confidence, and found more chance to collaborate in the classroom and learn from each other (Ç. Yastıba & E. Yastıba, 2015, p. 537). Learner reviews about the PIWCF process are not negative owing to the fact that, they suppose the learners believe it decreases their writing anxiety and helps them to become more confident in writing classes. To sum up, there are a variety of impacts of PIWCF on EFL writing anxiety (Ç. Yastıba & E. Yastıba, 2015, p. 532). The research finding of Shokrpour, Keshavarz and Jafari (n.d) revealed that, PIWCF sessions “engaged the students in frequent reading and writing, fostered their critical reading and reflection, sharpened their writing knowledge and skills, helped them to manage their learning schedule, increased their motivation and joy of writing, and promoted their information literacy” more than these, they also agreed that the peer rendering work indicated their accomplishment of mastership and writership (p. 32). Relying on the perceptions of the learners, it can be said that providing PIWCF is a trustworthy technique to increase the collaboration between the learners in the EFL writing classes.

Research has stated that PIWCF in writing classes is beneficial as a result of the social and cognitive effects of the PIWCF (Bijami, 2013). In the same way, PIWCF sessions help the learners to improve their writing skills (Yugandhar, 2015). It advances learners’ writing skills through proceeding “their use of effective composing processes since they can share ideas while planning, drafting, and revising writing forms” and “it also reduces the anxiety of students who can get constructive feedback on their writing from other peers instead of their instructors” (Al-Ghazali, 2015, p. 1). According to research findings, the usage of PIWCF in writing lessons decreased the learners’ writing anxiety from the point of

somatic, cognitive and abstinence anxiety. As a result of these, PIWCF was seen to reduce the students' writing anxiety levels and as a consequence of the "reduction in writing anxiety levels, the students' physical and cognitive reactions to writing anxiety changed in a positive way by the end of the study, and it encouraged students to use English to write compositions" therefore, PIWCF "can be used in writing classes in order to decrease the students' writing anxiety levels" (Ç. Yastiba & E. Yastiba, 2015, p. 537).

PIWCF on writing helps the learners to get involved in the learning process and to advance their autonomy and knowledge by creating new opportunities to think more critical. It is substantial that PIWCF plays a major role in writing instruction, as it maintains "a flexible platform to help students writing practice" (Bijami, 2013, p. 95). Similarly, Soleimani and Jamzivar's (2014) research findings revealed that, EFL learners' who received PIWCF, performed better than the EFL learners' that received only IIWCF. Additionally, Kahyalar and Yılmaz (2016) put forward the claim that the class who received PIWCF in their study performed better than the class that received IIWCF and they made less grammatical and mechanical errors during the writing process. Besides, PIWCF sessions "can be a way to open up new possibilities for both writer and reviewer" and "it has been proved as an effective approach to improve the writing skill, to increase motivation to writing, and to learn how to treat writing as a collaborative social activity" (Yugandhar, 2015, p. 25). It enhances motivation owing to the feeling of self-responsibility, and it has an effect on the learners' self-confidence too. Thenceforward, EFL readers observe that other learners "make the same mistakes or go through the same difficulties, they are relieved, their apprehension decreases" meanwhile, "their confidence increases" and "the peers can discuss the reasons of revision required on their writings and question them" (Ç. Yastiba & E. Yastiba, 2015, p. 532). For these reasons, PIWCF is regarded as encouraging and educational (Ç. Yastiba & E. Yastiba, 2015). Likewise, PIWCF helps the learners to become good writers who become competent in

planning, organising, drafting, revising and editing. Secondly, it influences the learner engagement, which is mostly psychological (Al-Ghazali, 2015). It is also indicated that, the eventual pedagogical goal is merely to direct the learners “to become independent of the instructor’s instructions” (Wen, 2013, p. 428). Further, “revision based on such feedback reinforced the idea that the students were writing for real audience other than the instructor” and it is proved that the PIWCF on a few drafts increased the learners’ writing performances from the beginning of the writing process until the learners’ final product as it provides learners an “opportunity to improve their critical thinking abilities in a learner-centred and non-threatening classroom atmosphere” (Ketabi&Torabi, 2012, p. 99). Through convenient education, learners could learn to provide more specific and helpful IWCF and with the help of acknowledging and implementing the skills needed for PIWCF, by supplying the environment of mutual respect and reliance, restricting the role of peer reviewer to that of an instructor and providing the independence of adjusting the recommendation to the writer would advance the quality of PIWCF (Yugandhar, 2015, p. 25). In short, learners developed their autonomy in writing, they “wrote more frequently and accurately, and most importantly, felt empowered as writers” (Bijami, Kashef & Nejad, 2013; Shokrpour, Keshavarz&Jafari, n.d, p. 32). To sum up, PIWCF enhances learners’ writing ability and motivation, and also it is believed to provide a relaxed, comfortable and friendly classroom atmosphere, where the learners learn the language more meaningfully, autonomously and independently.

Instructor versus Peer. Instructors help and feedback is believed to be an indispensable part of the learning process by the EFL learners (Khatri, 2013, p. 74). The instructor is considered as the authority and the provider of knowledge. Taking this into account the learners undervalue the IWCF of their peers as they consider the instructor as the more informed one that they receive correct IWCF and probability is related with the learners unawareness of the points to be corrected, they undervalue the level of information they

receive (Al-Ghazali, 2015). Likewise, EFL learners' autonomy could be affected from the instructors' from context to context (Zaman & Azad, 2012). As well as, Gielen et al. (2010) clarify that despite that peers and instructors follow the same evaluation criteria, instructors' IWCF is more advanced as the instructor is more professional and s/he provides more reliable IWCF, in contrast, instructors have to spend more time for the personal interaction among the all class members, so that, providing PIWCF an advantage at this point. In short, EFL learners believe that receiving IWCF from the instructor is more reliable as the instructor is the most proficient person and s/he is the authority of the classroom. Similarly, as the instructor is the most informed person in the classroom, it is believed that instructor provides correct and accurate IWCF. As opposed to the positive reviews about the instructors' IWCF, it is also claimed that as the instructor has the autonomy of the class, it affects the learners' autonomy so, learners do not feel relaxed and comfortable with the instructors' IWCF (Zaman & Azad, 2012).

On the other hand, instructors need to spend time with each learner separately for this reason providing PIWCF is seen to be more advantageous (Gielen et al., 2010). As Zaman and Azad (2012) believe that learners' perceptions toward the IWCF process can differ from context to context. Besides, "another factor affecting student receptiveness of PIWCF is mostly cultural" and as the learners "tend to avoid criticising the work of others, considering it offensive" so that, "they believe this job is ascribed to classroom instructors rather than students" (Al-Ghazali, 2015, pp. 11-12). For instance, according to the Bangladesh culture "learners are not open to criticism by their classmates" and "they do not feel quite comfortable that their writings are being corrected by their peers" further, "learners cannot rely on their peers" in terms of IWCF (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 145). It is revealed that, PIWCF sessions might affect the learner's performance in a negative way because of "both practical and psychological reasons" which could be range from learners readiness to share

his/her work with others, to “the sense of competition/lack of openness of mind resulting from lack of proficiency and confidence” (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 146). Moreover, more proficient EFL learners do not find their PIWCF reliable (Yang & Meng, 2013). So that, as it is indicated in the study of Kavaliauskiene and Darginaviciene (2010), EFL participants preferred to receive IIWCF to PIWCF. In the same way, there are strong negative “comments about peer review and cautioned that some peers are likely to comment on surface errors and give advice that does not help revision” (Bijami, 2013, p. 94). As it is mentioned in the study of Zaman and Azad (2012), approximately 47% of the EFL learners who participated in their study revealed that they enjoy receiving IWCF from their peers, 28.33% indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed while, 42.50% indicated they do not trust the feedback given by their classmates and these statements were “supported by the instructors’ opinions as almost 59% of the instructors thought that their learners were “not proficient enough to give PIWCF” (p. 145). In addition to this, PIWCF was seen to be an inefficient method for advancing learners’ writing. For this reason IIWCF is preferred to PIWCF (Bijami, Kashef & Nejad, 2013). Nonetheless, students have positive perceptions towards PIWCF although, they cannot trust it. More than these, it is believed to create more comfortable and relaxed environment. To sum up, PIWCF is believed to be unreliable and an untrustworthy technique for the writing and learning process as the EFL learners believe that their peers are not proficient enough to provide correct and accurate feedback. Likewise, some of the EFL learners might perceive their peers IWCF as criticism and offensive so, it might cause them to feel humiliated.

Collaborative. Yugandhar (2015) puts forward the claim that PIWCF is “meant to complement the IIWCF rather than to replace it” (p. 25). However, “if PIWCF is guided and followed by IIWCF, it may build confidence in learners, and then it may be more constructive” (Zaman & Azad, 2012, p. 146). PIWCF intends to adjunct IIWCF more than to substitute it (Yugandhar, 2015, p. 25). In collaborative indirect written corrective feedback

(CIWCF) sessions, instructors guide the learners and provide help to them whenever they need help. In order to accomplish the learner dependence on the instructors, it is believed to be more effective to combine both IIWCF and PIWCF, leastways throughout the preliminary learner implementation of PIWCF (Al-Ghazali, 2015). Therefore, the feedback session, where both the learners' and instructors are included into the process of writing, which is called "CIWCF", can be considered as more effective and beneficial than only receiving PIWCF and/or IIWCF (Zaman & Azad, 2012). In the same way, dissimilar with the PIWCF, the term CIWCF is generally "perceived as joint intellectual efforts among students and between students and instructors, and it is the mutual engagement of the group members in a coordinated effort to complete a particular task" (Barnawi, 2010, p. 211). Notably, as Guasch, Espasa and Alvarez (2010) claimed that "Feedback could be one type of support, seen as a joint activity which entails active interaction between students and the instructors, including how students receive and utilize the feedback" (p. 49). Clearly, IWCF fosters the self-confidence and "built important communication bridges between learners and the instructor who worked with them" (Ketabi&Torabi, 2012, p. 107). All things consider that CIWCF sessions can be used by the instructor as a language learning activity in order to help the learners to revise the information that they learned during their language learning process (Phiewma&Padgate, 2017).

According to the Khatri' s (2013) IWCF and collaboration between the learners, instructors' assistance and rewriting sessions play a major role in EFL classes. Research findings illustrate that the experimental class, who received CIWCF performed better than the other classes that received only PIWCF or IIWCF (Marzban&Sarjami, 2014, p. 293). Similarly, Motallebzadeh and Amirabadi (2013) stated that EFL learners who received CIWCF performed better than the instructor and peer IWCF classes. Further, during CIWCF sessions, learners are guided and supported by their instructors with the suggestions and

comments they make. So, through the use of it, learners are better able to understand whether they are on the right track (Zaman & Azad, 2012). Likewise, it is reported that, CIWCF sessions help “to enhance significantly the adult EFL learners’ oral skill performance and their motivation toward learning English” (Zahedi & Tabatabaei, 2012, p. 56). Moreover, CIWCF sessions are found to be beneficial to both learners’ mother tongue and the foreign language learning process from a pedagogical perspective. These benefits can range from increasing the learner knowledge about the language, fostering reflective thinking to the emboldening to the grammatical accuracy, lexis and discourse (Elola & Oskoz, 2010). Elola and Oskoz (2010) stated that, during the class hours that EFL learners engaged in CIWCF, they learned from each other’s mistakes and they figured out that “the analysis and critique of their ideas enhanced not only the content but also the overall quality of their essays” (p. 59). Conversely, Barnawi’s (2010) research findings revealed that some EFL learners do not want to provide or receive PIWCF because of the possible misunderstandings by their peers. As a consequence of the PIWCF, EFL learners’ supposed that their friends may get offended and humiliated. So, CIWCF might not be effective at all (Barnawi, 2010, p. 215).

Nonetheless, most learners have positive attitudes toward the CIWCF sessions (Ajmi & Ali, 2014, p. 1). Notably, Dang’s (2016) study revealed that eight EFL learners stated that they liked CIWCF as (1) the tasks that they corrected were particular, appropriate to their language proficiency level, and questionable, and (2) it increased the participation between the learners so that, their interest to the lesson increased by the help of the collaboration and also it encouraged learners to be more engaged in the lesson. Moreover, it was found that learners improved their writing skills after receiving IWCF and they enjoyed to work collaboratively during the IWCF sessions. To sum up, only instructors’ or only peers’ IWCF might cause negative effects on the EFL learners’ performance. These negative effects could range from negative feelings to incorrect learning and unreliability of the IWCF. More than

these, EFL learners believe that only instructors' or only peers' IWCF is not effective at all but through the combination of both, the writing and learning process could be more efficient and effective as it creates a collaborative and supportive environment. As it is mentioned above, EFL learners believe that both peers' and instructors' IWCF are important and necessary for the improvement of their writing skills. Therewithal, CIWCF helps the learners to increase the communication between each other so, it increases their self-confidence and they feel more comfortable in the language learning environment. Lastly, it is found to be beneficial for revising the information and leads to meaningful learning.

Gender and IWCF

Lastly, some variables such as gender differences might have effect on the learners' perceptions toward the IWCF (Pakbaz, 2014). Further, gender can be considered as one of the features of psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic techniques (Khorshidi & Rassaei, 2013). As Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) reported that gender has become a vital variable in terms of IWCF as "there are few studies about males' and females' preferences" from different agents, during the IWCF process (p. 74). In the light of Li and He's (2017) research findings it can be said that "gender difference significantly influences learners' preference" during the IWCF process (p. 63). Similar to these, Jebreil, Azizifar and Gowhary (2015) asserted that there is an effect of the gender factor on the learner performance. In contrast to these, some studies indicated that, there is no significant difference between the preferences of female and male EFL learners regarding the feedback process (Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015, p. 78). More than these, there is no prominent distinctions among the females and males as regards to their predilections for corrective feedback apart from their preference of the requirement of error correction and the "no corrective feedback option" alias, females and males were shown significant differences in evaluating requirement of error correction "and also choosing no corrective feedback as a viable option" (Khorshi & Rassaei, 2013, p. 71). Furthermore, the

research findings of Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) indicated that “88 learners agreed with error correction by instructors, whereas 51 learners agreed with peer-correction. However, there no statistically significant difference was found between male and female learners in delivering agents: peer-correction and instructor correction” (Khorshidi&Rassaei, 2013, p. 80).

To sum up, in the language learning process, learners’ preferences among the agent that they receive IWCF might show some significant differences. According to the studies and the findings of the researchers reviewed for this research, there needs to be more research, in order to learn more about the effects of the agent factor on the EFL learners’ IWCF process. Following this, this study also aims to find out the EFL learners’ perceptions toward the different agents that they want to receive feedback. Finally, the research aims to find out, whether some variables such as gender influence the EFL learners’ perceptions toward the different agents in the IWCF process.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter of the research presents the design of the research and its procedures. Following this, it discusses the participants and sampling. Next, it presents information regarding the data collection procedures, materials and data analysis procedures. Finally, it provides detailed information with regard to the ethical considerations of the study.

Research Design and Procedures

Primarily, this research focused on the elementary level English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' written texts analysis, in order to find the effects of the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) process. Three different elementary classes with three different instructors at a private university's Preparatory school were employed to carry out the study. The classes were selected by the Head of the Preparatory School and the instructors of these classes orally agreed to participate in the study. The EFL learners' in these classes were the participants of the study. In short, the classes and instructors were selected by the deputy director of the Preparatory School. Before carrying out the study the learners' background information such as their English proficiency levels, scores that they received from the language proficiency exam, departments that they will study in the future were obtained from the coordinators of the preparatory school. This was done to understand the language proficiency level of the participants, and by the help of this information, it was aimed to detect the improvement of the participants' writings.

Notably, these classes followed a skills-based syllabus. Hamidi and Montazeri (2015) define the skills-based syllabus as the sampling, ranging and justification of the content of the curriculum. In brief, it is a type of syllabus which focuses on the basic skills of

language learning namely, listening, speaking, reading and writing. Importantly, the preparatory school's 'Writing Correction Codes' criteria was used during the IWCF process (see Appendix C). As aforementioned in the Literature Review chapter of this thesis, it is evident that IWCF has more of an effect in terms of writing development compared to direct written corrective feedback (DWCF). For this reason, it was decided to choose IWCF in this study as it was believed that it would be more beneficial and effective to improve the participants' writings. Following these, the three classes underwent IWCF from three different agents separately. The three different classes were named as "A", "B" and "C" as they received IWCF from different agents. The researcher asked the instructors to give only instructor indirect written corrective feedback (IIWCF) to class "A", only peer indirect written corrective feedback (PIWCF) to class "B", and only collaborative indirect written corrective feedback (CIWCF) to the class "C". To be able to carry out such IWCF the instructors were trained and informed about how to give IWCF before the study took place in order to make sure that all three classes were following the same procedure. Then, the instructors trained their classes (the EFL learners) during a lesson (50 minutes). According to these, class A's instructor was the only person who provided IWCF to the participants. Basically, the instructor checked the participants' work and provided IWCF to them by using the preparatory school's writing correction codes for the errors. In addition to these, the agents also provided IWCF by writing their comments and suggestions on the EFL learners' written tasks. In class B, peer IWCF was provided to the participants, the instructor paired the learners and asked them to give IWCF to each other by using the preparatory school's writing correction codes and making comments and suggestions (see Appendix F for an example). Lastly, in class C, CIWCF was provided to the learners. The instructor collected the learners' work and provided IWCF to each of the written texts by using the preparatory school's writing correction codes (see Appendix C). Importantly, during this process, the instructor

provided unfocused IWCF, in order to put emphasis on every single error committed (Rad & Ghafournia, 2016). Then, the instructor highlighted the global errors and wrote these errors on a piece of paper (see Appendix F). The instructor provided IWCF to the participants' global errors as global errors affect the meaning of the sentences and the readers' understanding (Soadsaud, 2011). Afterwards, during the class hour, without giving any names, the instructor wrote these errors on the board and asked the learners to look at the board and find the errors, correct them and make suggestions and comments. All of the participants participated in the lesson, tried to correct the given errors and then discussed the errors and modified them accordingly (see Appendix F). Noticeably, during the class discussion, the instructor provided focused IWCF, as it is not possible to discuss every single error committed by each participant. However, the participants' global errors were discussed in the classroom and the corrections were limited with a few preselected types of errors (Rad & Ghafournia, 2016). Finally, after a fifteen minute discussion the instructor and learners wrote the correct version of these errors on the board and the learners wrote the errors and the corrected version of these errors in their notebooks (see Appendix F). To sum up, class A in which received IIWCF was used as the control group and class B and C were used as the experimental groups.

Five different writing topics were selected with the instructors before the treatment phase of five weeks. Every Thursday, the instructors asked the learners to write a composition (see sample in Appendix D) about the given topic in the classroom and every Wednesday, they received IWCF from the agent for the written text analysis in order to find out more about the effects of three different agents when giving IWCF to the EFL learners' written texts. In addition to these, every Monday, the participants' written texts were collected by the researcher and were photocopied. The copies of each classes' written texts were stored in different personal folders. This data collection process lasted for five weeks in total. The topics

of the written texts were as follows; week 1: Introducing myself, week 2: My everyday routines, week 3: Advertisement, week 4: My bedroom, and week 5: My favourite restaurant (see Appendix D).

Subsequently, all of the instructors were asked to rate the given written texts of different classes (score each written text out of ten), in accordance with the Preparatory School's written text assessment criteria (see Appendix E). Lastly, all of these texts were collected back from the instructors by the researcher, and the researcher gave scores to these texts by using the same assessment criteria (see Appendix E) and scored the written texts out of ten. After five weeks of instruction and IWCF, the researcher distributed a questionnaire to all the participants in order to find out their perceptions toward the different agents in the IWCF process (see Appendix G, H and I). After collecting the data for the written text analysis and questionnaire, a semi-structured interview which involved both open and close ended questions was carried out. The participants were asked questions related to their preferences and perceptions toward the agent factor during the IWCF process.

This research was based on a quasi-experimental design. It is a quasi-experimental design in the sense that the participants were present and not selected by the researcher. A quasi-experimental design "typically allows the researcher to control the assignment to the treatment condition, but using some criterion other than random assignment" (Estarki & Bazyar, 2016, p. 414). A mixed methods approach was employed. A mixed methods approach consists of both the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data (Green, 2015). As the study included both qualitative data which aimed to convert data into categorical form and quantitative data which aimed to convert the data into numerical form, written texts, a semi-structured interview and a questionnaire were used as its data collection tools.

Participants and Sampling

This study employed convenience sampling, where the specific type of data collected from the class members were conveniently available to participate in the study. Convenience sampling is known as “a type of nonprobability sampling, where the members of the target population that meet certain practical criteria, such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate” (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2016, p. 2). As it is stated convenience sampling is where the particular type of non-probability sampling withstands on the data gathering from population members that are conveniently available to participate in the study (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2012).

All of the participants in the selected classes wrote a written text and received IWCF. The data were collected during the 2017-2018 fall semester, from the preparatory school of a private university in North Cyprus. The sample groups in this research consisted of 16 participants in class A where IIWCF was provided to the learners, 16 participants in class B where PIWCF was provided to the learners and 16 participants in class C where CIWCF was provided to the learners.

All the participants in the selected classes were elementary level as they all scored between 20 and 60 per cent in the university’s language proficiency examination. In total, 48 EFL learners acted as the participants of this study. Noticeably, there were an equal number of female and male participants in all classes (class A, B and C). In brief, in each class there were eight female and eight male participants. In total, 24 female and 24 male EFL learners participated in the study. All the participants were adults as they were above the age of 18. In addition to these, the participants in class A came from Kuwait, Libya, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Qatar, and ten of them came from Turkey. Moreover, in class B, they came from Libya, Palestine, Somalia, and Turkmenistan, whereas two of them came from Jordan, an equal

number of them came from Syria, and eight of them came from Turkey. Likewise, the participants in class C came from Egypt, Jordan, North Cyprus, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen, whereas ten of them came from Turkey. As it is understood by the countries of the participants, their native languages were different. However, all the participants are considered EFL learners. All of the learners were going to study in different departments when they finalize the preparatory school.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was carried out to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaires (see Appendix G, H and I). The participants of the pilot study were the second year learners who were studying at the ELT department. Additionally, these participants received IIWCF, PIWCF and CIWCF from different courses. The participants consisted of 10 EFL learners in each group in total 30 participants. These participants were also divided into three groups. Participants of group A filled in the questionnaire for the IIWCF, participants of group B filled in the questionnaire for PIWCF and the participants of group C filled in the questionnaire for CIWCF. Importantly, the questionnaire was prepared by the researcher and checked by the researcher's supervisor. After the analysis of the pilot questionnaire, the data indicated that findings were reliable and there were no changes made by the researcher.

ELT Participants' Preferences

As it is shown in Table 1, the majority of the participants in group A stated that, if they had another chance to receive feedback, they would mostly like to receive feedback collaboratively (M: 2.90, SD: 0.31), followed by instructor IWCF (M: 1.90, SD: 0.56) and they indicated that they did not want to receive IWCF from their peers (M: 1.20, SD: 0.42). Moreover, the participants in group B indicated that if they had another chance to receive feedback, they mostly would like to receive IWCF from their instructor (M: 2.50, SD: 0.70), then they would prefer to receive IWCF collaboratively (M: 2.10, SD: 0.31) as a second

option and they indicated that they would not prefer to receive IWCF from their peers (M: 1.20, SD: 0.63). Additionally, the majority of the participants in group C revealed that if they had another chance to receive feedback, they would mostly like to receive IWCF collaboratively (M: 2.80, SD: 0.42), whereas the minority of them preferred to receive PIWCF (M: 1.30, SD: 0.48) and a few of them claimed that they would like to receive IIWCF (M: 1.90, SD: 0.73).

Table 1

ELT Learner Preferences

Statements	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive IIWCF.	10	1.90	0.56	2.50	0.70	1.90	0.73
2. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive PIWCF.	10	1.20	0.42	1.20	0.63	1.30	0.48
3. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive CIWCF.	10	2.90	0.31	2.10	0.31	2.80	0.42
Valid N (listwise)	10						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

ELT Participants' Perceptions: Advantages and Disadvantages of the IWCF

In addition to the participant preferences, the first part of the questionnaire asked the participants to indicate whether IWCF had any advantages and disadvantages. The results showed that the participants in group A agreed that receiving IWCF had more advantages (M: 1.80, SD: 0.42) over disadvantages (M: 1.20, SD: 0.42) (see Table 2). As illustrated in Table 2 the participants in group B agreed that receiving IWCF had more disadvantages (M: 1.70, SD: 0.48) than advantages (M: 1.10, SD: 0.31). Likewise, the participants in class C agreed that

IWCF had more advantages (M: 1.90, SD: 0.31) compared to the disadvantages (M: 1.10, SD: 0.31) (see Table 2).

Table 2

Advantages and Disadvantages of IWCF

Advantages and disadvantages of IWCF	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. I think receiving feedback has advantages.	10	1.80	0.42	1.10	0.31	1.90	0.31
2. I think receiving feedback has disadvantages.	10	1.20	0.42	1.70	0.48	1.10	0.31
Valid N (listwise)	10						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

ELT Learners' Perceptions: ELT Learners' Feelings

As the pilot study findings revealed, the ELT learners' feelings towards the agent factor during the IWCF process were as follows.

Table 24 points out that, the majority of the participants in group A felt: more motivated (M: 3.10, SD: 1.28), relaxed (M: 2.60, SD: 1.35), comfortable (M: 2.60, SD: 1.26), knowledgeable (M: 3.50, SD: 1.26), confident (M: 2.80, SD: 1.22), and neutral (M: 3.00, SD: 1.56); more or less anxious (M: 1.50, SD: 0.85), proud (M: 2.10, SD: 2.07), nervous (M: 1.60, SD: 1.50), depressed (M: 1.10, SD: 1.59), shy (M: 1.10, SD: 1.28), confused (M: 1.30, SD: 0.82), worried (M: 1.20, SD: 1.31), upset (M: 1.10, SD: 1.19), frustrated (M: 1.10, SD: 1.10) and stressed (M: 1.40, SD: 1.07); less humiliated (M: 0.90, SD: 1.28), offended (M: 0.60, SD: 0.96), disappointed (M: 0.90, SD: 1.10) when they received IWCF from their instructor (see Appendix N).

Moreover, the participants of group B, who received IWCF from their peers mentioned that they felt more knowledgeable (M: 3.10, SD: 1.72), relaxed (M: 2.90, SD: 1.52), confident (M: 3.10, SD: 1.66), neutral (M: 2.80, SD: 2.80), comfortable (M: 3.40, SD: 1.43), and motivated (M: 3.50, SD: 1.71); more or less humiliated (M: 1.60, SD: 1.71), frustrated (M: 1.00, SD: 1.15), stressed (M: 1.60, SD: 1.26), proud (M: 2.40, SD: 1.57), shy (M: 1.10, SD: 1.44), anxious (M: 1.00, SD: 0.66), worried (M: 1.50, SD: 1.17), confused (M: 1.70, SD: 1.25), nervous (M: 1.50, SD: 1.78), and disappointed (M: 1.50, SD: 1.50); less depressed (M: 0.80, SD: 1.39), upset (M: 0.40, SD: 0.69), and offended (M: 0.90, SD: 1.10) during the IWCF process (see Appendix N).

Further, the majority of the participants in group C agreed that they felt more confident (M: 3.20, SD: 1.75), motivated (M: 3.60, SD: 1.42), knowledgeable (M: 3.80, SD: 1.13), comfortable (M: 2.80, SD: 0.42), and proud (M: 2.80, SD: 1.61); more or less relaxed (M: 2.20, SD: 0.78), neutral (M: 2.20, SD: 1.75), shy (M: 1.00, SD: 1.24), stressed (M: 1.30, SD: 1.56), anxious (M: 1.20, SD: 1.54), and nervous (M: 1.40, SD: 1.50); less worried (M: 0.80, SD: 1.03), confused (M: 0.90, SD: 0.73), offended (M: 0.10, SD: 0.31), humiliated (M: 0.40, SD: 0.96), disappointed (M: 0.70, SD: 1.05), upset (M: 0.70, SD: 1.15), frustrated (M: 0.90, SD: 1.10) and depressed (M: 0.40, SD: 0.96) (see Appendix N).

To sum up, there were some significant differences and similarities found between the feelings of the participants in group A, B and C towards the IWCF process. Primarily, the participants in class A, B and C felt more confident, motivated, knowledgeable and comfortable, whereas the participants of the group B felt more relaxed than the participants in groups A and C, and the participants in groups A and B felt more neutral than the participants of group C. Contrarily, the participants of group C felt more proud than the participants in groups A and B. In contrast to these, the participants in all groups felt less offended, whereas the participants in groups A and C felt less disappointed and humiliated than the participants in

group B. Further, the participants in groups A and C felt less depressed and upset than the participants in group B. Finally, the participants in groups A, B and C agreed that they felt more or less stressed, anxious, nervous and shy, whereas the participants in groups B and C felt more or less worried, confused and frustrated than the participants of group A while the participants of group C felt more or less proud, depressed and upset than the participants of groups A and B (see Appendix N).

Data Collection

Data were collected both quantitatively and qualitatively. The quantitative data were collected through the written texts produced by the EFL participants and a questionnaire which was administered after the treatment phase, and the qualitative data were collected through the interviews conducted again after the treatment phase.

Written Texts. The study employed a written text analysis. The participants' written texts and scores were analysed, in order to learn more about whether there was an effect of the agent factor on the participants' writing skills when IWCF was employed (see Appendix D and F). All of the participants wrote paragraphs for each week (five weeks in total) and they received IWCF from the different agents. The written texts of the classes were collected and put in separate folders for each week as week 1, week 2, week 3, week 4 and week 5 by the researcher. Afterwards, these folders were given to the instructors of the different classes. For instance, all the written texts of class A were given to class C's instructor, class B's written texts were given to class A's instructor and class C's written texts were given to class B's instructor and all of the instructors were asked to rate the given written texts, in accordance with the preparatory school's written text assessment criteria (see Appendix E) and scored out of ten. Finally, all of these texts were collected back from the

instructors by the researcher, and the researcher also scored (out of ten) the texts by using the same assessment criteria (see Appendix E).

Questionnaire. The study employed a researcher-made questionnaire in which both open and close ended questions were administered. Through the use of open ended questions, it was aimed to learn more about each participants' unique thoughts about a specific subject, whereas the close ended questions aimed to provide generalized data about the participants' perceptions (Jamshed, 2014; Singh, 2010). The questionnaire was distributed to all of the participants. Noticeably, there was a difference between the questionnaire of class A, class B and class C as they did not receive the IWCF from the same agent. As a result, each class had their own personal questionnaire so three questionnaires were created in total. First of all, the participants were asked about their biographical information such as gender and native language by choosing the appropriate option (see Appendix G, H and I). Even though gender was the only variable used for the analysis of the data, the native language of the participants was asked to make sure all the participants were EFL learners. In part A of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to indicate their preferences regarding the agent factor during the IWCF process, and there were three options, where the participants were asked to choose one of the given options appropriate for them. Further, for the same statement, in order to learn more about the participants' preferences, the participants were asked to provide a reason behind their preferences, for this a blank was provided for the participants. Additionally, in the same part they were asked about the advantages and disadvantages of the IWCF, and there were two options, where the participants were asked to choose one of the given options. Afterwards, in part B, there were 19 statements about the participant's feelings and the participants were asked to rate these statements by indicating a five point Likert scale that ranged from zero which is least to five which is the most that showed the participants' level of agreement (see Appendix G, H and I). Finally, in the last

part of the questionnaire, the participants were asked to add any extra or missing points about the IWCF process and agent factor or the IWCF process in general (see Appendix G, H and I). All the participants were asked to fill in the questionnaire in class at different lesson hours. These lesson hours were decided by the school authorities and the class instructors'. It took 20 minutes for the participants to complete the questionnaire and hand them back to the researcher.

Interview. At the end of the five week treatment phase, six of the participants from each class were asked questions related to their experience regarding the IWCF process.

As the participants' language proficiency level was low (elementary), in order to answer the questions freely they spoke in their native language. During the semi-structured interview, the participants were asked about their perceptions by the use of a schematic presentation (symbolic and simplified) of questions and it took seven minutes to interview each participant, in total it took two hours to interview all of the participants (see Appendix M). As it is indicated above, semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect the data regarding the participant perceptions, through the use of simplified and symbolic questions (Jamshed, 2014; Singh, 2010).

Semi-structured interviews were administered to six volunteer participants from each class. In total 18 volunteer participants were interviewed about their perceptions toward the agents that they received IWCF. Noticeably, half of the participants in each class were female and the other half were male. So, in each class there were three female and three male participants. In the first part of the interview both open-ended and close ended questions were employed, the participants were asked about their thoughts regarding the IWCF process and the agent factor. By asking open ended questions, it was aimed to receive free-form answers from the participants (Farrell, 2016). In the second part of the interview, where the participants

were asked about their beliefs, in addition to the open ended questions, close ended questions were employed. By asking close ended questions, the participants were expected to provide yes or no answers to the given questions (Farrell, 2016). Then, in the first and second parts, by the use of open-ended questions, the participants were asked about their feelings and preferences regarding the agent factor during the IWCF process. Finally, in the last part of the interview the participants were asked about whether they wanted to add anything about the IWCF.

To sum up, the following interview questions were asked:

1. Do you think that written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) is an essential part of the learning process/developing your writing skills? Why?
2. Is there any advantages of receiving written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) from instructor/ peer/ instructor and peer? If yes, what are these?
3. Is there any disadvantages of receiving written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) from instructor/ peer/ instructor and peer? If yes, what are these?
4. How do you feel, when you receive written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) from the instructor / peer / instructor and peer? Do you feel shy, confident, anxious, nervous, upset, depressed, relaxed, motivated, humiliated or offended? Why?
5. Do you feel that you are improving your language proficiency in general (i.e., all skills, sub-skills) or only in writing when you receive written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction)? Why or why not?

6. If you had another chance to receive written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) from your instructor / peer / both instructor and peer, which one would you prefer? Why?
7. Is there anything that you want to add or share anything about written- corrective feedback (feedback/error correction) in the language learning process?

Data Analysis

Written Text Analysis. Data, regarding the written text analysis was analysed through the following procedures and steps. First of all, as mentioned in the paragraphs above, the instructors and the researcher graded the written texts individually, out of ten (see Appendix L). Then, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson's r) was used to examine the relationship between the instructors' and the researchers' evaluation given for the five written texts written by the three classes. A Pearson's r also identified as a Pearson product-moment coefficient was employed taking into account that it is "used with variables that have a curvilinear relationship, the resulting correlation is an underestimate of the true relationship between these variables" (Ravid, 2011, p. 119). These procedures were applied to affirm the reliability of the instructors' evaluation. Likewise, the 2-tailed significance tests were used in order to find out whether there is a positive or negative correlation between the variables and the relationship between these variables is statistically significant or not (see Table 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 & 18).

Table 4

IWCF Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	0.96 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	0.96 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 4 shows, values less than 0.50 are used to represent the poor reliability whereas, values between 0.50 and 0.75 represents adequate reliability. On the other hand, good reliability is represented between 0.75 and 0.90, whereas values higher than 0.90 are considered as the highest reliability value. According to the findings in Table 4, Pearson correlation value was 0.96, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 1 in which, IWCF was provided to the participants. So the scores given by both raters were reliable.

Table 5

IWCF Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	1.00 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1.00 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the findings shown in Table 5, Pearson correlation value was 1.00, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 2 in which, IIWCF was provided to the participants. So, the scores given by both raters were reliable.

Table 6

IIWCF Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	0.98 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	0.98 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the findings in Table 6, Pearson correlation value was 0.98, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 3 in which, IIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 7

IWCF Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	0.96 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	0.96 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to the findings in Table 7, Pearson correlation value was 0.96, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 4 in which, IWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 8

IWCF Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	0.95 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	0.95 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 8 shows, Pearson correlation value was 0.95, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 5 in

which,IIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 9

PIWCF Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.99**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.99**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.00	
	N	16	16

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 9 reveals, Pearson correlation value was 0.99, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 6 in which, PIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 10

PIWCF Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.99**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.99**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 10 shows, Pearson correlation value was 0.99, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 7 in which, PIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 11

PIWCF Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.98 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.98 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 11 illustrates, Pearson correlation value was 0.98, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 8 in which, PIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 12

PIWCF Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.95 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.95 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 12 presents, Pearson correlation value was 0.95, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 9 in which, PIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 13

PIWCF Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.98 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.98 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 13 indicates, Pearson correlation value was 0.98, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 10

in which, PIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 14

CIWCF Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.97**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.97**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 14, Pearson correlation value was 0.97, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 11 in which, CIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 15

CIWCF Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.97**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.97**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 15 illustrates, Pearson correlation value was 0.97, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 12 in which, CIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 16

CIWCF Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.94 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.94 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 16 demonstrates, Pearson correlation value was 0.94, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 13 in which, CIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 17

CIWCF Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.97 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.97 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 17 represents, Pearson correlation value was 0.97, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 14 in which, CIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

Table 18

CIWCF Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	0.96 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.00
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	0.96 ^{**}	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00	
	N	16	16

^{**}. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As Table 18 illustrates, Pearson correlation value was 0.96, so the value of the reliability is at the highest point, which means that there is a positive correlation between the lecturer's and researcher's marks. In brief, there was no significant difference found between the two raters' scores: the scores that were given by the researcher and instructor for task 15

in which, CIWCF was provided to the participants. This means that the scores of both raters were reliable.

To sum up, as the interrater reliability tests' results indicated there was a positive correlation between the variables and the relationship between these variables was statistically significant. As a result of these tests, it was found that there was almost no difference found between the given scores by the instructors and the researchers. So, it was found that the evaluation of the instructors for the five written texts of the three classes were reliable.

Afterwards, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 20.; descriptive statistics were used in order to find out the effects of the different agents on the improvement of the participants' writing skills. Through the use of ANOVA, potential differences in "a scale-level dependent variable by a nominal level variable having two or more categories" were assessed (Solutions, 2013). Subsequently, each classes' written text scores were compared among each other adopting Analysis of Variance test (ANOVA). In order to present the findings, mean scores and standard deviation were used. Then, an independent samples t-test was used, in order to find out the differences and similarities between the female and male participants' writing improvement in each class, considering that it is used to "examine the difference between two unrelated or sets of measurements" and "to compare the means of data from two groups" (Samuels, 2015, p. 2) Likewise, several histograms were used in order to illustrate the distribution of the data.

Questionnaire Analysis. On the other hand, in the first and second part of the questionnaire descriptive statistics (SPSS) was used in order to analyse the frequency of the participants' preferences and perceptions. Next, each classes' preferences and perceptions were compared among each other adopting ANOVA.

Interview Analysis. The interview data which was related with the underlying reasons behind the participants' preferences and perceptions toward the agent factor was analysed through the use of a constant comparison method, where the participants answers were analysed for key patterns and the framework method, where the data was analysed for the themes. The constant comparison method is defined by Kolb (2012) as the method which is used to generate and divide the social values of the participants into categories or themes. First of all, the interview data was separated into the themes and the participants' answers were divided into two groups as positive and negative perceptions. Subsequently, the themes of each participant's interview transcript was separated in order to find out why their perceptions were positive or negative. Then, these patterns were identified, categorised and coded by the researcher (see Appendix M).

Ethical Considerations

First of all, an ethical approval form was filled in and sent via email for ethical clearance to the Graduate School of Educational Sciences, before starting to collect the data for the study (see Appendix A). Then, permission from the Head of the Department was obtained before carrying out the study. Lastly, the permission of the class instructors and participants were obtained (see Appendix B).

Before administering the interview and questionnaire to the participants, informed consent was obtained in order to refer to the ethical rules of the research (see Appendix B). More than these, for the analysis of the EFL learners' written texts, the instructors' permission were obtained through the informed consent statement (see Appendix B). Data was collected completely anonymously and the participants' names were not asked. Pseudonyms were used in order to provide information about the interview data; as the research gave importance to the anonymity and privacy of the participants (see Appendix K). In addition to these, the researcher did not allow anyone to see the questionnaires, interview

transcripts and written texts, and they were stored in different personal folders and named as “class A, class B and class C”. These folders were categorized as week 1, week 2, week 3, week 4 and week 5 which indicated the written texts obtained for each week and during these processes pseudonyms were used for the anonymity of the participants’ written texts.

Importantly, this research was employed in accordance with the publication guide of the American Psychological Association’s (APA) 2010 6th edition, on account of the prevention of plagiarism. As a result of these, all the information regarding the data and materials, that were used and/or indicated in this research, were reported considering the APA (2010) 6th edition guide. Further, the ‘turnitin’ software report was received in order to avoid any variety of indefiniteness with regard to the plagiarism (see Appendix O). Turnitin is defined as the widely known instrument which helps to notice the learner’s plagiarism (Ali, 2013).

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Introduction

In this chapter of the research, information regarding the results of the written text analysis and the data regarding the answers of the first research question which was about the effects of the agent factor on the English as a foreign language (EFL) participants' performance, when indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) is employed will be discussed. Thenceforward, the data regarding the answer of the second research question, which was about the effect of the gender factor on the EFL participants' performance when IWCF is employed by different agents will be presented. Afterwards, the EFL participants' perception toward the agent factor during the IWCF process will be presented.

Written Text

To be able to answer whether the agent factor has an effect on the learners' performance, and which agent improves EFL learners' writing skills the most when IWCF is employed, this study compared three classes who received IWCF from three different agents namely, instructor, peer and collaborative.

Table 19

The Most Effective Agent

Tasks	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1	16	2.38	1.74	1.38	2.84	2.31	2.12
2	16	2.31	2.33	2.38	2.18	3.25	1.57
3	16	2.19	2.13	0.63	2.70	2.69	1.74
4	16	2.69	1.53	1.50	1.93	2.31	1.95
5	16	1.69	1.58	0.13	2.50	2.56	1.99
Valid N (listwise)	16						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

Instructor. Class A in which received instructor IWCF seemed not to have improved their writing skills in their first (M: 2.38, SD: 1.74), second (M: 2.31, SD: 2.33) and third (M: 2.19, SD: 2.13) tasks (see Table 19). On the other hand, performed better during their fourth (M: 2.69, SD: 1.53) task compared to their first (M: 2.38, SD: 1.74), second (M: 2.31, SD: 2.33) and third (M: 2.19, SD: 2.13) tasks. However, their writing performance seemed to decrease in the fifth (M: 1.69, SD: 1.58) task. This finding was dissimilar to that of Alharbi (2016) who found out that, instructors' written corrective feedback (WCF) had positive effects on the participants' writing skills. In class A, where the IIWCF was provided to the EFL learners, six out of six participants in the interview agreed that IIWCF was an essential part of the learning process and developing learner writing skills. Initially, Jane, Carol, Isabel, John, Jack and Robert mentioned that IIWCF is an essential part of the learning process and they all agreed that it helped them to improve their writings. This was apparent in the words of Carol specifically who put forth that 'by the help of the IIWCF that we received from our instructor, we learned about our mistakes so that, our writing improved and we started to write more accurately'.

Peer. Secondly, class B who received IWCF from their peers also seemed to not have improved their writing skills from task one (M: 1.38, SD: 2.84) to five (M: 1.69, SD: 1.58) (see Table 19). According to the findings, it is observed that there is a significant improvement in class B's writings from task 1 (M: 1.38, SD: 2.84) to task 2 (M: 2.38, SD: 2.18) while there is a rapid decrease in their third (M: 0.63, SD: 2.70) task. Nevertheless, the participants increased their writing performance during their fourth (M: 1.50, SD: 1.93) task. In comparison to their performance during the fourth (M: 1.50, SD: 1.93) task, there was a rapid decrease in the fifth (M: 0.13, SD: 2.50) task. Dissimilar to the findings of Yoon (2011) who indicated that EFL participants' performances increased after receiving peer IWCF, there was no improvement in class B's writing performances. With respect to the interview, three

out of six participants in class B (Alice, Dean and Sam) all agreed that IWCF is the essential for language learning which were seen in the words of Alice who agreed that 'IWCF is an essential part of the learning process, because it helps us to reach the correct information whereas three out of six participants in class B (Diana, Janessa and Bob) indicated that IWCF was essential but PIWCF is not reliable at all as they do not trust their peers' IWCF which was apparent in the words of Janessa, who stated that 'I think it is essential, but if we receive the IWCF from the instructor, because I do not trust my peers' IWCF, as all of us are not proficient enough to give IWCF to each other'.

Collaborative. As illustrated in Table 19 class C who received IWCF collaboratively showed improvement in their writing skills during their performance of the five tasks. It is observed that there is a significant improvement in class C's participants' writing performance from task 1 (M: 2.31, SD: 2.12), task 2 (M: 3.25, SD: 1.57), task 3 (M: 2.69, SD: 1.74), task 4 (M: 2.31, SD: 1.95), to task 5 (M: 2.56, SD: 1.99). This finding is in line with the findings of Motallebzadeh and Amirabadi (2013) whose EFL learners who received collaborative indirect written corrective feedback (CIWCF) performed better than the instructor and peer IWCF classes. In class C, where the CIWCF was provided to the EFL participants, all of them asserted that (in the interview) the CIWCF was beneficial. The participants also claimed that, CIWCF is educative and informative, so that, it helps them to improve their writing skills. Six out of six participants in class C (Rose, Elsa, Fiona, Tom, Smith and Mike) revealed that CIWCF was essential for the language learning process which was significantly evident in the words of Fiona who stated that 'CIWCF is essential, because it is educative and informative'.

In brief, similar to the results of Dang's (2016) findings, the participants who received IWCF collaboratively performed better than the classes that received instructor and peer IWCF. Kahyalar and Yilmaz (2016) mentioned that the class who received peer IWCF in

their study performed better than the class that received instructor IWCF and they made less grammatical and mechanical errors during the writing process. Contrary to this finding, this study reveals that CIWCF is the most effective agent when giving IWCF followed by instructor then peer.

Effects of Gender

In order to find out the most effective agent when receiving IWCF the results of the five tasks were compared according to the gender of the participants. As it was found, there is an effect of the participants' gender on their writing performances. The findings were in line with the findings of Jebreil, Azizifar and Gowhary (2015) whose study asserted that there is an effect of the gender factor on the learner performance. The findings of this study showed that there is a significant difference between the writing performances of the female and male participants in class A, B and C who received IWCF from different agents. According to the findings, the female participants in class B and C performed better than the male participants, while the male participants in class A performed better than the females. As the results have indicated, there is an effect of both the agent and gender factor on the EFL participants' writing performances and as the findings revealed peer and collaborative IWCF had more positive effects on the female participants' writing performances, whereas instructor IWCF had more positive effects on the male participants' writing performances. As a result, it is claimed that peers affected the female participants' learning performances in a positive way, whereas the instructor affected the male participants' learning performances in a positive way. Table 20 reveals the results of the gender variable on the writing performances of the three classes and the effects of the agent factor (see Table 20).

Table 20

Gender and Writing Improvement

Tasks	Gender	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
			M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1	female	8	2.38	1.84	2.38	2.32	3.00	1.41
	male	8	2.38	1.76	0.38	3.11	1.63	2.56
2	female	8	1.13	2.53	3.00	1.92	3.63	0.74
	male	8	3.50	1.41	1.75	2.37	2.88	2.10
3	female	8	1.50	2.07	0.50	2.67	3.38	0.74
	male	8	2.88	2.10	0.75	2.91	2.00	2.20
4	female	8	2.63	1.40	1.50	2.07	2.88	1.24
	male	8	2.75	1.75	1.50	1.92	1.50	2.43
5	female	8	2.00	1.06	1.00	2.39	3.75	1.03
	male	8	1.38	1.99	-0.25	2.43	1.38	2.06
Valid N		8						
(listwise)								

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

Instructor. Both the male and female participants who received IWCF seemed to not have improved their writing performances as aforementioned however, it was found out that the female participants performed better in their first task (M: 2.38, SD: 1.84) compared to their second (M: 1.13, SD: 2.53) and third tasks (M: 1.50, SD: 2.07). Moreover, it was also observed that they increased their writing performance in task 4 (M: 2.63, SD: 1.40), while their writing performances decreased in their final task (M: 2.00, SD: 1.06). In the same way, the males performed better in their second (M: 3.50, SD: 1.41), third (M: 2.88, SD: 2.10) and fourth tasks (M: 2.75, SD: 1.75) compared to their first task (M: 2.38, SD: 1.76), while their writing performances decreased in the fifth task (M: 1.38, SD: 1.99). In short, the male participants performed better than the female learners during their second (M: 3.50, SD: 1.41), third (M: 2.88, SD: 2.10) and fourth (M: 2.75, SD: 1.75) tasks, while the female participants performed better than the male participants in task 5 (M: 2.00, SD: 1.06). Likewise, there was no difference between the performance of the female and male participants in class A, in task

1 (M: 2.38, FSD: 1.84, MSD: 1.76). When the participants were asked about their perceptions regarding the effect of the IIWCF on their writing performances during the interview session, six out of six participants in class A, where the IIWCF was provided to the EFL learners, the participants agreed that, they feel that they are improving their language proficiency in general. These findings were also made evident in the words of Carol, Isabel, Jack, Jane, John, and Robert who agreed that IIWCF helped them improve their writing skills, as they received IWCF from their instructors, they did not keep repeating the errors which were seen in the words of John who claimed that ‘I improve my language with IIWCF because I have a chance to see my mistakes and after repeating the same mistake a few times and receiving the IWCF for it several times, I learned to write more accurately’.

Peer. Class B who received peer indirect written corrective feedback (PIWCF) were believed to not have improved their writing performances for the five tasks set. In terms of gender it was found that the female participants performed better than the male participants in their writing skills (see Table 20). The results of the written text analysis of the female participants in class B, proved that the female participants performed better in their second task (M: 3.00, SD: 1.92) in comparison to their first (M: 2.38, SD: 2.32) task, while their writing performance rapidly decreased in their third (M: 0.50, SD: 2.67), fourth (M: 1.50, SD: 2.07) and fifth tasks (M: 1.00, SD: 2.39). On the other hand, the male participants’ written text analysis revealed that they performed better in their second (M: 1.75, SD: 2.37), third (M: 0.75, SD: 2.91) and fourth (M: 1.50, SD: 1.92) tasks compared to their first task (M: 0.38, SD: 3.11). The results asserted that the male EFL participants’ writing performance rapidly decreased during their last task (M: -0.25, SD: 2.43). As a result, the female participants performed better during tasks 1 (M: 2.38, SD: 2.32), 2 (M: 3.00, SD: 1.92), and 5 (M: 1.00, SD: 2.39) compared to the male participants, while the male participants performed slightly better than the female participants in task 3 (M: 0.75, SD: 2.91). Further, both female and

male participants in this class received almost similar mean scores. When the participants were asked about their perceptions towards the effects of the PIWCF on their writing improvement, as similar with the findings of the Yang and Meng (2013), six out of six participants revealed that they do not trust their peers' IWCF. These results were also made evident in the words of Alice, Bob, Dean, Diana, Janessa, and Sam who put forward the claim that PIWCF was not reliable as the IWCF that they received from their peers might be incorrect or improper, and their peers are not skilled enough, so they do not trust their peers' IWCF. This was apparent in the words of Janessa who implied that 'I do not trust my peers' IWCF. Honestly, I feel that I didn't improve my language skills, during the PIWCF sessions'. Contrarily, two out of six participants in class B (Alice and Bob) put forth that, reliability of the IWCF depends on their peers' language proficiency level. This was also evident in the words of Bob who mentioned that 'reliability depends on the peer that I receive IWCF. If s/he is proficient enough to provide IWCF, my language skills will improve, if not, as I will receive incorrect or improper IWCF, my language proficiency level will decrease'.

Collaborative. The results regarding gender and writing performance in terms of IWCF received collaboratively revealed that the female participants improved their writing skills more than the male participants. The findings of the written text analysis of the female participants in class C demonstrated that the female participants performed better in their second (M: 3.63, SD: 0.74) and third (M: 3.38, SD: 0.74) tasks in comparison to their first task (M: 3.00, SD: 1.41), while their writing performance decreased a little bit during their fourth task (M: 2.88, SD: 1.24) and rapidly increased in their fifth task (M: 3.75, SD: 1.03). While, the written text analysis results of the male participants in class B inferred that they rapidly increased their writing performance in their second (M: 2.88, SD: 2.10), third (M: 2.00, SD: 2.20) and fourth tasks (M: 1.50, SD: 2.43) compared to their first task (M: 1.63, SD: 2.56) while their writing performance decreased in their fifth task (M: 1.38, SD: 2.06). As it is

indicated by the research findings, the female participants performed better in their first (M: 3.00, SD: 1.41), second (M: 3.63, SD: 0.74), third (M: 3.38, SD: 0.74), fourth (M: 2.88, SD: 2.10) and fifth tasks (M: 3.75, SD: 1.03) compared to the male participants. In general, the female participants in class C, performed better than the male participants in all tasks. When the participants were asked about their perceptions regarding the effect of the CIWCF on their writing performances during the interview session, Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom believed that they improve their language skills by the help of CIWCF that they receive, as they learn new information and ideas from their instructors and peers. This was apparent in the words of Mike who asserted that 'I improved my language skills, because in addition to our mistakes, we have a chance to see our peers' mistakes and we try to correct these mistakes too and while doing these, we learn from our peers' mistakes too'. To conclude, it is better to work with both the instructor and peers during the writing process (Gielen, Tops, Dochy, Onghena & Smeets, 2010).

EFL Learners' Preferences towards the Agent Factor

A questionnaire was administered to the participants to reveal their preferences and perceptions regarding the agent in which they received IWCF from. Moreover, the questionnaire aimed to find an answer to the second research question which sought to find out the perceptions of the EFL participants who received IWCF from different agents (see Table 21).

Table 21

EFL Learner Preferences

Statements	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
4. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive IIWCF.	16	2.13	0.71	2.44	0.62	2.06	0.25
5. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive PIWCF.	16	1.38	0.80	1.19	0.54	1.00	0.00
6. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive CIWCF.	16	2.50	0.51	2.38	0.61	2.94	0.25
Valid N (listwise)	16						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

Instructor.As it is shown in Table 21, the majority of the participants in class A, who received IWCF from their instructor stated that if they had another chance to receive feedback, they mostly would like to receive feedback collaboratively (M:2.50, SD: 0.51), then they preferred to receive IWCF from their instructor (M: 2.13, SD: 0.71) as a second option and they indicated that they did not want to receive IWCF from their peers (M: 1.38, SD: 0.80). In the study of Kavaliauskiene and Darginaviciene (2010), when the participants were asked about their preferences among instructor and peer IWCF, more than 90% of the participants agreed that IIWCF was effective, whereas more than 40% of them agreed that PIWCF was not beneficial. Similarly, the findings of Gielen et al. (2010) revealed that although both the peers and the instructor followed the same process during the IWCF process, it was found out that IIWCF was more reliable, trustworthy and more sophisticated, whereas PIWCF was found to be an inefficient method to use during the writing process.

During the interview sessions, two out of the six participants in class A, agreed that if they had another chance to receive IWCF from another agent, they would like to receive it

from the instructor, as IICWF is more beneficial and the instructor is the best feedback agent, s/he knows more than the learners, her/his feedback is reliable, s/he is the agent that knows the participants' language proficiency level and provides appropriate IWCF to the participants. These results were also made evident in the words of Isabel and John who put forth that IICWF is reliable as the instructor is the most knowledgeable person in the classroom. Isabel (class A) stated that the 'instructor is the most knowledgeable and proficient person. Therefore, we never doubt about the reliability of the IWCF. Then, she never laughs at us for our mistakes'. Contrarily, one out of six participants who would like to receive PIWCF added on that PIWCF is more enjoyable and peers always say the truth to them which was seen in the words of Jack who stated that 'I like to share my ideas with my ideas with my peers because we never judge to each other with our mistakes, we just say the truth to each other'.

Next, three out of six participants emphasized that they can learn from each other's mistakes and both peers and instructor should be included in to the learning process, in order to receive appropriate and reliable feedback. Carol, Jane and Robert referred that both the instructor and peers have important roles in the IWCF process as it provides a more effective language learning environment. This was seen in the words of Carol who argued that 'collaboration is important for the learning process, because sometimes one of the agents might miss to notice our mistakes. In that case, if we collaborate during the IWCF process, we might overcome to this problem and we learn more effectively'.

Peer. Table 21 illustrates that the majority of the participants in class B who received IWCF from their peers indicated that if they had another chance to receive feedback, they mostly would like to receive IWCF from their instructor (M: 2.44, SD: 0.62), then they would prefer to receive IWCF collaboratively (M: 2.38, SD: 0.61) as a second option and they indicated that they would not prefer to receive IWCF from their peers at all (M: 1.19, SD:

0.54). This was similar to the findings of Zaman and Azad (2012) who stated that EFL learners prefer IIWCF to PIWCF. Two out of six participants in class A, namely Alice and Sam explained the reason behind their preferences during the interview sessions as IIWCF is more reliable because the instructor is the most proficient person in the classroom, s/he provides perfect feedback, IIWCF is more beneficial, and s/he knows better than them. These were apparent in the words of Sam who stated that 'Instructor is the most proficient and reliable source, so that we do not have any hesitations about the correctness of the IWCF provided by her/him'.

On the other hand, one out of six participants who would like to receive IWCF from their peers, namely Bob stated that PIWCF is more memorable, enjoyable and it provides a more relaxed and comfortable environment. This result was also specified in his words during the interview process 'by the help of the PIWCF that I received I feel more relaxed, and motivated as my peers help me to notice my mistakes'. Whereas, three out of the six participants, namely Dean, Diana and Janessa who would like to receive IWCF collaboratively indicated that CIWCF might be more beneficial as they have a chance to receive IWCF from both the instructor and peer. Moreover, they revealed that CIWCF might be more informative as they have a chance to share their ideas, mistakes, errors with each other and collaborate during the learning process. These findings were also made evident in the words of Diana who stated that 'I prefer to receive CIWCF, as the both peers and instructor collaborate during the IWCF process. Additionally, I think there would be more supportive and creative environment, and also it is more reliable'.

Collaborative. As illustrated in Table 21 the majority of the participants in class C who received IWCF collaboratively stated that if they had another chance to receive feedback, they mostly would like to receive feedback collaboratively (M: 2.94, SD: 0.25), their next preference would be IIWCF (M: 2.06, SD: 0.25) as a second option and they emphasized that

a few of them wanted to receive IWCF from their peers (M: 1.00, SD: 0.00). As it is shown in Table 21, an ample number of the participants in class C who received IWCF collaboratively stated that they would like to receive IWCF collaboratively (M: 2.94, SD: 0.25), whereas the minority of them preferred to receive IWCF (M: 2.06, SD: 0.25) and none of them claimed that they would like to receive IWCF from their peers (M: 1.00, SD: 0.00). These findings were also similar with the findings of the Dorcas, et al. (2014), who claimed that the participants who received IWCF collaboratively or from the instructor agreed that if they had another chance they would like to receive IWCF collaboratively. More than these, six out of six participants in class C, namely Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom explained the reason behind their preferences as they believed the instructor provides correct IWCF and s/he affects the learning process. However, they insisted that CIWCF is more reliable, enjoyable, comfortable and supportive. Additionally, they emphasized that CIWCF increases motivation, is more memorable and is believed to help them become more proficient learners. These findings were also made evident in the words of Fiona who referred that 'both the instructor and peers were helpful for the writing process, so that, I would prefer to receive CIWCF. By the help of both peers' and the instructors' IWCF, I felt more motivated and learned'. As similar to the Alvarez, Espasa and Guasch's (2012) research findings, the participants who received IWCF collaboratively in the writing process, and the participants who worked with their peers or an instructor, stated that they had a chance to 'promote the exchange of thoughts and ideas with each other' (p. 387). The participants who received CIWCF liked to collaborate and share their ideas with their peers and the instructor during the writing process. Further, by the help of CIWCF the participants found a chance to see and learn about their peers' errors and learn from them. Similarly, they mentioned that their peers are helpful and the instructor is the most reliable source to receive IWCF so that, the language learning process becomes more effective. What is more, two out of six participants (Mike and

Rose)also referred that by the help of CIWCF sessions, they felt more energetic and motivated. These results were also made evident in the words of Mike who inferred that ‘I would like to receive CIWCF, because we learn about each other’s mistakes and I feel more confident as I was not the only person in the classroom who made a mistake. For this reason, I feel more motivated’.

EFL Learners Perceptions towards the Agent Factor

The second part of the questionnaire aimed to find out the EFL learners’ feelings towards the agent factor during the IWCF process (see Appendix J).

Feelings.As the findings pointed out the majority of the participants in class A felt: more motivated (M: 3.81, SD: 1.55), relaxed (M: 3.81, SD: 1.32) comfortable (M: 3.63, SD: 0.96), knowledgeable (M: 3.50, SD: 1.26), confident (M: 3.63, SD: 1.58), proud (M: 2.81, SD: 1.90); less anxious (M: 0.94, SD: 1.28), nervous (M: 0.94, SD: 1.52), depressed (M: 0.88, SD: 1.40), disappointed (M: 0.69, SD: 1.40), confused (M: 0.56, SD: 0.96), worried (M: 0.38, SD: 0.71), upset (M: 0.25, SD: 0.57), frustrated (M: 0.19, SD: 0.40), humiliated (M: 0.13, SD: 0.34), and offended (M: 0.13, SD: 0.34),while they felt more or less neutral (M: 1.63, SD: 1.89), stressed (M: 1.63, SD: 1.70), and shy (M: 1.25, SD: 1.73)when they received IWCF from their instructor(see Appendix J). Six out of six participants in class A, namely Carol, Isabel, Jack, Jane, John, and Robertagreed that they felt more confident, comfortable and knowledgeable during the IIWCF process. These results were also made evident in the words of Isabel, who emphasized during the interview session that ‘I feel comfortable, happy and knowledgeable, because I learn about my mistakes by the help of IIWCF’.

Further, the participants of class B, who received IWCF from their peers mentioned that they felt more knowledgeable (M: 3.19, SD: 1.64), confident (M: 3.06, SD: 1.38), comfortable (M: 3.00, SD: 1.78), and motivated (M: 2.94, SD: 1.91); less depressed (M: 0.81,

SD: 1.64), upset (M: 0.75, SD: 1.43), humiliated (M: 0.69, SD: 1.53), frustrated (M: 0.56, SD: 1.41), and offended (M: 0.50, SD: 1.21); more or less stressed (M: 2.56, SD: 1.86), relaxed (M: 2.13, SD: 1.96), proud (M: 2.00, SD: 1.41), neutral (M: 2.31, SD: 2.08), shy (M: 1.38, SD: 1.50), anxious (M: 1.25, SD: 1.34), worried (M: 1.25, SD: 1.84), confused (M: 1.19, SD: 1.37), nervous (M: 1.06, SD: 1.43), and disappointed (M: 1.00, SD: 1.63) during the IWCF process (see Appendix J). Two out of six participants, namely Janessa and Dean agreed that during the PIWCF process they felt more confident and relaxed as they received IWCF from their peers. These results were also made evident in the words of Janessa, who emphasized during the interview session that ‘I felt confident with the PIWCF, because no one is better than anyone in the classroom’. On the contrary, four out of six participants in class B, namely Alice, Bob, Diana, and Sam referred that they felt less humiliated, frustrated and offended as their peers checked to their written texts. This was mostly apparent in the words of Sam who claimed that ‘when I received PIWCF, I felt less humiliated and offended as my peers checked my work, because they were not better than me, so that no one can laugh at another. Everyone in the class made mistakes while writing’.

In contrast to these, the majority of the EFL participants stated that they felt more confident (M: 4.13, SD: 0.88), motivated (M: 4.06, SD: 1.18), knowledgeable (M: 3.50, SD: 1.41), comfortable (M: 3.31, SD: 1.40), proud (M: 3.13, SD: 1.50), and relaxed (M: 3.13, SD: 1.70); less worried (M: 0.75, SD: 1.34), anxious (M: 0.56, SD: 0.72), confused (M: 0.56, SD: 0.81), nervous (M: 0.38, SD: 0.71), offended (M: 0.38, SD: 1.02), humiliated (M: 0.31, SD: 0.87), disappointed (M: 0.25, SD: 0.77), upset (M: 0.25, SD: 0.77), and depressed (M: 0.13, SD: 0.34); more or less neutral (M: 1.63, SD: 1.78), shy (M: 1.25, SD: 1.80) and stressed (M: 1.06, SD: 1.52), whereas none of them felt frustrated (M: 0.00, SD: 0.00) when they received IWCF collaboratively (see Appendix J). Six out of six participants in class C, namely Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom claimed that they felt more confident, knowledgeable,

motivated and comfortable with the IWCF that they received collaboratively. These results were also made evident in the words of Elsa, who asserted during the interview session that ‘I felt happy, motivated and knowledgeable with the CIWCF, because by the help of both my instructor and peers I improved my writing and I enjoyed from the IWCF process’.

To sum up, there are some significant differences and similarities found between the feelings of the participants in class A, B and C towards the IWCF process. Firstly, the participants in class A, B and C felt more confident, motivated, knowledgeable and comfortable, whereas participants in class A and C felt more proud and relaxed than the participants in class B. In contrast to these, the participants in all classes felt less anxious, depressed, upset, humiliated, and offended, whereas the participants in class A and C felt less nervous, disappointed, confused and worried than class B. Interestingly, when the participants in class A and B felt less frustrated, none of the participants in class C felt frustrated. Lastly, the participants in class A, B and C agreed that they felt more or less stressed, neutral and shy, whereas the participants in class B felt more or less relaxed, proud, anxious, worried, confused, nervous and disappointed too (see Appendix J). These findings were also made evident in the interviews conducted to class A, B, and C seen in the words of Jane from class A, who said that ‘I feel motivated and learned, because instructor is the best feedback agent. So that, we should feel happy that our instructor guides us during the learning process’, Dean from class B, who agreed that ‘I feel anxious, because my peer is not proficient enough to provide IWCF to me’ and Elsa from class C, who claimed that ‘I feel happy and knowledgeable because I learn about my mistakes and also my peers’ mistakes and how to correct these mistakes’.

Advantages and disadvantages of IWCF. The first part of the questionnaire asked the participants to indicate whether IWCF has any advantages and disadvantages. The results revealed that the participants in class A believed that receiving IWCF had more advantages

(M: 3.44, SD: 0.89) over disadvantages (M:2.19, SD: 0.40) (see Table 22).According to Table 19 the participants in class B agreed that receiving IWCF had more advantages (M: 3.13, SD: 0.95) than disadvantages (M: 2.63, SD: 0.95).Likewise, the participants inclass C agreed that IWCF had more advantages (M: 3.75, SD: 0.77) compared to the disadvantages (M: 2.13, SD: 0.71) (see Table 22).To sum up, as it was indicated in the study of Hanjani (2015) the participants agreed thatthere are advantages and disadvantages of IIWCF, PIWCF and CIWCF.

Table 22

Advantages and Disadvantages of IWCF

Advantages and disadvantages of IWCF	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
3. I think receiving feedback has advantages.	16	3.44	0.89	3.13	0.95	3.75	0.77
4. I think receiving feedback has disadvantages.	16	2.19	0.40	2.63	0.95	2.13	0.71
Valid N (listwise)	16						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

Moreover, when the participants were asked about their perceptions about theadvantages and disadvantages of the IWCF during the interview session, six out of six of the participants in class A(Carol, Isabel, Jack, Jane, John, and Robert) agreed that it has advantages.This finding was made evident in the words of John who asserted that ‘IIWCF it is reliable and I trust my instructor’s feedback. So that, I felt more relaxed with my instructor’s feedback’. Interestingly, contrary to the questionnaire results, in the interview six out of six of the participants in class B;Alice, Bob, Dean, Diana, Janessa, and Sam asserted that PIWCF had more disadvantages. This finding was made specifically evident in the words of Alice who claimed that ‘in my opinion, PIWCF had no advantages, because I did not trust my

peers' IWCF, as the reliability is very important for me and I did not feel confident and knowledgeable with my peers IWCF'. In addition, six out of six of the participants in class C (Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom) indicated during the interview sessions that CIWCF had advantages. This was apparent in the words of Mike who mentioned that 'CIWF had advantages, as it creates more friendly, comfortable and collaborative environment'.

Next, as the interview results revealed, six out of six of the participants in class A (Carol, Isabel, Jack, Jane, John, and Robert) agreed that IIWCF was beneficial. This finding was made evident in the words of Isabel who asserted that 'IIWCF is beneficial, because it guided to us during the writing process and we improved our writing skills'. Similarly, six out of six of the participants in class B Alice, Bob, Dean, Diana, Janessa, and Sam asserted that PIWCF was beneficial. This finding was made evident in the words of Diana who put forth that 'it is beneficial because we become aware of our mistakes and we can write better in the exam'. Furthermore, six out of six of the participants in class C (Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom) claimed that CIWCF was beneficial for their language learning. This finding was made evident in the words of Fiona who mentioned in the interview that 'CIWCF is beneficial, because by the help of it we can learn about our inadequate parts of language'.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This part of the research presents, the overall findings regarding the answers to the each research question. Followed by information regarding practical implications for education and recommendations for further research.

The findings related to the first research question which aimed to find out the agent that improves students' writing skills the most when indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) is employed indicated that the participants who received IWCF collaboratively performed better than the classes that received instructor and peer IWCF. So, this study reveals that collaborative indirect written corrective feedback (CIWCF) is the most effective agent when giving IWCF followed by peer and finally instructor IWCF.

Further, as the second research question aimed to find out the participants' perceptions regarding the agent that they received IWCF, the participants in class A who received IWCF from their instructor stated that they would like to receive IWCF collaboratively whereas the majority of the participants in class B, who received IWCF from their peers stated that they would like to receive IWCF from their instructor. As similar with the participants in the class A, participants in class C agreed that they would like to receive IWCF as collaboratively.

Firstly, the participants in classes A, B and C felt more confident, motivated, knowledgeable and comfortable, whereas the participants in classes A and C felt more proud and relaxed compared to the participants in class B. In contrast to these, the participants in all classes felt less anxious, depressed, upset, humiliated, and offended, however, the participants in classes A and C felt less nervous, disappointed, confused and worried compared to the

participants in class B. Moreover, the participants in classes A, B and C agreed that there are both advantages and disadvantages of the instructor, peer and collaborative indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF). Nonetheless, the advantages of instructor, peer and collaborative IWCF were believed to be more than the disadvantages. Importantly, no matter which agent the participants received IWCF, all of them agreed that IWCF had benefits for writing improvement.

Finally, as the third research question aimed to find out information regarding the effects of the gender factor on the participants' writing improvement and attitudes towards the agent during the IWCF process, it was found that, there was a significant difference between the writing performances of the female and male participants in classes A, B and C who received IWCF from different agents. Then, it was revealed that the female participants in class B and C performed better than the male participants, while the male participants in class A performed better than the females.

Practical Implications for Education

According to the findings, it was found that EFL learners mostly preferred to receive collaborative IWCF as it includes both instructor and peers. In addition, the participants mostly had positive attitudes towards CIWCF. Additionally, it was proved that the participants who received IWCF collaboratively, performed better than the other participants who received instructor and peer IWCF. As a result of these, it is suggested for pre-service and in-service instructors to provide CIWCF to their learners and use more collaborative work and activities in their classrooms in order to create a more friendly, positive, supportive and collaborative atmosphere in the language learning environment. By including CIWCF to writing tasks, instructors will be better able to help the learners to improve their writing skills.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further research could be carried out to reveal the effects of other factors, such as culture, age and so on, on the EFL learners' written work and perceptions toward the IWCF. In order to learn more about whether there is any effect of the culture on the participants' perceptions toward the IWCF and the agent factor, it is suggested for further research to focus on the cultural differences. More than these, it is also suggested to researchers to focus on the other type of feedback, such as direct written corrective feedback. On the other hand, EFL learners' perceptions might show some differences when it is applied to different age classes. Thenceforward, further research could be carried out to see if EFL learners' years of English study affect their writing development. Moreover, individual differences, regarding the motivation of the participants or performance of the participants during the IWCF process might be the focus of another study. Further research could also be carried out to find out the instructors' attitudes towards IWCF.

REFERENCES

- Abadikhah, S., & Ashoori, A. (2012). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' performance after collaborative output. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3*(1), 118-125.
- Abaya, R. (2014). Corrective feedback in English language teaching and learning: Which way to go? *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 5*-12.
- AbuSeileek, A. F. (2013). Using track changes and word processor to provide corrective feedback to learners in writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 3*19-333.
- AbuSeileek, A., & Abualsha'r, A. (2014). Using peer computer-mediated corrective feedback to support EFL learners' writing. *Language Learning and Technology, 7*6-95.
- Adel, S., & Alwi, N. M. (2014). Investigating the effects of Wiki-based implicit corrective feedback on L2 learners' written products. *International Journal of English and Education, 1*60-178.
- Agbahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher written feedback on student writing: teachers' and learners' perspectives. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(10), 1895-1904.
- Aghajanloo, K., Mobini, F., & Khosravi, R. (2016). The effect of teachers' written corrective feedback types on intermediate EFL learners' writing performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 2*8-37.
- Ajmi, A. A., & Ali, H. I. (2014). Collaborative writing in group assignments in an EFL/ESL classroom. *English Linguistics Research, 3*(2), 1-17.
- Alharbi, H. S. (2016). Effects of teachers' written corrective feedback on Saudi EFL university students' writing achievements. *International Journal of Linguistics, 8*(5), 15-29.

- Alhumidi, H. A., & Uba, S. Y. (2016). The effect of indirect written corrective feedback to Arabic language intermediate students' in Kuwait. *European Scientific Journal*, 12(28), 361-374.
- Ali, H. I. H. (2013). Minimizing cyber plagiarism through turnitin: Faculty's and students' perspectives. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 2(2), 33-42.
- Alimohammadi, B., & Nejadansari, D. (2014). Written corrective feedback: Focused and unfocused. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(3), 581-587.
- Almasi, E., & Tabrizi, A. R. (2016). The effects of direct vs. indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 74-85.
- Al-Olimat, S. I., & AbuSeileek, A. F. (n.d.). Using computer-mediated corrective feedback modes in developing students' writing performance. *Teaching English with Technology*, 3-30.
- Alvarez, I., Espasa, A., & Guasch, T. (2011). The value of feedback in improving collaborative writing assignments in an online learning environment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 387-400.
- Amara, N. (2015). Errors correction in foreign language teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 58-68.
- Azarnoosh, M. (2013). Peer assesment in EFL context: Attitudes, and friendship bias. *Language Testing in Asia*, 3-11.
- Azevedo, R., Landis, R. S., Behnagh, R. F., Duffy, M., Trevors, G., Harley, J. M., & Hossain, G. (2012). The effectiveness of pedagogical agents' prompting and feedback in

facilitating co-adapted learning with meta-tutor. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 212-221.

Banditvilai, C. (2016). Enhancing students' language skills through blended learning . *The Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 220-229.

Barnawi, O. Z. (2010). Promoting noticing through collaborative feedback tasks in EFL college writing classrooms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 209-217.

Barnett, P. (2010). Test reliability and validity. *The Inappropriate Use of the Pearson and Other Variance Ratio Coefficients for Indexing Reliability and Validity*, 9. Retrieved from
http://www.pbarrett.net/techpapers/correlations_reliability_validity_Rev_1_July_2010.pdf

Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer feedback in learning English writing: Advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(4), 91-97.

Bozyi it, E., & Ek i, Y. G. (2017). Action research: Video assisted written constructivist feedback of ELT student teachers in micro-teaching sessions. *ELT Research Journal*, 6(2), 174-192.

BusinessDictionary. (n.d.). *Factor*. Retrieved from BusinessDictionary:
<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/factor.html>

Carvalho, C., Santos, J., Conboy, J., & Martins, D. (2014). Teachers' feedback: Exploring differences in students' perceptions. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 169-173.

- Casinghino, C. (2016). The role of collaboration and feedback in advancing student learning in media literacy and video production. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 7(2), 69-76.
- Cha, Y. (2014). Effects of blended peer feedback modes on learners' writing performance and perspectives. *Multimedia Assisted Language Learning*, 11-42.
- Chen, C., Leung, K., & Maxwell, G. (2011). Peer assessment using wiki to enhance their mastery of Chinese language. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 177-185.
- Cloete, R. (2014). Blending offline and online feedback on EAP writing. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 559-571.
- Dang, T. T. (2016). Vietnamese EFL students' perceptions of noticing-based collaborative feedback on their writing performance. 141-153.
- Daniel, G. R., Auhl, G., & Hastings, W. (2013). Collaborative feedback and reflection for professional growth: preparing first-year pre-service teachers for participation in the community of practice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 159-172.
- Davaribina, M., & Karimi, H. S. (2016). The effect of different types of teacher written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(14), 23-39.
- Debreli, E., & Onuk, N. (2016). The influence of educational programme on teachers' error correction preferences in speaking skill: Insights from English as a foreign language context. *International Education Studies*, 9(6), 76-85.

- Dorcas, G., Baraka, N., Samuel, N., Joshua, K., & Makewa, N. L. (2014). Students' attitudes towards group collaborative learning experiences: A case of university of Eastern Africa, Baraton. *Baraton Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, 52-64.
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning and Technology*, 14(3), 51-71.
- Ene, E., & Upton, T. (2014). Learner uptake of teacher electronic feedback in ESL composition. *System*, 80-95.
- Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 445-452.
- Espitia, M. I., & Corzo, C. C. (2013). Peer-feedback and online interaction: A case study. *Íkala*, 131-151.
- Estarki, K. N., & Bazyar, M. (2016). The effect of MALL on pre-intermediate EFL learners' writing performance. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 406-420.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Farrell, S. (2016). *Open ended vs close ended questions in user research*. Retrieved from Nielsen Norman Group: <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/open-ended-questions/>
- Farrokh, P. (2011). Analysing of EFL learners' linguistic errors: Evidence from Iranian translation trainees. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 676-680.
- Ghazali, F. A. (2015). Peer feedback for peer learning and sharing. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Gulf Perspectives*, 12(1), 1-13.

- Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum. *British Educational Research Journal*, 143-162.
- Green A. C. (2015). Approaches to mixed methods dissemination and implementation research: Methods, strengths, caveats, and opportunities. *Adm Policy Ment Health*, 42(5), 508-523.
- Guasch, T., Espasa, A., & Álvarez, I. (2010). Formative e-feedback in collaborative writing assignments: the effect of the process and time. *Research Paper Series*, 49-59.
- Guénette, D. (2012). The pedagogy of error correction: Surviving the written corrective feedback challenge. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(1), 117-126.
- Güzer, B., & Caner, H. (2014). The past, present and future of blended learning: an in depth analysis of literature. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 4596 – 4603.
- Halili, H. S., Naimie, Z., Sira, S., Abuzaid, A. R., & Leng, H. C. (2015). Exploring the link between learning styles and gender among distance learners. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1082-1086.
- Hamidi, H., & Montazeri, M. (2015). *Language syllabus design and curriculum development*.
Retrieved from The First Technical ELT Website:
<http://iranelt.com/inndex.php/introduction-to-syllabus-design>.
- Hanjani, A. M. (2015). Collaborative revision in L2 writing : Learners' reflections. *ELT Journal*, 70(3), 296-307.
- Ho, M. C. (2015). The effects of face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review on EFL writers' comments and revisions. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 1-15.

- Horbacauskiene, J., & Kasperaviciene, R. (2015). Learners' preferences towards corrective feedback in writing assignments in tertiary education. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics*, 70-83.
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skills. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 668–674.
- Ion, G., Corominas, B. A., & Folch, T. M. (2016). Written peer feedback to enhance students' current and future learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 13-15.
- Jahin, J. H. (2012). The effect of peer reviewing on writing apprehension and essay writing ability of prospective EFL teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11), 60-84.
- Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *J Basic Clin Pharm*, 5(4), 87-88.
- Jebreil, N., Azizifar, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). Investigating the effect of anxiety of male and female Iranian EFL learners on their writing performance. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 190-196.
- Kahn, J. (2010). *Reporting statistics in APA style* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kahraman, A., & Yalvaç, F. (2015). EFL Turkish university students' preferences about teacher feedback and its Importance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 73-80.
- Kahyalar, E., & Yılmaz, F. (2016). Teachers' corrective feedback in writing classes: The impact of collaborating with a peer during the editing process on students' uptake

and retention. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 16(1), 148-160.

Kassim, A., & Ng, L. L. (2014). Investigating the efficiency of focused and unfocused corrective feedback on the accurate use of prepositions in written work. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 119-130.

Kavaliauskiene, G., & Darginaviciene, I. (2010). Feedback at university level studies. *Socialinis Darbas*, 9(1), 132-140.

Ketabi, S., & Torabi, R. (2013). Teaching academic writing in Iranian EFL classrooms: Teacher-initiated comments or peer-provided feedback. *IJRELT*, 1(2), 99-109.

Khatri, R. (2013). Feedback, student collaboration, and teacher support in English as a foreign language writing. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 2(2), 70-75.

Khorshidi, E., & Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of learners' gender on their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, 1(4), 71-83.

Kızıl, A. . (2014). Blended instruction for EFL learners: Engagement, learning and course satisfaction. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 175–188.

Kolb, S. (2012). Grounded theory and the constant comparative method: Valid research strategies for educators. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3(1), 83-86.

Lee, I. (2016). Teacher education on feedback in EFL writing: Issues, challenges, and future directions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 518-527.

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.

- Liu, X., & Lee, W. J. (2014). EFL college students' reactions to their writing teachers' corrective feedback. *English Teaching*, 69(3), 81-103.
- Maleki, A., & Eslami, E. (2013). The effects of written corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' control over grammatical construction of their written English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1250-1257.
- Marzban, A., & Sarjami, S. M. (2014). Collaborative negotiated feedback versus teacher written feedback: Impact on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(2), 293-302.
- McHugh, L. M. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochem Med*, 22(3), 276-282.
- Moghadam, E. S., & Ghafournia, N. (2017). The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on the use of collocations in speaking assignments by Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 79-93.
- Motallebzadeh, K., & Amirabadi S. (2013). Online international feedback in second language writing: Through peer or tutor. *MJAL*, 3(2), 156-174.
- Motlagh, N. L. (2015). Who do learners prefer to be corrected by? Teachers or classmates. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 381-386.
- Mowlaie, B. (2014). The effect of teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self revision on Iranian EFL learners' form and content revision. *English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 37-57.
- Oroujlou, N., & Vahedi, M. (2011). Motivation, attitude, and language learning. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 994-1000.

- Pakbaz, R. (2014). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing performance: Explicit vs. implicit. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 11-17.
- Petchprasert, A. (2012). Feedback in second language teaching and learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, 1112-1120.
- Phiewma, W., & Padgate, W. (2017). The effects of teacher indirect feedback and collaborative revision activity on grammatical accuracy of Thai college students' writing. *Journal of Community Development Research (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 2(10), 1-10.
- Rad, Z. M., & Ghafournia, N. (2016). The effect of focused corrective feedback and attitude on grammatical accuracy: A study of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 4(15), 75-86.
- Rahimi, M. (2015). The role of individual differences in L2 learners' retention of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 19-48.
- Raja, M. S., Albasher, K. B., & Farid, A. (2016). Error treatment in teaching English to EFL adult learners: A study in current English language teaching practices in native versus non-native divide context in Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(5), 1-16.
- Ravid, R. (2011). *Practical statistics for educators* (4thed.). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Rezaei, M., & Shokrpour, N. (2017). The effect of medium on the message: Paper and pencil vs electronic teacher corrective feedback. *Social Sciences and Humanities*, 25(4), 1703-1720.

- Roustaei, R., Pourrajab, M., Kasmaiezhadfar, S., & Taleblo, B. (2015). The relationship between demographic variables and collaborative learning activities of teachers. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 4(6), 430-434.
- Sajjadi, M., Khabbazi, F., & Sajjadi, S. Y. (2015). The effect of written corrective feedback in second language writing. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 22-30.
- Salteh, M. A., & Sadeghi, K. (2015). Teachers' and students' attitudes toward error correction in L2 writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 1-31.
- Samuels, P. (2015). *Independent samples t-test*. Retrieved from Research Gate:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274635481_Independent_Samples_t-test
- Sarvestani, S. M., & Pishkar, K. (2015). The effect of the written corrective feedback on writing accuracy of intermediate learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(10), 2046-2052.
- Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 611-633.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research methods for business students* (6th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Shokrpour, N., Keshavarz, N., & Jafari, S. M. (n.d.). The effect of peer review on writing skill of EFL students. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 24-35.
- Sia, D. F. P., & Cheung, L. Y. (2017). Written corrective feedback in writing instruction: A qualitative synthesis of recent research. *Issues in Language Studies*, 6(1), 61-80.

- Singh, J. K. (2010). *Types of questionnaire*. Retrived from Research Methodology:
<http://www.mbaofficial.com/mba-courses/research-methodology/what-are-the-types-of-questionnaire/>
- So, L., & Lee, C. B. (2012). Peer feedback using blended learning in L2 writing at the university level. *English Teaching*, 307-337.
- Soadsaud, S. (2011). *Errors in the ESL classroom*. Retrieved from TESOL:
<https://soadsaud.wordpress.com/2011/11/13/errors-in-the-esl-classroom/>
- Soleimani, H., & Jamzivar, A. S. (2014). The impact of written peer corrective feedback on pre-intermediate Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 5(4), 1-10.
- Solutions, S. (2013). *ANOVA*. Retrieved from Statistics Solutions:
<http://www.statisticssolutions.com/manova-analysis-anova/>
- Srichanyachon, N. (2012). An investigation of university EFL students' attitudes toward peer and teacher feedback. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 7(26), 558-562.
- Su, Z. (2011). Peer feedback: A new approach to English writing instruction in a Chinese college setting. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 8(6), 364-368.
- Sukumaran, K., & Dass, R. (2014). Students' perspectives on the use of peer feedback in an English as a second language writing class. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Education*, 4(1), 27-40.
- Tai, H. C. (2016). Effects of collaborative online learning on EFL learners' writing performance and self-efficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 9(5), 119-130.

- Tangkiengsirisin, S., & Kalra, R. (2016). Thai students' perceptions on the direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: A Thai university context. *Arab World English Journal*, 161-176.
- Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5), 924-931.
- Üstünba , Ü., & Çimen, S. (2016). EFL learners' preferences for feedback types for their written products. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 68-74.
- Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher written feedback on L2 student writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 427-431.
- Yang, Y. F., & Meng, W. T. (2013). The effects of online feedback training on students' text revision. *Language Learning and Technology*, 220-238.
- Yastıba , G. Ç., & Yastıba , A. E. (2015). The effect of peer feedback on writing anxiety in Turkish EFL (English as a foreign language) students. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 530-538.
- Yoke, S. K., Rajendran, C. B., Sain, N., Kamaludin, P. N., Nawi, S. M., & Yusof, S. M. (2013). The use of online corrective feedback in academic writing by L1 Malay learners. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 175-180.
- Yoon, S. Y. (2011). Students' reflection on feedback in L2 writing in blended learning. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 235-261.
- Yugandhar, D. K. (2015). Practicing teacher organized peer review to advance EFL students' writing skills. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature*, 3(1), 25-29.

- Zahedi, M., & Tabatabaei, O. (2012). The effect of collaborative learning on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' oral skills and motivation. *Advances in English Linguistics, 1*(3), 56-60.
- Zaman, M., & Azad, A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review, 6*(1), 139-156.
- Zarei, A. A., & Mahdavi, A. S. (2014). The effect of peer and teacher assessment on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy. *Journal of Social Issues and Humanities, 2*(9), 92-97.
- Zareil, A. A., & Rahnama, M. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback modes on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy: From perceptions to facts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 1-14.*

APPENDICES**APPENDIX A**

Ethical Approval Form



YAKIN DOĐU ÜNİVERSİTESİ

BİLİMSEL ARAŐTIRMALAR ETİK KURULU

18.06.2017

Sayın Fatma Őengül,

Bilimsel Arařtırmalar Etik Kurulu'na yapmıř olduėunuz YDÜ/EB/2017/9 proje numaralı ve "Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in EFL" bařlıklı proje önerisi kurumumuzca deėerlendirilmiř olup, etik olarak uygun bulunmuřtur. Bu yazı ile birlikte, bařvuru formunuzda belirttiėiniz bilgilerin dıřına çıkmamak suretiyle arařtırmaya bařlayabilirsiniz.

Yardımcı Doėent Doktor Direnç Kanol

Bilimsel Arařtırmalar Etik Kurulu Raportörü

Not: Eėer bir kuruma resmi bir kabul yazısı sunmak istiyorsanız, Yakın Doėu Üniversitesi Bilimsel Arařtırmalar Etik Kurulu'na bu yazı ile bařvurup, kurulun bařkanının imzasını taşıyan resmi bir yazı temin edebilirsiniz.

APPENDIX B

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent:

INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

fatmasengul3@gmail.com

Project Description: In the light of the study and the participant written text, the findings will be better able to explain the effects of the agent factor on the improvement of the EFL learners' writing skills and seeks to find out the EFL learners' preferences among the agents that the EFL learners prefer to receive indirect written corrective feedback. Additionally, teachers and researchers will be better able to understand whether there is any effect of some variables such as the EFL learners' gender on their preferences towards indirect written corrective feedback. To sum up, this research aims to contribute more information to the field of education about the Preparatory School EFL learners' perspectives about the indirect written corrective feedback process.

Procedure and Risks:

We would like to get EFL learners' written texts, if you are willing, and use these written texts for the study. We will get the EFL learners' written texts only with your written consent.

All the information that will be collected from the written texts, will be kept anonymous, without any reference to learner's and instructor's identity.

There are no known risks associated with participation in the study.

Benefits:

It is hoped that the results of this study will benefit the community through providing greater insight into the field of education.

Cost Compensation:

Participation in this study will involve no costs or payments.

Confidentiality:

All information collected during the study period will be kept strictly confidential until such time as you sign a release waiver. No publications or reports from this study will include identifying information on any participant without your signed permission, and after your review of the materials. If you agree to join this study, please sign your name on the following page.

**INFORMED CONSENT FOR INTERVIEW AND WRITTEN TEXT ANALYSIS
OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK**

I, _____, agree to be involved to the project entitled _____ which is being produced by Fatma Şengül of Near East University, Institute of Educational Sciences and supervised by Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen of Near East University, Ataturk Faculty of Education, English Language Teaching Department.

I certify that I have been told of the confidentiality of information collected for this study and the anonymity of my participation; that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters; and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the study or task at any time without prejudice.

I understand that related materials will be kept completely anonymous, and that the results of this study may be published in an academic journal or book anonymously.

I agree that any information obtained from this research may be used in any way thought best for this study.

Please approve the following requirements:

I accept for my written materials to be used in this study as data.

I accept to take part in the interviews as required by this study.

_____ Date _____

Signature of Participant

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact the researcher or supervisor through the following information:

Researcher Contact Information:

Fatma Şengül
fatmasengul3@gmail.com
0533 8613556
Near East University, Institute of Educational
Sciences,
English Language Teaching Department

Supervisor Contact Information:

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen
hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr
+90 (392) 444 0 NEU / 255
Near East University, Ataturk Faculty of
Education, English Language Teaching
Department

APPENDIX C

Error Correction Symbols

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Error Correction Symbols

Below, you will find some common symbols to use when making corrections to your portfolio work. All teachers will use the same symbols and will demonstrate them to you prior to setting any portfolio work.

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
P	Punctuation	I live work, and go to school in Birmingham. The dodgers play baseball in los angeles.	I live, work and go to school in Birmingham. The Dodgers play baseball in Los Angeles.
T	Tense Problem	I go to London last month.	I went to London last month.
S/V	Subject-Verb Agreement	The manager work very hard. Peter and I am students.	The manager works very hard. Peter and I are students.
SP	Spelling	She is really beaitful. It's a wonderfull song.	She is really beautiful . It's a wonderful song.
S/PL	Singular/Plural issues	Apple are very healthy for you.	Apples are very healthy for you.
//	Unnecessary Word	The student she studies all the time.	The student she studies all the time.
^	Missing Word	Please don't me that question again.	Please don't ask me that question again.
WW	Wrong Word	The apple is delighted.	The apple is delicious .
W/O	Wrong Word Order	Friday always is our busiest day.	Friday is always our busiest day.
Prep.	Preposition needed	We start class 08.30 or 12.10.	We start class at 08.30 or 12.10.
W Prep	Wrong preposition is used	He lives at London.	He lives in London.
Conj.	Conjunction needed	Fish, vegetables, fruit are healthy foods.	Fish, vegetables, and fruit are healthy foods.
WWF	Wrong word form Wrong word formation	I like eat chocolate. Martin plays football very good. It's impossible for him to win the race	I like eating chocolate. Martin plays football very well . It's impossible for him to win the race
CAP	Capital Letter is needed	I went to london.	I went to L ondon.
WE	Wrong Expression		
InCS	Incomplete Sentence	When I went home.	When I went home, I had a shower .

APPENDIX D

Written Samples

Task 1

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 1:**First Draft**Date: 29.09.2017

Hello! My name is Turab. I am 18 years old. I am
 a university student and my major is International Relations.
 My first year at university, I don't have a job.
 I speak and understand Turkish and English, but I still
^{WVF} learn English. I like ^{WVF} play and ^{WVF} watch basketball matches.
 I am interested in technology, space and science.
 I ^{WVF} birth in Bodrum and I live in Istanbul. I go to
 school ^{WVF} Monday to ^{WVF} Friday. I have ^{WVF} a 2 brothers and
 a sister. My middle brother is a highschool student, and ^{WVF} other
^{WVF} is a baby. My sister is 4 years old and ^{WVF} little brother is 1
 years old. I have one father and mother. My father
 is a calligrapher. My mother is a housewife.
 Okey! Nice to meet you. See you next week. =D

Teacher's Comments:

Well done! 😊

 Be careful of grammar and
 punctuation → (word forms)

Task 2

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 2:

First DraftDate: 06.10.2017

Hello, my name is Turab. I live alone. Today, I will try to talk about my family. First, dad, his name is Feroz, he is a calligrapher. He usually ^{SIV} get up at 12:00 p.m. and he ^{SIV} take a shower. After the shower, he ^{SIV} have a breakfast at 1:00 p.m. He usually goes to work at 4:00 p.m. He ^{SIV} have dinner at 8:00 p.m. and he leaves the work at 03:00 a.m. He usually sleeps at 4:30 a.m. ^{WN} Second, mom, her name is Gange, she is a house wife. She usually ^{SIV} get up early to cook. She ^{SIV} have a breakfast at 1:00 p.m. with ^{WN} him. After the breakfast, she washes the dishes and ^{SIV} watch T.V. She ^{SIV} cook again at 7:00 p.m. and she ^{SIV} have a dinner at 8:00 p.m. She sleeps at 4:30 a.m. Finally me, I always get up early ^{WN} like 5:30 a.m. because ^{WN} prayer I make, and I have a breakfast at 6:30 a.m. From Monday to Friday I go to school, and sometimes I go to library. I listen to music ^{WN} in the weekend. That's enough. See you b = D

Teacher's Comments:

Excellent!

Be careful of your grammar
 (subject/verb) and your vocabulary

Task 3

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 3:**First Draft**Date: 20.10.2017

^{WW}
 This thin, rectangular books are only 300 tl.
 They are only two weeks old, so they are new.
 They are clean, less than used. They are made ^{SP} off
 paper, card. They are green, blue and dark blue.
 They are useful for preparatory students, because
 They are English lesson books. They have ^{useful, up-used} cards
 for help if you are ^{WW} not understand these books.
 I sell it cheaper than school, you can trust me =>
 If you ^{WW} aren't like, you can give me ^{WWO} back and I
 pay back ^{WW} they price.
 Call 842-5694 or use this link: www.stationery.com
 for more information.

Turab Stationery

Teacher's Comments:

Excellent!

Pay attention to your grammar

Task 4

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 4:**First Draft**Date: 10/11/2017

I haven't ^{SP} my own bedroom in my dormitory. The room is quiet ^{SP} big. The walls are white. I have two windows ^{WW WW WW} on the walls. There are six bunk ^{SP} bed and a rug in my bedroom. There isn't a desk, because the desks are in the survey class. My favourite thing in my bedroom is my bed.

=) In my living room. There is a double glazing, three frames, three paints and a clock on the walls. There are two ^{SP} sofa, a T.V., a T.V. unit, an aquarium, two cabinets and two rugs in my living room ^{WW} on Turkey. The walls are turquoise. Finally, my living room is small.

Teacher's Comments:

Well done!

Be careful of your vocabulary

Task 5

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 5:**First Draft****Date:** 17/11/2017

My favourite restaurant's name is Burger King®. It is in Bodrum. It serves many kind^{SPL} of burgers like King Chicken®, Double King Chicken®, Big King®, Fries, different kind of cokes, and juice. Many kind^{SPL} of ice creams, and toys for children. In here^{WR}, the food, and drinks are cheap, and they tasteth are^{SP} delicious. There is a free wi-fi, and it's terrace view^{SIV} is very nice. You can also feed the fishes in the sea. My favourite dish is Double King Chicken®. It's decoration^{SIV} is simple and nice, and itth have^{SIV} a four floor with terrace, and balcon^{SPL}. There is nothing I don't like, and I give it four [4(★★★)] starts^{SP} =) See you soon.

Teacher's Comments:

Well done!

Pay attention to your spelling and unnecessary words/letters.

APPENDIX E

Writing Evaluation Criteria

Task 1

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

WRITING CRITERIA FOR BEGINNER-ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Name : _____ First Marker : _____

Mark : _____ / 10

If the sentences are irrelevant or incomprehensible to the topic, the student will not be evaluated on any of the points below. Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Incomplete task. There aren't enough sentences to evaluate the writing. (between 1-5 sentences)

The student starts his/her sentences related to the topic and then switches to an irrelevant one. **More than 5 of his/her sentences are irrelevant.** Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Accuracy

4 pts.- All of his/her sentences (min.15) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes.

3 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 12/14) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**

2.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min.8/11) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**

2 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 12/14) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**

1.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min. 8/11) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes that **make the meaning unclear.**

1 pts.- A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/7) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**

0.5 pts. A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/7) are in the correct structure with some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**

0 pt.- None of the sentences are in the correct structure and the meaning is obscure .

Content

4 pts.- The student has a full realisation of the given topic with **all** the necessary/possible content points covered and expanded.

3 pts. The student has min. **11/12 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **most** of the necessary/possible content points covered.

2 pts- The student has min. **9/10 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **some** of the necessary/possible content points covered.

1.5 pts. The student has min. **7/8 sentences** with a reasonable number of necessary/possible content points covered.

1 pt The student has min. **6 sentences** related to the given topic but it's inadequate.

0 pt.- The student has made a poor attempt writing about the given topic with most of the content points missing.

ENG 010/TASK 1/ WRITING CRITERIA Page 1

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Vocabulary

- 2 pts.-He /She uses **a wide range of vocabulary** related to the task **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1.5 pts - He /She uses **adequate** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt. - He /She uses **relevant but limited** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt.- He/She uses **a wide range of** vocabulary **in a meaningful way** but **some** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0.5 pts.-He/She **uses a wide range of** vocabulary but **only some** of them are used **correctly** or in a meaningful way.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses the **relevant** vocabulary. However, it's very **limited** due to the limited number of sentences.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses **a wide range of/relevant** vocabulary in a meaningful way but **most** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0 pt.- He /She uses a **wide range of/limited** vocabulary related to the task but **most of them are used incorrectly** or not in a meaningful way
- 0 pt.- Almost all of the words are misspelt or unclear.

Task 2

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

WRITING CRITERIA FOR BEGINNER-ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Name : _____

First Marker : _____

Mark : _____ / 10

- If the sentences are irrelevant or incomprehensible to the topic, the student will not be evaluated on any of the points below. Therefore, he/she gets zero.
- Incomplete task. There aren't enough sentences to evaluate the writing. (between 1-5 sentences)
- The student starts his/her sentences related to the topic and then switches to an irrelevant one. **More than 5 of his/her sentences are irrelevant.** Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Accuracy

- 4 pts.- All of his/her sentences (min.15) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes.
- 3 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 12/14) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min.8/11) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 12/14) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min. 8/11) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes that **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1 pts.- A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/7) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 0.5 pts. A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/7) are in the correct structure with some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 0 pt.- None of the sentences are in the correct structure and the meaning is obscure .

Content

- 4 pts.- The student has a full realisation of the given topic with **all** the necessary/possible content points covered and expanded.
- 3 pts. The student has min. **11/12 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **most** of the necessary/possible content points covered.
- 2 pts- The student has min. **9/10 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **some** of the necessary/possible content points covered.
- 1.5 pts. The student has min. **7/8 sentences** with a reasonable number of necessary/possible content points covered.
- 1 pt The student has min. **6 sentences** related to the given topic but it's inadequate.
- 0 pt.- The student has made a poor attempt writing about the given topic with most of the content points missing.

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Vocabulary

- 2 pts.-He /She uses **a wide range of vocabulary** related to the task **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1.5 pts - He /She uses **adequate** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt. - He /She uses **relevant but limited** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt.- He/She uses **a wide range of** vocabulary **in a meaningful way** but **some** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0.5 pts.-He/She **uses a wide range of** vocabulary but **only some** of them are used **correctly** or in a meaningful way.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses the **relevant** vocabulary. However, it's very **limited** due to the limited number of sentences.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses **a wide range of/relevant** vocabulary in a meaningful way but **most** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0 pt.- He /She uses a **wide range of/limited** vocabulary related to the task but **most of them are used incorrectly** or not in a meaningful way
- 0 pt.- Almost all of the words are misspelt or unclear.

Task 3

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

WRITING CRITERIA FOR BEGINNER-ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Name : _____

First Marker : _____

Mark : _____ / 10

- If the sentences are irrelevant or incomprehensible to the topic, the student will not be evaluated on any of the points below. Therefore, he/she gets zero.
- Incomplete task. There aren't enough sentences to evaluate the writing.(between 1-3 sentences)
- The student starts his/her paragraph related to the topic and then switches to an irrelevant one. More than 4 of his/her sentences are irrelevant. Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Accuracy

- 4 pts.- All of his/her sentences (min. 9/10) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes.
- 3 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 7/8) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2.5 pt.- Some of his/her sentences (min.5/6) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 7/8) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min. 5/6) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes that **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1 pts.- A few of his/her sentences (min. 3/4) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 0.5 pts. A few of his/her sentences (min. 3/4) are in the correct structure with some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**

Content

- 4 pts.- The student has a full realisation of the given topic with **all** the necessary/possible content points covered and expanded.
- 3 pts- The student has **min.8 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **some** of the necessary/possible content points covered.
- 2 pts- The student has **min.6 sentences** with a reasonable number of necessary/possible content points covered.
- 1 pt- The student has **min.4 sentences** related to the given topic but it's inadequate.
- 0 pt.- The student has made a poor attempt writing about the given topic with most of the content points missing.

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Vocabulary

- 2 pts. -He /She uses **a wide range of vocabulary** related to the task **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1.5 pts - He /She uses **adequate** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt. - He /She uses **relevant but limited** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt.- He/She uses **a wide range of** vocabulary **in a meaningful way** but **some** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0.5 pts.-He/She **uses a wide range of** vocabulary but **only some** of them are used **correctly** or in a meaningful way.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses the **relevant** vocabulary. However, it's very **limited** due to the limited number of sentences.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses **a wide range of/relevant** vocabulary in a meaningful way but **most** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0 pt.- He /She uses a **wide range of/limited** vocabulary related to the task but **most of them are used incorrectly** or not in a meaningful way
- 0 pt.- Almost all of the words are misspelt or unclear.

Task 4

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

WRITING CRITERIA FOR BEGINNER-ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Name : _____

First Marker : _____

Mark : _____ / 10

- If the sentences are irrelevant or incomprehensible to the topic, the student will not be evaluated on any of the points below. Therefore, he/she gets zero.
- Incomplete task. There aren't enough sentences to evaluate the writing.(between 1-3 sentences)
- The student starts his/her paragraph related to the topic and then switches to an irrelevant one. More than 4 of his/her sentences are irrelevant. Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Accuracy

- 4 pts.- All of his/her sentences (min. 9/10) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes.
- 3 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 7/8) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2.5 pt.- Some of his/her sentences (min.5/6) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 7/8) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min. 5/6) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes that **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1 pts.- A few of his/her sentences (min. 3/4) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 0.5 pts. A few of his/her sentences (min. 3/4) are in the correct structure with some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**

Content

- 4 pts.- The student has a full realisation of the given topic with **all** the necessary/possible content points covered and expanded.
- 3 pts- The student has **min.8 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **some** of the necessary/possible content points covered.
- 2 pts- The student has **min.6 sentences** with a reasonable number of necessary/possible content points covered.
- 1 pt- The student has **min.4 sentences** related to the given topic but it's inadequate.
- 0 pt.- The student has made a poor attempt writing about the given topic with most of the content points missing.

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Vocabulary

- 2 pts. -He /She uses **a wide range of vocabulary** related to the task **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1.5 pts - He /She uses **adequate** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt. - He /She uses **relevant but limited** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt.- He/She uses **a wide range of** vocabulary **in a meaningful way** but **some** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0.5 pts.-He/She **uses a wide range of** vocabulary but **only some** of them are used **correctly** or in a meaningful way.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses the **relevant** vocabulary. However, it's very **limited** due to the limited number of sentences.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses **a wide range of/relevant** vocabulary in a meaningful way but **most** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0 pt.- He /She uses a **wide range of/limited** vocabulary related to the task but **most of them are used incorrectly** or not in a meaningful way
- 0 pt.- Almost all of the words are misspelt or unclear.

Task 5

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

WRITING CRITERIA FOR BEGINNER-ELEMENTARY LEVEL

Name : _____

First Marker : _____

Mark : _____ / 10

- If the sentences are irrelevant or incomprehensible to the topic, the student will not be evaluated on any of the points below. Therefore, he/she gets zero.
- Incomplete task. There aren't enough sentences to evaluate the writing.(between 1-3 sentences)
- The student starts his/her paragraph related to the topic and then switches to an irrelevant one. More than 4 of his/her sentences are irrelevant. Therefore, he/she gets zero.

Accuracy

- 4 pts.- All of his/her sentences (min.11) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes.
- 3 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 9/10) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2.5 pts.- Some of his/her sentences (min.7/8) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However, **they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 2 pts.- Most of his/her sentences (min. 9/10) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1.5 pt.- Some of his/her sentences (min. 7/8) are in the correct structure but there are some mistakes that **make the meaning unclear.**
- 1 pt.- A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/6) are in the correct structure with some minor mistakes. However,**they don't make the meaning unclear.**
- 0.5 pt. A few of his/her sentences (min. 4/6) are in the correct structure with some mistakes which **make the meaning unclear.**
- 0 pt.- None of the sentences are in the correct structure and the meaning is obscure.

Content

- 4 pts.- The student has a full realisation of the given topic with **all** the necessary/possible content points covered and expanded.
- 3 pts- The student has **min.8 sentences** with a good realisation of the given topic with **some** of the necessary/possible content points covered.
- 2 pts- The student has **min.6 sentences** with a reasonable number of necessary/possible content points covered.
- 1 pt- The student has **min.4 sentences** related to the given topic but it's inadequate.
- 0 pt.- The student has made a poor attempt writing about the given topic with most of the content points missing.

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

- 2 pts.-He /She uses **a wide range of vocabulary** related to the task **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1.5 pts - He /She uses **adequate** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt. - He /She uses **relevant but limited** vocabulary **correctly** in a meaningful way.
- 1 pt.- He/She uses **a wide range of** vocabulary **in a meaningful way** but **some** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0.5 pts.-He/She **uses a wide range of** vocabulary but **only some** of them are used **correctly** or in a meaningful way.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses the **relevant** vocabulary. However, it's very **limited** due to the limited number of sentences.
- 0.5 pts.- He/She uses **a wide range of/relevant** vocabulary in a meaningful way but **most** of them are **misspelt**.
- 0 pt.- He /She uses a **wide range of/limited** vocabulary related to the task but **most of them are used incorrectly** or not in a meaningful way
- 0 pt.- Almost all of the words are misspelt or unclear.

APPENDIX F

Written Texts of the EFL Learners

Class A

Week 1:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 1:**First Draft****Date:** 05.10.2017

My name is Serrin. I am 20 years old.
 I am a university student. I am a freshman in North
 Cyprus. I live with my friends. I speak English and
 Turkish. I read and understand English. My major is
 Software Engineering. My favorite writers are Victor
 Hugo and Nostoyovski. I am very interested in sports.
 I like soccer, baseball, tennis and basketball. I am
 also interested in movies and playable tennis.
 I am from Turkey. I live in Cyprus. Cyprus is
 wonderful because it is calm. I have got an English
 teacher. She is Baren, my friends and I watch TV everyday.
 I read a book every night. I have got long hair.
 I like it. Nice to meet you!

Teacher's Comments:

Good effort. Well done!

Week 2:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 2:

delicious

First DraftDate: 06.10.2017

I live with my parents. We are from Turkey. My mother
 died ten years ago. I really miss her. My father
 is official employee. He gets up at 8.00. He goes to
 work at 9.00. He has lunch in a hospital. He is
 an expert. ^{low} ~~him~~ favourite meal is ^{of} ~~it~~ ^{of} ~~it~~ is very
 delicious. He gets home at 7.00. He watches TV at
 home. He goes to bed at 9.00. My major is ~~oblique~~
 Engineering. I love it. I get up at 7.00. I have
 breakfast at 8.00. I go to school at 8.15. My lessons
 start at 9.00. I have work of 12.00 in school with my friends
 My lessons finish at 1.00. I have dinner at 8.00. I study
 lessons at home. I read aloud every night. I go to bed
 at 10.00. My brother's name is Aziz. I love him ~~so~~ much
 because he is a very good person. He is a teacher.
 He lives in ~~between~~ ^{SP} ~~him~~ favourite meal is
 Kısık. ^{low} ~~it~~ is ^{low} ~~delicious~~ ^{low} ~~delicious~~
 SP

Teacher's Comments:

Good start but be more careful with
 spelling and word choice,

Week 3:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 3:

First Draft

Date: 2010 2013

Mobile phone \$254

This ^{was} this mobile phone is only \$254. I ^{use} take my phone
 two weeks ago. ^{cap} It has a camera, bluetooth, games.
 It is very ^{cap} useful. ^{cap} It has a large screen that's great for
 watching movies, ^{view} play games, ^{view} talk face to face. ^{cap} It has a ^{SP} great
 decoration. I use facebook, instagram, twitter, youtube, whatsapp
^{w Prep} ^{cap} in my mobile phone. It has white and black colors.
^{cap} It is brandy HTC. It is ^{view} great and ^{view} ^{view} it comes with
 a pink case. Call 544-430-95-30 for more information

Teacher's Comments:

Good start but you should be more
 careful with vocabulary, punctuation
 and spelling.

Week 4:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 4:**First Draft**Date: 10.11.2017

I like my own bedroom ✓
 My bedroom is very small but usefull and nice. The walls are creamy and I haven't anything on the walls. There is a new study desk, a chair, a wardrobe, a bed, ⁵ five pencils, two pens, a lot of papers and books. My favorite thing in my bedroom is my nice bed. My bedroom is very quiet. It is the best thing ^{for} my bedroom. I feel relax in my bedroom.

Teacher's Comments:

Good effort but be careful with grammar mistakes.

Week 5:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 5:**First Draft**

Date: _____

The name of the restaurant is Mardo.
Mardo is in Georgia. Mardo is ~~near~~^{close} my house. I go to
Mardo twice ~~in~~^{missing} week. I always go ~~to~~^{there} with my
friends. Mardo serves Turkish food. The food is
delicious^{SP} and prices are expensive. My favorite dish
is pizza. I like ~~eat~~^{new} in this restaurant. I don't like
walking ~~person~~^{new} about Mardo. I give ~~like~~^{to prep} about ~~to~~^{to} Mardo
work is not bad ~~not~~^{not} good. I meet a lot of friends
in Mardo. I think Mardo is nice because ~~there~~^{there} ~~has~~^{has} ~~got~~^{got}
delicious food.
SPV

Teacher's Comments:

Good start but you should be
careful with vocabulary and spelling.

Class B

Week 1:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 1: Online Profile**First Draft**Date: 29/9/2017

My name is Asiye. I am 37 years old. I am a university student. I am a foundation in Cyprus. It is a city in Cyprus. I speak Greek, Turkish and English. I read and understand English, Turkish and Greek. My major is interpreter. My favorite novel writer is WC Andrews, Wilbur Smith and Orhan Pamuk. I am very interested in sports. I like ~~skates~~ cycling and volleyball. I am married. I have four sons.

Teacher's Comments:

Well done! Please don't forget to use full stops (.)

Week 2:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 2: My family**First Draft**Date: 06/10/2017

My family is very big ^{to} we live with my parents. We live with my parents and sons. We live in ^{an} detached house in Nicosia. It is middle ^{size} but I like it a lot. It's a good size for us. My son is ^a student. They go to school everyday. I go to a university. They ^{is} very good. I like my teachers. They help me a lot. My major is interpreter. It is not easy but I like it.

I have a sister. She is married. Her husband is a soldier. They live in Izmir. They have a daughter and a son.

I live ^{with} my parents. I go to school at 7:30. I get home at 5:00 and do ^{my} homework. ^{We} try to finish it before dinner at 6:30. I like to help them. My parents don't watch TV. I wash the dishes. Then I study. I go to bed ^{at} 10:00 o'clock.

Teacher's Comments:

Well done! Please use capital letters at the beginning of the sentence. Please check your other mistakes.

Week 3:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 3: Advertisement**First Draft**Date: 20/10/2017

This thin silver mobile phone is only \$300. It's only one year old, so it's [^]very good condition. It's brand [^]i phone. My phone ^{was} model [^]i phone 6 plus s, and [^]16 gb memory. It's in very good shape. It's a camera [^]extraordinary. It's never infected. There is also [^]headphone charging cable.

I ^{am} a very busy businesswoman because, it ^{doesn't} has ^{enough} memory. I use [^]very clean you can see pictures

Can seek serious buyers.
My number and mail address.

Asije Konil
0547 8806550
asujekonil63850@yahoo.com

Teacher's Comments:

Please study sentence structure.

Week 4:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 4: My Bedroom**First Draft****Date:** 10.11.17

I like my bedroom. The room is very big and nice. The walls are black. I haven't pasters. There is a bed, a big sofa, a DVD, a TV, a mirror, a desk and bookshelves. The desk is often messy. On it I have a computer, a lamp, a dictionary and other schoolbooks.

My favorite thing in my bedroom is my sofa. I like reading a book on the sofa.

My bedroom is in bathroom and dress room available. It has a new architectural structure.

Teacher's Comments:

Week 5:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 5: Restaurant Review

First Draft

Date: 17/11/2017

Palm House restaurant typical Cyprus food like salad and steak. My favorite dish is fish in salt. Daily appetizers and fresh dessert options. Price is

The portions are large and the price is expensive. Many people go there for dinner.

The restaurant has an amazing design. It is in the palm beach. East of Nicosia. Typical family restaurant. Cyprus food culture

Address:

SP

Teacher's Comments:

Well done. Please check your mistakes.

Class C:

Week 1:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 1:**First Draft**Date: 29/09/2017

My name is Melisa I'm 18 years old
 My ^{WW}country is Turkey I'm from Izmir I live in Kyrenia
 with my family I don't have a pet I have got ^A one
 brother I'm a student My school is Near East University
 My ^{SP}department is ^SMath but this year I'm ^{WWF}study ^{AR}English
 Preparatory School I ^{SP}read and write English My ^{SP}teachers
 are Mrs Cibna Mehmet and Mrs Gulshan Kara I go to
 school ^{WW}on Monday to Friday I ^{WW}see 4 lessons a day.

I love sport I did taekwondo My hobbies are
 going to cinema, swimming, dancing, playing basketball and
 listening to music I hate football

Teacher's Comments:

Excellent! 😊

Pay attention to spelling and
 vocabulary

Week 2:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 2:**First Draft**Date: 06/10/2013

I live in Kyrenia with my family. I have got a small family. My father's name is Ali. He is 44 years old. He works in Golden Tulp Casino. He goes to work at 4 in the evening. His job is very hard but he ^{SIV} like it. He usually has dinner in the hotel restaurant. He occasionally cooks, watches TV and shopping. He gets home at 1:00 o'clock in the morning. My mother's name is Zahide. She is 41 years old. She is a house wife. She always cleans the house, cooks and shopping. usually watches TV in the evening. She often ^W texts the message with her friends. She always gets up at 11:00 o'clock. She has breakfast at 12:00 o'clock. After, she drinks coffee. My brother's name is Berkay. He is 21 years old. He is a university student. He goes to the university from Monday to Friday. He meets friends at the weekend. He always listens to music, ^{WW} texts the ^{SIPL} message and reads a ^{SIPL} book. He usually goes to the gym in the evenings. He always watches ^{SIPL} film in the ^{WW} night. He goes to bed at 2:00 o'clock. My name is Melina. I'm 18 years old. I usually go to school at 9 o'clock. I get home at 7:00 o'clock. I have ^{WWO} breakfast only at the weekend. I usually have lunch at 2 o'clock in a restaurant. I meet friends at the weekend. I always watch TV, listen to music, ^{WW} text the ^{SIPL} message and study. I often go to library. **Teacher's Comments:** I eat spiky chicken twice a week. Because I like it. I have dinner at 8 o'clock. I always go to bed at 11 o'clock.

An excellent piece of writing.
Pay attention to your grammar
and vocabulary.

Week 3:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

Melisa E

2017-2018

Task 3:

First Draft

Date: 20/10/2017

This light black ^A is only €400 It's two years old.
 Its picture quality is very good It has a useful modern design.
 This is a ^{WVO} cheap, nice camera that is ["] perfect for a photographer.
 It has 18 mp & that's great for ["] to ^{WVWF} take photos. It's ["] a ^{SP} steal.
 In this way it ["] ^{SV} don't ^{WVWF} broken It's very strong It's ["] a memory
^{WVO} very ^{WVWF} with It has a big wide black bag It has 3 good lens
 Call 842 - 9133 for more information

Teacher's Comments:

Well done!
 Be careful of your word forms

Week 4:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 4:**First Draft**Date: 10/11/2017

I have my own bedroom in my house. I think my bedroom is small but fun. The walls are white. It has ^{WW} a Istanbul poster and a shelf. The shelf is above ^{WW} a bed. There is ^{WW} the bed, a mirror, a desk, a chair, a ^{SP} wardrobe and a rug. The bed is in the corner of the room. My ^{SP} wardrobe colour is a purple. On the desk, there are pens, pencils, books, boxes, papers, photos. In the ^{SP} wardrobe, there are clothes, shoes, jeans and socks. I like to spend time in ^{WW} the bedroom. My favourite thing is the bed. Because I love ^{WWF} sleep.

Teacher's Comments:

Excellent!

Be careful of spelling and vocabulary.

Week 5:

NEU ENGLISH PREPARATORY SCHOOL

2017-2018

Task 5:**First Draft**Date: 19/11/2017

My favourite restaurant is Cookies. It is in Nicosia. It serves ^{S/PL} # chickens, burgers, salads, pastas, french fries, ^{S/PL} desserts and drinks. The ^{S/PL} dessert are cakes, chocolates and ice creams. The drinks are teas, coffees, juices and sparkling waters. The food is delicious, interesting and the price is normal, not cheap or not expensive. My favourite dishes are chicken and fries. I like ^{S/PL} # foods, ^{S/PL} # waiters, ^{S/PL} # prices. The service is fast and friendly. The restaurant is clean. They have free wifi, so it's very important for me. The location is good because it's in a city centre. Its portions ^{S/PL} # very big, so ^{S/PL} # I leave the restaurant, I'm not hungry. I think ^{S/PL} # restaurant is very small and very crowded. It hasn't ^{S/PL} # a car park. I don't like ^{S/PL} # them ^{S/PL} # it give ^{S/PL} #

Teacher's Comments:

Excellent effort!

Be careful of your grammar
(singular/plural nouns) and missing words

APPENDIX G

Class A Questionnaire

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback Process in EFL

Dear Participant,

This questionnaire is designed to find out your attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process. Please be sincere in providing your replies. The data that you provide will be kept confidential and will be anonymously used in analysing the English as a foreign language learners' attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process.

Thank you in advance for your attention and participation.

Fatma engül

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen

MA Student

Supervisor

Department of ELT

Department of ELT

Near East University

Near East University

E-mail: fatmasengul3@gmail.com

E-mail: hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr

Demographic Information

Please provide information by completing the blanks and marking options you select with (X).

Native Language: _____

Gender: () Female () Male

- ❖ **Part A:** Please read the following statements carefully and mark the option that matches your opinion with (X) as in the example and write the reason behind your opinion.

Statements	Mark one of the following options.	Please write the reason(s) behind your opinion in this column.
Example: Mostly, I like to	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Write <input type="checkbox"/> Read <input type="checkbox"/> Speak	<u>I like to write because I want to talk about my thoughts.</u>
1. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive feedback from	<input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Peer(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor&Peer(s)
2. I think receiving indirect written corrective feedback had ...	<input type="checkbox"/> Advantages <input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantages

- ❖ **Part B:** Please read the following statements carefully and rate them by marking the option that matches your opinion with (X). (**Note: 5 is most, 0 is least**)

When I receive feedback from my instructor, I feel						
	0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Shy						
2. Proud						
3. Nervous						
4. Motivated						
5. Confident						
6. Humiliated						
7. Relaxed						
8. Anxious						
9. Upset						
10. Offended						
11. Neutral						
12. Frustrated						
13. Confused						
14. Depressed						
15. Comfortable						
16. Disappointed						
17. Worried						
18. Knowledgeable						
19. Stressed						

--> Thank you for your participation<--



APPENDIX H

Class B Questionnaire

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback Process in EFL

Dear Participant,

This questionnaire is designed to find out your attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process. Please be sincere in providing your replies. The data that you provide will be kept confidential and will be anonymously used in analysing the English as a foreign language learners' attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process.

Thank you in advance for your attention and participation.

Fatma engül

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen

MA Student

Supervisor

Department of ELT

Department of ELT

Near East University

Near East University

E-mail: fatmasengul3@gmail.com

E-mail: hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr

Demographic Information

Please provide information by completing the blanks and marking options you select with (X).

Native Language: _____

Gender: () Female () Male

- ❖ **Part A:** Please read the following statements carefully and mark the option that matches your opinion with (X) as in the example and write the reason behind your opinion.

Statements	Mark one of the following options.	Please write the reason(s) behind your opinion in this column.
<p>Example: Mostly, I like to</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Write <input type="checkbox"/> Read <input type="checkbox"/> Speak</p>	<p><u>I like to write because I want to talk about my thoughts.</u></p>
<p>1. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive feedback from</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Peer(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor&Peer(s)</p>	<p>.....</p>
<p>2. I think receiving indirect written corrective feedback had ...</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Advantages <input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantages</p>	<p>.....</p>

- ❖ **Part B:** Please read the following statements carefully and rate them by marking the option that matches your opinion with (X). (**Note: 5 is most, 0 is least**)

When I receive feedback from my instructor and peer, I feel	0	1	2	3	4	5
	1. Shy					
2. Proud						
3. Nervous						
4. Motivated						
5. Confident						
6. Humiliated						
7. Relaxed						
8. Anxious						
9. Upset						
10. Offended						
11. Neutral						
12. Frustrated						
13. Confused						
14. Depressed						
15. Comfortable						
16. Disappointed						
17. Worried						
18. Knowledgeable						
19. Stressed						

-->Thank you for your participation and contribution. <--



APPENDIX I

ClassC Questionnaire

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback Process in EFL

Dear Participant,

This questionnaire is designed to find out your attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process. Please be sincere in providing your replies. The data that you provide will be kept confidential and will be anonymously used in analysing the English as a foreign language learners' attitudes toward the agent factor during the indirect written corrective feedback process.

Thank you in advance for your attention and participation.

Fatma engül

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hanife Bensen

MA Student

Supervisor

Department of ELT

Department of ELT

Near East University

Near East University

E-mail: fatmasengul3@gmail.com

E-mail: hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr

Personal Information

Please provide information by completing the blanks and marking options you select with (X).

Native Language: _____

Gender: () Female () Male

- ❖ **Part A:** Please read the following statements carefully and mark the option that matches your opinion with (X) as in the example and write the reason behind your opinion.

Statements	Mark one of the following options.	Please write the reason(s) behind your opinion in this column.
<p>Example: Mostly, I like to</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Write <input type="checkbox"/> Read <input type="checkbox"/> Speak</p>	<p><u>I like to write because I want to talk about my thoughts.</u></p>
<p>1. If I had another chance to receive feedback, I would like to receive feedback from</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Peer(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor&Peer(s)</p>	<p>.....</p>
<p>2. I think receiving indirect written corrective feedback had ...</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Advantages <input type="checkbox"/> Disadvantages</p>	<p>.....</p>

- ❖ **Part B:** Please read the following statements carefully and rate them by marking the option that matches your opinion with (X). (**Note: 5 is most, 0 is least**)

When I receive feedback from my instructor and peer, I feel						
	0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Shy						
2. Proud						
3. Nervous						
4. Motivated						
5. Confident						
6. Humiliated						
7. Relaxed						
8. Anxious						
9. Upset						
10. Offended						
11. Neutral						
12. Frustrated						
13. Confused						
14. Depressed						
15. Comfortable						
16. Disappointed						
17. Worried						
18. Knowledgeable						
19. Stressed						

-->Thank you for your participation and contribution. <--



APPENDIX J

EFL Learner's Perceptions

Table 23

EFL Learners' Perceptions

Statements about the feelings	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. When I receive feedback I feel shy.	16	1.25	1.73	1.38	1.50	1.25	1.80
2. When I receive feedback I feel proud.	16	2.81	1.90	2.00	1.41	3.13	1.50
3. When I receive feedback I feel nervous.	16	0.94	1.52	1.06	1.43	0.38	0.71
4. When I receive feedback I feel motivated.	16	3.81	1.55	2.94	1.91	4.06	1.18
5. When I receive feedback I feel confident.	16	3.63	1.58	3.06	1.38	4.13	0.88
6. When I receive feedback I feel humiliated.	16	0.13	0.34	0.69	1.53	0.31	0.87
7. When I receive feedback I feel relaxed.	16	3.81	1.32	2.13	1.96	3.13	1.70
8. When I receive feedback I feel anxious.	16	0.94	1.28	1.25	1.34	0.56	0.72
9. When I receive feedback I feel upset.	16	0.25	0.57	0.75	1.43	0.25	0.77
10. When I receive feedback I feel offended.	16	0.13	0.34	0.50	1.21	0.38	1.02
11. When I receive feedback I feel neutral.	16	1.63	1.89	2.31	2.08	1.63	1.78
12. When I receive feedback I feel frustrated.	16	0.19	0.40	0.56	1.41	0.00	0.00
13. When I receive feedback I feel confused.	16	0.56	0.96	1.19	1.37	0.56	0.81
14. When I receive feedback I feel depressed.	16	0.88	1.40	0.81	1.64	0.13	0.34
15. When I receive feedback I feel comfortable.	16	3.63	0.96	3.00	1.78	3.31	1.40
16. When I receive feedback I feel disappointed.	16	0.69	1.40	1.00	1.63	0.25	0.77
17. When I receive feedback I feel worried.	16	0.38	0.71	1.25	1.84	0.75	1.34
18. When I receive feedback I feel knowledgeable.	16	3.50	1.26	3.19	1.64	3.50	1.41
19. When I receive feedback I feel stressed.	16	1.63	1.70	2.56	1.86	1.06	1.52
Valid N (listwise)	16						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

APPENDIX K

Pseudonyms

Pseudonyms

Class A. Carol, Isabel, Jack, Jane, John, and Robert.

Class B. Alice, Bob, Dean, Diana, Janessa, and Sam.

Class C. Elsa, Fiona, Mike, Rose, Smith and Tom.

APPENDIX L

Instructor vs Researcher's Scores

Table 3

Instructor vs Researcher's Scores

Classes & Participants	Raters' Scores	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5
IIWCF Participant 1	Instructor	6/10	7/10	6/10	6/10	3/10
	Researcher	6/10	7/10	6/10	6/10	2/10
IIWCF Participant 2	Instructor	6/10	5/10	6/10	7/10	7/10
	Researcher	6/10	5/10	6/10	7/10	7/10
IIWCF Participant 3	Instructor	7/10	8/10	7/10	9/10	6/10
	Researcher	7/10	8/10	7/10	9/10	7/10
IIWCF Participant 4	Instructor	10/10	1/10	9/10	9/10	9/10
	Researcher	10/10	1/10	9/10	9/10	8/10
IIWCF Participant 5	Instructor	7/10	6/10	7/10	7/10	6/10
	Researcher	7/10	6/10	7/10	7/10	6/10
IIWCF Participant 6	Instructor	7/10	8/10	7/10	8/10	7/10
	Researcher	7/10	8/10	8/10	8/10	7/10
IIWCF Participant 7	Instructor	5/10	6/10	7/10	5/10	6/10
	Researcher	5/10	6/10	7/10	5/10	6/10
IIWCF Participant 8	Instructor	10/10	9/10	10/10	10/10	7/10
	Researcher	10/10	9/10	9/10	10/10	8/10
IIWCF Participant 9	Instructor	6/10	5/10	6/10	9/10	7/10
	Researcher	5/10	5/10	6/10	9/10	7/10
IIWCF Participant 10	Instructor	4/10	8/10	9/10	6/10	5/10
	Researcher	5/10	8/10	9/10	5/10	5/10
IIWCF Participant 11	Instructor	8/10	9/10	8/10	8/10	8/10

	Researcher	8/10	9/10	8/10	7/10	8/10
IIWCF Participant 12	Instructor	8/10	10/10	9/10	9/10	8/10
	Researcher	8/10	10/10	9/10	9/10	8/10
IIWCF Participant 13	Instructor	8/10	10/10	10/10	10/10	9/10
	Researcher	9/10	10/10	10/10	9/10	9/10
IIWCF Participant 14	Instructor	8/10	9/10	4/10	6/10	5/10
	Researcher	8/10	9/10	4/10	6/10	5/10
IIWCF Participant 15	Instructor	8/10	7/10	2/10	7/10	8/10
	Researcher	8/10	7/10	3/10	7/10	8/10
IIWCF Participant 16	Instructor	10/10	9/10	8/10	7/10	6/10
	Researcher	10/10	9/10	8/10	7/10	6/10
PIWCF Participant 1	Instructor	5/10	4/10	4/10	5/10	3/10
	Researcher	5/10	4/10	5/10	5/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 2	Instructor	1/10	6/10	3/10	6/10	3/10
	Researcher	2/10	6/10	3/10	6/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 3	Instructor	5/10	6/10	5/10	4/10	3/10
	Researcher	4/10	6/10	5/10	5/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 4	Instructor	3/10	3/10	3/10	3/10	3/10
	Researcher	3/10	3/10	2/10	4/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 5	Instructor	10/10	9/10	10/10	9/10	1/10
	Researcher	10/10	9/10	10/10	8/10	1/10
PIWCF Participant 6	Instructor	7/10	9/10	6/10	8/10	4/10
	Researcher	7/10	9/10	6/10	8/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 7	Instructor	3/10	5/10	3/10	3/10	3/10
	Researcher	3/10	5/10	3/10	4/10	3/10
PIWCF Participant 8	Instructor	5/10	6/10	3/10	7/10	5/10
	Researcher	5/10	6/10	3/10	6/10	5/10

PIWCF Participant 9	Instructor	9/10	9/10	8/10	8/10	9/10
	Researcher	9/10	9/10	8/10	8/10	9/10
PIWCF Participant 10	Instructor	3/10	8/10	9/10	6/10	6/10
	Researcher	3/10	8/10	9/10	6/10	7/10
PIWCF Participant 11	Instructor	8/10	10/10	7/10	8/10	6/10
	Researcher	8/10	10/10	7/10	8/10	6/10
PIWCF Participant 12	Instructor	9/10	8/10	8/10	9/10	7/10
	Researcher	9/10	8/10	8/10	9/10	8/10
PIWCF Participant 13	Instructor	9/10	10/10	8/10	7/10	8/10
	Researcher	9/10	9/10	7/10	7/10	7/10
PIWCF Participant 14	Instructor	7/10	8/10	1/10	7/10	6/10
	Researcher	7/10	8/10	1/10	7/10	6/10
PIWCF Participant 15	Instructor	10/10	10/10	8/10	8/10	10/10
	Researcher	10/10	10/10	9/10	8/10	10/10
PIWCF Participant 16	Instructor	8/10	7/10	4/10	6/10	5/10
	Researcher	8/10	7/10	4/10	5/10	5/10
CIWCF Participant 1	Instructor	6/10	8/10	8/10	7/10	7/10
	Researcher	6/10	8/10	8/10	7/10	6/10
CIWCF Participant 2	Instructor	8/10	8/10	9/10	9/10	10/10
	Researcher	7/10	8/10	9/10	9/10	10/10
CIWCF Participant 3	Instructor	8/10	10/10	9/10	7/10	10/10
	Researcher	8/10	10/10	9/10	8/10	10/10
CIWCF Participant 4	Instructor	7/10	8/10	7/10	7/10	6/10
	Researcher	8/10	8/10	7/10	7/10	6/10
CIWCF Participant 5	Instructor	9/10	9/10	9/10	8/10	9/10
	Researcher	9/10	9/10	9/10	8/10	8/10
CIWCF Participant 6	Instructor	7/10	9/10	6/10	9/10	6/10

	Researcher	7/10	8/10	7/10	9/10	6/10
CIWCF Participant 7	Instructor	10/10	10/10	9/10	9/10	8/10
	Researcher	10/10	10/10	9/10	9/10	9/10
CIWCF Participant 8	Instructor	10/10	9/10	8/10	6/10	7/10
	Researcher	10/10	9/10	7/10	6/10	7/10
CIWCF Participant 9	Instructor	6/10	8/10	8/10	8/10	8/10
	Researcher	6/10	7/10	7/10	7/10	8/10
CIWCF Participant 10	Instructor	7/10	9/10	8/10	8/10	9/10
	Researcher	6/10	9/10	7/10	8/10	9/10
CIWCF Participant 11	Instructor	8/10	8/10	8/10	3/10	7/10
	Researcher	8/10	8/10	7/10	3/10	8/10
CIWCF Participant 12	Instructor	8/10	8/10	9/10	8/10	9/10
	Researcher	8/10	8/10	9/10	8/10	9/10
CIWCF Participant 13	Instructor	7/10	8/10	8/10	8/10	6/10
	Researcher	7/10	8/10	8/10	8/10	6/10
CIWCF Participant 14	Instructor	1/10	3/10	2/10	3/10	2/10
	Researcher	2/10	3/10	2/10	3/10	2/10
CIWCF Participant 15	Instructor	6/10	8/10	7/10	7/10	8/10
	Researcher	6/10	8/10	6/10	7/10	8/10
CIWCF Participant 16	Instructor	9/10	9/10	8/10	10/10	9/10
	Researcher	9/10	9/10	8/10	9/10	9/10

APPENDIX M

Interview Transcript

Participant Thoughts

Question 1: Do you think that IWCF is an essential part of the learning process/ developing your writing skills? Why or why not?

Class A

Jane: I agree that IWCF is an essential part of the learning process, because we have a chance to see our mistakes.

Carol: Yes it is. By the help of the IWCF that we received from our instructor, by the help of the IIWCF that we received from our instructor, we learned about our mistakes so that, our writing improved and we started to write more correctly.

Isabel: Yes, in my opinion, by the help of the IWCF that we received from our instructor, our writing improved. We can understand these from the mistakes that we did from our first paragraph to the last paragraph.

Jack: I believe that my writing improved, as I took the instructors' IWCF into consideration.

John: Yes, because without it we cannot correct our mistakes and we continue to do these mistakes. So that, without IWCF, we cannot improve our writing. In sum, it is beneficial.

Robert: In general, I believe that IWCF helps us to improve our writing but to be honest, I do not take it into consideration.

Class B

Alice: IWCF is an essential part of the learning process, because it helps us to reach the correct information.

Diana: Yes, it is an essential part of the learning process, because without IWCF, we cannot learn about our mistakes, even we cannot be aware of our mistakes.

Janessa: I think it is essential, but if we receive the IWCF from the instructor, because I do not trust my peers' feedback, as all of us are not proficient enough to give feedback to each other.

Dean: Yes, it is essential part of the writing process, in order to write more correctly.

Sam: I think IWCF is essential part of the writing process, because it guides us in order to become more proficient in writing.

Bob: In my opinion it is essential, but I think it should be given by the instructor, because peers might provide incorrect feedback and if they provide incorrect feedback to us, we cannot benefit from it.

Class C

Rose: In my opinion, it is essential. As I mentioned before, by the help of the IWCF, we can learn new information and we can improve my language skills.

Elsa: Yes, it is essential for the writing process, because it guides us during the writing process and we notice our mistakes.

Fiona: IWCF is essential, because it is educative and informative.

Tom: In my opinion IWCF is essential, because by the help of the directions that we receive, we learn to write with less mistakes.

Smith: Yes, it is essential, because without knowing about our mistakes we cannot improve our writing skills.

Mike: Yes, it is essential because we notice the mistakes and next time we do not keep to repeat the same mistakes.

Question 2: Is there any advantages of receiving IWCF from instructor/ peer/ instructor and peer? If yes, what are these?

Class A

Jane: Instructor is the best feedback agent and s/he always provides correct feedback.

Carol: Instructor provides proper feedback, so that we can learn about every single mistake.

Isabel: Instructor is the most knowledgeable and proficient person. Therefore, we never doubt about the reliability of the feedback. Then, s/he never laughs at us for our mistakes.

Jack: Instructor always knows the best, because s/he knows our level and helps us to improve our writing.

John: IWCF it is reliable and I trust my instructor's feedback. So that, I felt more relaxed with my instructor's feedback.

Robert: Instructor never makes mistake, her feedback is always correct and she provides feedback for every single mistake.

Class B

Alice: In my opinion, PIWCF had no advantages, because I did not trust my peers' IWCF, as the reliability is very important for me and I did not feel confident and knowledgeable with my peers IWCF.

Diana: No, because everyone learns about your mistake and I do not want my peers to see my work.

Janessa: In my opinion it has no advantages but I like to share my ideas with my peers.

Dean: It does not have any advantages, because we are not skilled enough to provide feedback to each other.

Sam: PF has advantages. For instance, I feel more relaxed and motivated with my peers' feedback than the instructors' feedback.

Bob: No, it does not have any advantages, because peers might provide incorrect feedback.

Class C

Rose: Receiving IWCF as collaboratively has advantages, because as the instructor and peers are collaborate during the feedback process, we receive more reliable feedback.

Elsa: Yes, it has advantages because we learn from our peers too, by the guidance of the instructor.

Fiona: Yes, it has advantages, because peers and the instructor are work together during the feedback process. As a result, feedback process becomes more reliable and enjoyable.

Tom: Yes, it has advantages, because we receive IWCF from both the instructor and peers, if one of the agents miss to notice a mistake, another agent could notice it.

Smith: Yes, we share our works with each other and we have a chance to learn from each other's mistakes.

Mike: CIWF had advantages, as it creates more friendly, comfortable and collaborative environment.

Question 3: Is there any disadvantages of receiving IWCF from instructor/ peer/ instructor and peer? If yes, what are these?

Class A

Jane: No, there isn't any disadvantages of it.

Carol: No.

Isabel: No, there isn't any disadvantages of receiving IWCF from instructor.

Jack: No there isn't.

John: No.

Robert: No there isn't.

Class B

Alice: No there isn't.

Diana: No there isn't.

Janessa: No.

Dean: No it doesn't have any disadvantages.

Sam: No there isn't any disadvantages of it.

Bob: No.

Class C

Rose: No, there isn't any disadvantages of it.

Elsa: No there isn't.

Fiona: No, I think it does not have any disadvantages.

Tom: No, there isn't.

Smith: No.

Mike: No.

Participant Feelings

Question 1: How do you feel, when you receive IWCF from the instructor/ peer/ instructor and peer? Do you feel shy, confident, anxious, nervous, upset, depressed, relaxed, motivated, humiliated or offended? Why?

Class A

Jane: I feel knowledgeable and learned, because instructor is the best feedback agent, in order to receive feedback. So that, we should feel happy that our instructor guides us during the learning process.

Similarly,

Carol: I feel knowledgeable, because I learn about my mistakes and next time, I try to avoid making these mistakes.

Isabel: I feel comfortable, happy and knowledgeable, because I learn about my mistakes by the help of IIWCF'

Jack: I feel knowledgeable and comfortable, because I make a lot of mistakes and I need to correct them.

John: I feel confident and comfortable, because IWCF is necessary for the writing process.

Robert: I feel that I am improving my language, so I feel learned and knowledgeable.

Class B

Alice: I feel less humiliated, because my peer is not better than me.

Diana: I feel less frustrated, because only my peers learn about my mistakes.

Janessa: I feel confident with the PIWCF, because no one is better than anyone in the classroom

Dean: I feel confident and relaxed I receive feedback from their peers.

Sam: I feel less humiliated, because my peer could not able to find all of my mistakes. So that, I see a few mistakes on my work.

Bob: Actually I feel less offended, because our proficiency level is almost the same.

Class C

Rose: When I receive IWCF, I feel happy and motivated because I believe that by the help of the IWCF that I receive, I will write better next time.

Elsa: I felt happy, motivated and knowledgeable with the CIWCF, because by the help of both my instructor and peers I improved my writing and I enjoyed from the IWCF process.

Fiona: I feel motivated, because I need to be motivated in order to perform better in my following paragraphs.

Tom: I feel more comfortable and confident as I receive feedback from both my instructor and peers.

Smith: I feel knowledgeable and motivated because I feel learned.

Mike: I feel confident, happy and knowledgeable because I learn about my mistakes and next time I try to be more careful.

Question 2: Do you feel that you are improving your language proficiency in general (i.e., all skills, sub-skills)? Why or why not?

Class A

Jane: Yes, I feel that I improve my language in general, because after each IWCF session, I learn about my mistakes and I correct them. As a consequence, I try not to repeat the same mistake in my next paragraph.

Carol: Yes, I feel that my writing and language improves, by the help of the IWCF that I receive, because I learn about my mistakes and I work on them.

Isabel: I agree with it. I feel that I improve my language, because I noticed that, during the writing sessions I made a few grammatical mistakes, so that I learned that I need to work more on grammatical rules, in order to improve my language.

Jack: By the help of the IWCF that I received from my instructor, I feel that I improve my writing. For instance, in one of my essays, I noticed that I made simple but an important mistake, such as starting a sentence with a capital letter after putting a comma to the end of my sentence. If my instructor didn't provide IWCF to me for this mistake, I might keep repeating the same mistake without being aware of it.

John: I improve my language with IIWCF because I have a chance to see my mistakes and after repeating the same mistake a few times and receiving the feedback for it several times, I learned to write more accurately.

Robert: Yes, of course, because if it doesn't help us to improve our language, none of the instructors spend time for it. In brief, instructors always know the best.

Class B

Alice: I think it depends, because if my peer provides me incorrect feedback, without any doubt I feel that I do not improve my language, but if the feedback is correct, I might feel that I improve my language. In my opinion we cannot compare the PF with TF. Instructors' feedback is always better than the peers' feedback.

Diana: No, because my peers are not proficient enough to provide me IWCF.

Janessa: I do not trust my peers' IWCF. Honestly, I feel that I didn't improve my language skills, during the PIWCF sessions do not trust my peers' feedback. Honestly, I feel that I didn't improve my language skills, during the PF sessions.

Dean: I disagree that I improve my writing with my peers' feedback, because I do not find it reliable.

Sam: As I am not sure that I receive proper feedback, I do not feel that I am improving my writing with the PF.

Bob: Reliability depends on the peer that I receive IWCF. If s/he is proficient enough to provide IWCF, my language skills will improve, if not, as I will receive incorrect or improper IWCF, my language proficiency level will decrease.

Class C

Rose: I feel that I am improving my language skills, by the help of the CIWCF, because I receive feedback from both my instructors and peers. So that, if one of them miss to see one of my mistake, another agent can notice it.

Elsa: I improve my language skills with the CIWCF, because I learn about my mistakes and also my peers' common mistakes. So that, I improve my language skills especially my grammar and vocabulary.

Fiona: Yes, definitely, because by the help of the CF sessions, I learned new vocabulary items from my peers' paragraphs".

Tom: Yes, I feel that I am improving my language skills, especially my writing.

Smith: Yes, because my peers and my instructor is very helpful.

Mike: I improved my language skills, because in addition to our mistakes, we have a chance to see our peers' mistakes and we try to correct these mistakes too and while doing these, we learn from our peers' mistakes too.

Participant Preferences

Question 1: If you had another chance to receive IWCF from your instructor/ peer/ both instructor and peer, which one would you prefer? Why?

Class A

Jane: If I had another chance to receive IWCF from another agent, I would like to receive IWCF as collaboratively. Due to the fact that instructor is the most reliable source for the feedback and peers make the feedback process more enjoyable.

Carol: Sometimes our peers or instructor might miss to see our mistakes. In my opinion, if we include both of them to the feedback process, we might overcome to this problem. So that, I believe that CIWCF might be more effective.

Isabel: I prefer IWCF as the instructor is the most knowledgeable and proficient person. Therefore, we never doubt about the reliability of the feedback. Then, she never laughs at us for our mistakes.

Jack: If I had another chance to receive IWCF, I would prefer to receive PIWCF, because I like to share my ideas with my ideas with my peers and we never judge to each other with our mistakes, we just say the truth to each other.

John: In my opinion, receiving CIWCF is the most logical choice as it gives you chance to learn from both instructor and peers. More than these, you can share your ideas and discuss your opinions with your peers during the language learning process.

Robert: If someone asks me a question like this, without thinking a minute my answer would be CIWCF, because instructor is the most reliable source and proficient person in the classroom, while I feel more comfortable with my peers' feedback.

Class B

Alice: If I had another chance, I would prefer to receive IIWCF because her feedback is reliable.

Diana: I prefer to receive CIWCF, as the both peers and instructor collaborate during the IWCF process. Additionally, I think there would be more supportive and creative environment, and also it is more reliable.

Janessa: If I had another chance, I would prefer to receive IWCF as collaboratively, as the instructor is the most proficient person and always provide correct feedback and peers make the learning process more enjoyable and memorable.

Dean: I would prefer to receive collaborative feedback, as both the instructor and peers collaborate during the language learning process.

Sam: Instructor is the most proficient and reliable source, so that we do not have any hesitations about the correctness of the feedback provided by her/him. So that I prefer to receive IIWCF.

Bob: I would prefer to receive PIWCF, because by the help of it I feel more relaxed, and motivated as my peers help me to notice my mistakes'

Class C

Rose: I think, both the instructor and peers are helpful for the writing process, as a consequence, I would prefer to receive CIWCF.

Elsa: I would prefer to receive CIWCF, because it creates more supportive and friendly environment. We share our thoughts with each other and learn from each other's mistake.

Fiona: Both the instructor and peers were helpful for the writing process, so that, I would prefer to receive CIWCF. By the help of both peers' and the instructors' IWCF, I felt more motivated and learned'

Tom: I would prefer both the instructor and peers' feedback because they help me to improve my writing.

Smith: I would prefer CIWCF, because I have a chance to collaborate with both my instructor and peers.

Mike: If I had another chance to receive IWCF from another agent, I would prefer to receive CIWCF, because as I experienced from the CIWCF sessions, I was not only person in the classroom that made mistakes. For this reason, my motivation increased.

APPENDIX N

ELT Learner's Perceptions

Table 24

ELT Learners' Perceptions

Statements about the feelings	N	Instructor		Peer		Collaborative	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. When I receive feedback I feel shy.	10	1.10	1.28	1.10	1.44	1.00	1.24
2. When I receive feedback I feel proud.	10	2.10	2.07	2.40	1.57	2.80	1.61
3. When I receive feedback I feel nervous.	10	1.60	1.50	1.50	1.78	1.40	1.50
4. When I receive feedback I feel motivated.	10	3.10	1.28	3.50	1.71	3.60	1.42
5. When I receive feedback I feel confident.	10	2.80	1.22	3.10	1.66	3.20	1.75
6. When I receive feedback I feel humiliated.	10	0.90	1.28	1.60	1.71	0.40	0.96
7. When I receive feedback I feel relaxed.	10	2.60	1.35	2.90	1.52	2.20	0.78
8. When I receive feedback I feel anxious.	10	1.50	0.85	1.00	0.66	1.20	1.54
9. When I receive feedback I feel upset.	10	1.10	1.19	0.40	0.69	0.70	1.15
10. When I receive feedback I feel offended.	10	0.60	0.96	0.90	1.10	0.10	0.31
11. When I receive feedback I feel neutral.	10	3.00	1.56	2.80	2.25	2.20	1.75
12. When I receive feedback I feel frustrated.	10	1.10	1.10	1.00	1.15	0.90	1.10
13. When I receive feedback I feel confused.	10	1.30	0.82	1.70	1.25	0.90	0.73
14. When I receive feedback I feel depressed.	10	1.10	1.59	0.80	1.39	0.40	0.96
15. When I receive feedback I feel comfortable.	10	2.60	1.26	3.40	1.43	2.80	0.42
16. When I receive feedback I feel disappointed.	10	0.90	1.10	1.50	1.50	0.70	1.05
17. When I receive feedback I feel worried.	10	1.20	1.31	1.50	1.17	0.80	1.03
18. When I receive feedback I feel knowledgeable.	10	3.50	1.26	3.10	1.72	3.80	1.13
19. When I receive feedback I feel stressed.	10	1.40	1.07	1.60	1.26	1.30	1.56
Valid N (listwise)	10						

Key: M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

APPENDIX O

Turnitin Report

Thesis Fatma Şengül

ORIGINALITY REPORT

12%	10%	6%	6%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

MATCH ALL SOURCES (ONLY SELECTED SOURCE PRINTED)

4%

★ etd.lib.metu.edu.tr

Internet Source

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 5 words

Exclude bibliography On