Eurasian Journal of Educational Research 76 (2018) 73-92

Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

Who is the Most Effective Agent When Giving Indirect Written Corrective Feedback?

Hanife Bensen BOSTANCI[1], Fatma SENGUL[2]

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received: 22 Mar. 2018
Received in revised form: 17 May 2018
Accepted: 5 Jul. 2018
DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.76.4

Keywords
Gender, english as a foreign language learners, writing improvement

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Who is the most effective agent when giving indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) to English as a foreign language (EFL)? The answer is ambiguous, and factors such as gender have been neglected. For these reasons, this study attempts to reveal the most effective agent when giving IWCF and seeks to highlight the impact of gender when receiving IWCF from different agents. **Method:** A quasi-experimental study was carried out in which the participants were three classes of EFL learners studying at a private university's preparatory school. One of the classes was named class A, which only recieved instructor IWCF, another class B, which only recieved peer IWCF, and the last class C, which only recieved collaborative IWCF for a five-week period. Each group produced five written texts regarding the same topic each week at the same time. The data, or the participants' texts, were analyzed quantitatively. **Findings:** It was revealed that class C—who received only collaborative IWCF—significantly improved their writing skills compared to the other classes that received teacher and peer IWCF. In terms of gender, it was revealed that the male participants performed better than the female participants in class A, and the female participants in classes B and C produced better written texts compared to the male participants. **Implications for Research and Practice:** Pre-service and in-service teachers should provide IWCF to their EFL learners collaboratively, and they should consider the gender factor. It is suggested that future research focuses on other factors (i.e. age, proficiency). It is also suggested that researchers focus on the other type of feedback, namely direct written corrective feedback.

[1] Corresponding Author: Near East University, North Cyprus. e-mail: hanife.bensen@neu.edu.tr., ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5451-8698
[2] Near East University, North Cyprus. e-mail: fatmasengul3@gmail.com, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9925-6449

Introduction

Written errors are unavoidable in our first language (L1), let alone a foreign/second language (L2). English as a foreign language (EFL) learners commit errors, and as teachers (instructors), we tend to correct our students in some way to help them develop their writing skills. Giving indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) is undeniably beneficial for EFL students to improve their writing skills. It is through IWCF that learners see and work on their errors. However, it is still unknown whether the agent through whom learners receive constructive IWCF and thereby produce better writing matters. In addition, to the best of our knowledge, no study has indicated the impact of gender when receiving IWCF in the Turkish Cypriot context.

As the feedback process gains a great deal of importance in the worldwide context, English Language Teaching (ELT) instructors in the Turkish Cypriot context have started to pay more attention to the feedback process. In this context, very few studies have focused on the IWCF process (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2017). In contrast, a few researchers have focused on the effects of the agent factor in the feedback process (Marzban & Shrjami, 2014; Mowlaie, 2014). As a result, instructors are unaware of the importance and effects of the agent in the IWCF process (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2017).

Particularly in the Turkish Cypriot context, instructors pay little or no attention to providing effective and constructive feedback to their students (Bensen & Cavusoglu, 2017). In general, EFL students receive traditional teacher feedback, where direct corrections (see literature review section) are provided by the instructor. Nowadays, some institutions have started to provide IWCF to their EFL students by using their departments' own writing correction codes. Additionally, some have started to provide peer feedback, and a few have started to provide collaborative feedback. In order to universalize agents during the feedback process, we need to pinpoint the effects on EFL students' writing performance and to take gender into account when doing so. In short, more focus should be given to the issues and dilemmas related with the feedback process in the Turkish Cypriot context.

Currently, writing is the prominent skill of language-learning instruction for evaluating academic achievement in the education sector. Students spend more time studying their writing skills in order to have full fluency, and thus they learn to act as a decision maker in their writing process during their language learning classes (Jahin, 2012). As a result, a good command of writing skills is crucial in language learning. In terms of teaching writing, not many changes and advancement have been made, particularly when giving indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF) to students' errors (Marzban & Sarjami 2014).

Writing plays a key role in the cognition process, as it leads, composes, and communicates one's opinions (Yugandhar, 2015). In fact, a great number of researchers believe that writing is one of the most difficult skills, both to be learned and to be taught (Su, 2011). One important element of writing and writing improvement is errors. Errors can be viewed as an indispensable part of the foreign language-learning process; they are unavoidable for instructors, who are the first agents that reply to students' inappropriate language productions (Li & He, 2017). Instructors "find these

as guiding stars reflecting upon the learning process of learners", that is, "the teacher today is conscious of the fact that errors reflect how much the learners have learned and guide the teachers 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 (Raja, Albasher, & Farid 2016). They indicate to teachers the areas that they need to focus on in order to improve their students' language proficiency.

According to Zaman and Azad (2012), feedback is a major element of the foreign language writing pedagogy; students wait for feedback on their work, having ideas about their strong and weak points**.** Therefore, providing students with constructive and effective feedback will foster their learning. The term *written corrective feedback* (WCF) can be identified as a 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). Two distinctive types of WCF have been introduced into the literature: direct and indirect WCF. The process of *direct written corrective feedback* (DWCF) can be defined as a language tool that is used to help students see their errors and the corrected version of their errors; linguistic forms are provided by the agent. On the other hand, *indirect written corrective feedback* (IWCF) can be defined as a clue that points out to the student that an error has been committed (Hosseiny, 2014). Furthermore, 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). In this process, the students are provided codes, i.e. WW (meaning 'wrong word'), underlining, circling, etc. that highlight that an error exists. Guenette (2012) emphasized that "for linguistic notions that the learners have been exposed to or are expected to know, it makes sense to provide indirect corrections with or without brief explanations or simply reminders to consult their notes or other resources". Still, "for features that are clearly outside the realm of the learners or that have not been the subject of instruction, direct corrections can be used, or errors can simply be ignored" (pp. 121-122). Many researchers revealed that IWCF is efficient in developing students' language and writing abilities (Alhumidi & Uba 2016, p. 366).

Information gathered from surveys has indicated that IWCF is the most common type of feedback strategy in which students and instructors engage, and prominent distinctions exist among the learners' predilections for direct and indirect written corrective feedback (Li & He, 2017, p. 71). A great deal of research regarding the impact of DWCF and IWCF on grammatical accuracy advancement not only concluded that IWCF was more effective than DWCF in promoting grammatical accuracy, but also found that IWCF "led to either greater or similar levels of accuracy over time" (Phiewma & Padgate, 2017, pp. 1-2). Another research finding showed that students at higher proficiency levels prefer to receive IWCF, while students at lower proficiency levels prefer to receive DWCF (Zareil & Rahnama, 2013, p. 10).

With regard to gender, different findings have been revealed. In light of Li and He's (2017) research findings, it could be said that "gender difference significantly influences learners' preference" during the feedback process (p. 63). In contrast, some studies indicated no significant difference between the preferences of female and male

EFL learners regarding the feedback process (Kahraman & Yalvac, 2015, p. 78). Moreover, no prominent distinction has been found between male and female students with regard to their predilections for WCF, apart from their preference of the requirement of error correction and the 'no corrective feedback' option. In other words, female and male students showed 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 of the students in their study stated that teacher WCF was more beneficial, and 51 of the learners stated that peer WCF was beneficial—that is, students preferred teacher WCF to peer WCF. On the other hand, if the gender variable is taken into consideration, no statistically-significant difference was found between male and female students in delivering the specific agents of peer and teacher WCF (Khorshidi & Rassaei, 2013, p. 80).

The agent who gives feedback is also important. Azevedo et al. (2012) mentioned that "pedagogical agents can adequately and correctly detect, track, model, and foster learners' self-regulatory processes" (p. 212). Additionally, 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). Thus, in this study, the term *agent factor* refers to people such as a teacher or peers who are the source of feedback that the students receive; this study examines their effects on the IWCF process.

One of the agents who gives feedback is the teacher. As Marzban and Sarjami (2014) pointed out, "there is no doubt that teacher written feedback plays an essential role in English writing classes" (p. 293). Thus, as can be understood from the name, *teacher feedback* is the process through which the teacher provides feedback to the learners.

Another agent is the peers in the class. Bijami, Kashef and Nejad (2013) defined the term *peer feedback* as the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing. (p. 93)

Peer feedback refers to the process where students provide feedback to each other.

A more recent agent is collaboration. Barnawi (2010) defines the term *collaborative feedback* as the "collaboration between students and students or students and teachers who are engaged in the act of explaining, arguing, and negotiating their ideas with their peers" (pp. 211-212). Indeed, collaborative feedback is the process in which students and teachers collaborate with each other in order to discover the errors; they share their knowledge about these errors and participate in the learning process together.

Not many studies have explicitly pointed out which specific agent helps develop writing skills, nor which gender reaps more benefits when receiving IWCF from a

particular agent (Sengul & Bostanci, 2018). For this reason, the aim of this study is to explore and reveal the most effective agent in giving IWCF to EFL students studying at a preparatory school in North Cyprus. In addition, this study aims to reveal the effects of gender on receiving IWCF from the teacher, from peers, and collaboratively.

To be able to address this topic, the following research questions are posed:

1. Which agent improves English as a foreign language (EFL) learners' writing skills the most when indirect written corrective feedback is employed?
2. What is the effect of gender when receiving indirect written corrective feedback from different agents?

Research Hypothesis

1. When the proficiency level of the learners and this specific context are taken into account, the EFL learners will improve their writing performance more when receiving instructor IWCF.
2. Female students will improve their writing skills in all three groups more than the male students.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design in which three classes of EFL students received IWCF from different agents: teacher, peer, and collaborative. The design is quasi-experimental in the sense that the participants were not selected by the researchers. In quasi-experimental designs, the samples are not randomly assigned (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The class that received IWCF from their teacher acted as the control group, while the two other groups (peer and collaborative) acted as the experimental groups.

Research Sample

Forty-eight EFL learners constituted the sample of this study. Three classes were selected, each class consisting of 16 EFL learners. All the participants of this study were preparatory school students, with an elementary proficiency level in English, studying at a private university in North Cyprus. The research participants' ethnic origins were Turkish, Turkish Cypriot, Arabic, and Kurdish, and all participants were over the age of 18.

Research Instrument and Procedure

To be able to determine the answers to the aforementioned research questions, five written text scores of the participants were compared, both within the group and with the other groups. In addition, the written text scores were compared again in terms of gender, both within the same group and with the other groups.

Three classes of EFL students were selected. These three classes followed the exact same writing syllabus with different instructors for one semester (16 weeks in total: 14 weeks of instruction, a midterm, and final exam week). However, only five of these weeks were used to carry out this study. At the end of each of the five weeks, the students of each group produced a written text. These written texts were selected by the institution before classes commenced. 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 favorite restaurant.

Initially, the three classes were named class A, B, and C. Class A received instructor IWCF, class B received peer IWCF, and class C received collaborative IWCF. The instructor in class A, the peers in class B, and the learners and instructor in class C were all trained on how to give IWCF before the classes commenced, in order for the IWCF agents to follow the same process. The agents employed the written code criteria and assessment criteria of the preparatory school when correcting errors. Every week on the same day at the same time, the EFL students of each group were expected to write a composition.

Validity and Reliability

In terms of reliability, the five written text tasks were scored out of ten in each group. Interrater reliability was employed to ensure that the assessment and evaluation of the participants were significant. The researchers of this study, along with the lecturers of the groups, discussed and scored each paper. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson's *r*) was computed to assess the relationship between the instructors' and the researchers' assessments given to the five written texts produced by the students of each of the three classes. A Pearson's *r*, also known as a Pearson product-moment coefficient, was employed, as 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). This procedure was carried out to confirm the reliability of the lecturers' assessments.

A strong relationship appeared between the two sets of results, as the Pearson *r* is very close to one (see Appendix) (Kahn, 2010; Ravid, 2011). This means that changes in one variable are strongly correlated with changes in the second variable. The 2-tailed significance tests show that the variables positively correlate and that the relationship is statistically significant. For this reason, it could be concluded that the assessments of the texts by the instructors were reliable.

Before this research was conducted, a consent form was designed, and an ethical review application was created for the study. As required by the academic research etiquette, upon approval from the Ethics Committee of the Institute of Education Sciences of Near East University, the ethical clearance letter, the information sheet for participants, and the consent form were shared with the participants of this study. The participants were also notified that the data collected from this study would not be used for any purpose other than for analysis. Confidentiality of all data was assured.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed quantitatively through the written works of the samples. The scores received from each task were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program version 20 to be analyzed. Descriptive statistics were employed to find out the effects of the aforementioned agents on the writing performances of the samples. Then, each group's written texts were compared among each other, adopting an Analysis of Variance test (ANOVA). Finally, to be able to determine gender differences, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The mean scores and standard deviation of the participants were then entered into a table (see Table 1).

Results

In order to answer the research questions, each class (class A, teacher IWCF; class B, peer IWCF; class C, collaborative IWCF) completed five writing tasks in which they wrote a composition and received IWCF.

The Most Effective Agent. In order to answer whether the agent factor affects the students' performance, and which agent improves EFL students' writing skills the most when employing IWCF, the participants' five written texts were scored out of ten and entered into SPSS.

Table 1

The Most Effective Agent

Tasks	**N**	**Teacher**		**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 IWCF. As can be seen in Table 1, the mean scores indicate that the samples of class A did not improve their writing skills during their first, second, and third tasks. They seemed to have performed better in their fourth task compared to their first, second, and third tasks. It could be seen that the participants' writing performance seemed to decrease during the fifth task.

Peer IWCF. Table 1 indicates that class B did not improve their writing skills in general. The findings show the performances of class B's samples' writings from task 1 to task 2 significantly improved, but rapidly decreased in their third task. Nevertheless, the samples increased their writing performance during their fourth

task. In comparison to their performance during the fourth task, there was a rapid decrease in their fifth task.

Collaborative IWCF. The findings related to class C indicate that collaborative IWCF helped the samples improve their writing performance (see Table 1). It was observed that class C's writing performance significantly improved from task 1 to task 5.

The Effect of Gender. To be able to reveal whether gender affects the participants' writing performances, participants' gender was compared among the groups.

Instructor IWCF. According to Table 1, the students who received IWCF from their instructor (class A) seemed not to have improved their writing skills in general. However, it was revealed that the male participants in class A performed better than the female participants (see Table 2).

The results of the written-text analysis of the female participants in class A show that the female participants performed better in their first task than the second and third tasks. Moreover, it was also observed that these participants also increased their writing performance in task 4, while their writing performances decreased in their final task. In the same way, the male samples in class A performed better in their second, third, and fourth tasks compared to their first task. Similar to the female participants, male participants' writing performances decreased in the fifth task. In short, the male students performed better than the female students during their second, third, and fourth tasks, while the female students performed better than the male samples in task 5. There was no difference between the performances of the female and male participants in group A in task 1.

Table 2

Gender and IWCF

Tasks	G	N	Teacher		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	.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	.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
Valid N (listwise)	male	8 8	1.38	1.99	-0.25	2.43	1.38	2.06

Key: G: Gender M: Mean Score SD: Standard Deviation

Peer IWCF. According to the average grade of class B's samples, group B's female and male participants were believed to not have improved in their writing skills. Moreover, it was discovered that the female participants in group B performed better than the male participants.

It is evident from the results of the written-text analysis of the female participants in class B that they performed better in their second task in comparison to their first task, while their writing performance rapidly decreased in their third, fourth, and fifth tasks (see Table 2). Similarly, the results of the written-text analysis of the male participants in class B revealed that they performed better in their second, third, and fourth tasks compared to their first task. It was also revealed that the male participants in class B rapidly decreased their performance in the last task. As a result, the female participants performed better during tasks 1, 2, and 5 compared to the male participants, while the male participants performed slightly better than the female participants in task 3. Both female and male participants in this group received similar scores.

Collaborative IWCF. The findings with regard to class C revealed that the female participants performed better than the male participants in all tasks (see Table 2). The findings of the written-text analysis of the female participants in class C demonstrated that they performed better in their second and third tasks in comparison to their first task, while their writing performance decreased a little in their fourth task and rapidly increased in their fifth task. Meanwhile, the written-text analysis results of the male participants showed that they rapidly increased their writing performance in their second, third, and fourth tasks compared to their first task, while their writing performance decreased in their fifth task. As a result, the female participants performed better in the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth tasks compared to the male participants. In general, the female participants in class C performed better than the male participants in all tasks.

To sum up, the overall findings showed a significant difference between the performances of the female and male participants in classes A, B, and C, who all received IWCF from different agents. It was discovered that the female participants in classes B and C (peer and collaborative) performed better than the male participants, while the male participants in class A (teacher) performed better than the female participants.

Discussion and Conclusion

Drawing on our findings, we could say that—despite the fact that Alharbi (2016) found that teachers' WCF (instructor in this case) had positive effects on students' writing skills—the present study found that the samples in class A, who received IWCF from the instructor, did not improve their performances. Furthermore, class B, who received IWCF from their peers, also did not improve their writing skills. Contradictory to the findings of Yoon (2011)—who indicated that EFL students' performances increased after receiving peer feedback—no improvement was seen in

the writing performance of class B, who received IWCF from their peers. In contrast to the results of classes A and B, class C, who received IWCF collaboratively, showed that collaborative IWCF helped the participants improve their writing performance. This is in line with the findings of Motallebzadeh and Amirabadi's (2013) study, in which the EFL students who received collaborative feedback performed better than the other groups.

In brief, similar to Dang's (2016) findings, the participants who received collaborative IWCF performed better than the groups who received teacher and peer IWCF (classes A and B). This study revealed that the most effective agent for the improvement of EFL students' writing skills was when both the teacher and students gave IWCF. After collaborative IWCF, teacher IWCF was found to be second-most effective, and lastly peer IWCF. This finding contradicted the findings of Kahyalar and Yılmaz (2016), who revealed that the group receiving peer feedback performed better than the group receiving teacher feedback. These results may be due to the fact that the teacher was more acquainted with giving feedback, compared to the students on their own. Moreover, the students were elementary level in proficiency, so they may not have been sufficiently equipped in terms of language proficiency to give effective feedback to their peers in order to help them develop their writing performance.

The students who received IWCF from their instructor (class A) seemed to have not improved their writing skills in general. Moreover, it was shown that the male participants in class A performed better than the female participants. With regards to the average grade of class B's participants, it was noticed that class B's female and male participants did not improve in their writing skills. However, the results related to class C revealed that the female participants performed better than the male participants in all tasks. These results are not in line with the findings of Kahraman and Yalvaç (2015), who found no significant difference related to the gender of their participants when giving WCF.

Drawing on the findings, we could say that the most effective agent when giving IWCF to EFL students is collaboration—both the students and the teacher of the writing class give the student in question IWCF. EFL students' writing performances improve when they receive IWCF collaboratively. When the gender variable was taken into consideration, it was also revealed that female participants who received peer and collaborative IWCF outperformed the male participants, whereas the male students who received teacher IWCF outperformed the female participants. For this reason, we could conclude that gender has an effect on students' writing performances when feedback is given by different agents. Particularly in this specific context, where students are used to receiving no feedback or only feedback from their teachers, female students seem to act more confident and have more say in the writing process when they receive feedback from their peers and collaboratively.

Limitations

This research is limited to the Turkish Cypriot context. Consequently, the research results might be different in other contexts. Therefore, the results should not be generalized to the whole population, both in and out of North Cyprus. Likewise, this

research is limited to adult EFL learners; hence, the research results might be different if carried out with learners from different proficiency levels and age groups. The collected written texts have not provided any information regarding the most frequent error types; they have only focused on the errors committed in general. Moreover, even though the related literature has introduced two types of written corrective feedback, this study has only employed indirect written corrective feedback. In addition, this study only focuses on three possible agents (teacher, peer, collaborative) to correct errors; self-correction is only fostered through indirect error correction. Furthermore, the EFL sample is limited, with only sixteen participants in each group; as a result, the research findings might change if a study were to be carried out with a larger sample.

Implications for Research and Practice

As the findings indicated, there are significant differences between class A, class B, and class C participants' scores when receiving IWCF from different agents, and gender has an effect on the scores of the participants. It is recommended that institutions, teachers, and IWCF providers take these results into account, especially in the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot context, in which students are EFL learners. It is also suggested that pre-service and in-service instructors provide CIWCF to their learners and use more collaborative work and activities in their classrooms, in order to create a friendlier and more positive, supportive, and collaborative atmosphere in the language-learning environment. By including CIWCF in writing tasks, instructors will be better able to help students improve their writing skills.

Further research could be conducted to see if other variables—such as EFL students' years of English study—affect their writing development. Another study might focus on individual differences regarding the motivation or the performance of the participants during the IWCF process. Discovering the attitudes of EFL learners and their teachers towards IWCF could be the focus of another study.

References

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.

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.

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.

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.

Bensen, H., Cavusoglu, C. (2017). The impact of blended learning in an EFL writing course. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. ISBN: 978-3-659-54027-1.

Business Dictionary. (n.d.). *Factor*. Retreived from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/factor.html

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues in field settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Dang, T. T. (2016). Vietnamese EFL students' perceptions of noticing-based collaborative feedback on their writing performance. *English Language Teaching, 9*(5), 141-153.

Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 445-452.

Guénette, D. (2012). The pedagogy of error correction: Surviving the written corrective feedback challenge. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(1), 117-126.

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.

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.

Kahn, J. (2010). *Reporting statistics in APA style. American Psychological Association.* Washington, DC: Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed.).

Kahraman, A., & Yalvac, 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.

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.

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.

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.

Motallebzadeh, K., & Amirabadi S. (2013). Online international feedback in second language writing: Through peer or tutor. *MJAL, 3*(2), 156-174.

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.

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.

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* (4th ed.). UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 611-633.

Sengul, F., & Bostanci, H. B. (2018). *Indirect written corrective feedback in EFL*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing. ISBN: 978-613-9-85797-5.

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.

Yoon, S. Y. (2013). 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.

Zaman, M., & Azad, A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review, 6*(1), 139-156.

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.

Appendix

Interrater Reliability Test Results

Teacher IWCF

Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	.968**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	.968**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	1.000**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1.000**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	.982**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	.982**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	.966**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Mark	Pearson Correlation	.966**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Mark	Pearson Correlation	1	.953**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
	Pearson Correlation	.953**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

Researcher's Mark

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

Peer IWCF

Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.992**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.992**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.994**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.994**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.983**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.983**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.980**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.980**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.954**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.954**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Collaborative IWCF

Task 1

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.971**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.971**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 2

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.977**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.977**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 3

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.945**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.945**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 4

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.974**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.974**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Task 5

		Lecturer's Marks	Researcher's Marks
Lecturer's Marks	Pearson Correlation	1	.967**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	16	16
Researcher's Marks	Pearson Correlation	.967**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	16	16

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

Dolaylı Yönden Yazılara Geri Dönüş Verirken En Etkili Kişi Kimdir?

Atıf:

Bostanci, H. B., & Sengul, F. (2018). Who is the most effective agent when giving indirect written corrective feedback? *Eurasion Journal of Educational Research, 76, 73-92,* DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.76.4

Özet

Problem Durumu: İngilizce dilini yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilere dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verilmesinde en etkili etken kişinin kim olduğu sorusunun cevabı halen belirsizliğini sürdürmekte ve cinsiyet gibi faktörlerin etkisi göz ardı edilmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Yukarıda belirtilen nedenlerden dolayı bu çalışma ile dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verilmesinde en etkili etken kişiyi bulmak ve farklı etken kişilerden dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alınmasında cinsiyet faktörünün etkisini bulmak amaçlanmaktadır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Yarı deneysel yöntem izlenerek yapılan bu çalışmanın katılımcıları, özel bir ünivesitede hazırlık okulunda İngilizce dilini yabancı dil olarak öğrenen üç farklı sınıfın öğrencileridir. Beş haftalık bir süreç boyunca sadece öğretmen tarafından dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan sınıf, A sınıfı; sadece öğrencilerden dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan sınıf, B sınıfı; ve hem öğretmen hem öğrencilerin katılımı ile işbirlikçi bir şekilde dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim alan öğrencilerin bulundukları sınıf ise C sınıfı olarak adlandırılmıştır. Her grup, toplamda beş haftada beş farklı konulu yazılı metin olmak

üzere her hafta aynı zamanda yazılı metin üretmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin yazmış oldukları bu yazılı metinlerden elde edilen veriler, nicel olarak analiz edilmiştir.

Araştırma Sonuçları: Araştırma sonucuda, hem öğretmen hem de öğrencilerin işbirlikçi bir şekilde dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verdikleri C sınıfındaki katılımcılar, diğer sınıflardaki katılımcılara önemli ölçüde kıyasla yazma yeteneklerini geliştirdikleri bulgusuna varılmıştır. Cinsiyet açısından ise A sınıfındaki erkek katılımcıların, aynı sınıftaki kadın katılımcılara oranla daha iyi bir performans göstermesine karşın, B ve C sınıfındaki kadın katılımcıların erkek katılımcılara oranla daha iyi performans sergilediği ortaya konmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Öğretmen adayı ve öğretmenlerin, cinsiyet faktörünü göz önünde bulundurarak, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenmekte olan öğrencilere, hem öğretmen hem de öğrencilerin işbirlikçi bir şekilde dolaylı yoldan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim verdikleri bir yöntem izlemeleri sağlanmalıdır. Bu nedenle, ileride yapılacak olan araştırmaların yaş ve dil yeterlik gibi diğer faktörler üzerine yoğunlaşmaları önerilmektedir. Aynı zamanda araştırmacılara doğrudan yazılı düzeltici geribildirim gibi diğer geribildirim çeşitleri üzerine odaklanmaları önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyet, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen, yazı gelişimi.