



AFFECTIVE AND COGNITIVE EFFECTS OF CODED TEACHER FEEDBACK ON FL WRITING STUDENTS

DOLAYLI ÖĞRETMEN GERİBİLDİRİMİNİN YABANCI DİL YAZMA DERSİ ÖĞRENCİLERİNDE DUYUŞSAL VE BİLİŞSEL ETKİLERİ

Ayhan KAHRAMAN*

ABSTRACT: This study investigates whether or not “good paragraph writing” affects language learners’ both cognitive and affective levels, i.e., it is aimed to search the correlation among learners’ beliefs about corrective feedback, their writing anxiety, and their writing performances. Two questionnaires are conducted to compare students’ beliefs before and after treatment. Additionally, the experimental part is conducted through in-class treatment where in control group all the errors are just underlined i.e. provided only un-coded feedback, whereas in experimental group all the error types underlined, coded but not corrected. Statistical and descriptive analyses of learners’ perceptions revealed that learners prefer indicated, coded but not corrected type of feedback especially provided by teachers. At last, this study seems to prove the need for coded teacher feedback and the possibility and effectiveness of using it in reducing foreign language writing anxiety.

Keywords: teacher feedback, coded feedback, writing anxiety

ÖZET: Bu çalışma, iyi paragraf yazmanın dil öğrenenlerin bilişsel ve duyuşsal düzeylerine etki edip etmediğini, yani öğrencilerin düzeltici dönüt ve yazma kaygısı inançları ile yazma başarıları arasında ilişki olup olmadığını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Öğrencilerin düşüncelerini kıyaslamak için sınıf uygulaması öncesi ve sonrası iki anket uygulanmıştır. Bununla birlikte, sınıf-içi uygulamada kontrol grubundaki hataların sadece altı çizilirken, yani kodlanmamış dönüt verilirken, deney grubunda tüm hataların altı çizilmiş, kodlanmış fakat düzeltilmemiştir. İstatistikî ve betimleyici analizler öğrencilerin özellikle öğretmenler tarafından sağlanan altı çizili, kodlanmış fakat düzeltilmemiş geribildirim türünü tercih ettiklerini göstermektedir. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışma kodlanmış öğretmen geribildiriminin gerekli olduğunu ve ayrıca yabancı dil yazma kaygısını düşürmede etkili olabileceğini kanıtlamış görünmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: öğretmen geribildirimi, kodlu geribildirim, yazma kaygısı

1. INTRODUCTION

Although it was ignored in connection with the supremacy of Audio-Lingual Method in 1950’s and 1960’s, effective paragraph or essay writing in English as an EFL/ESL learner has always been one of the most problematic part of language learning. The main problem lied merely on accuracy rather than fluency i.e. error-free composition was mainly emphasized due to habit-formation theory of behaviourism. Parallel to the shift from behaviourism to interactionism, the field realized that L2 writing is the selection and organization of thoughts rather than the orthographic symbols of speech and emphasized the process of writing than the structural confines of writing. This shift also emerged some approaches of promoting L2 writing such as formative feedback, multiple draft composition and peer analyses (Rivers, 2009). As a result of this change, L2 writing teachers and learners have perceived that a proficient L2 writer does not only need mastering elements of grammar, vocabulary and writing mechanics but also content, style and organisation. In short, error correction or known as corrective feedback -whether given by their peers or instructors- has come to the fore in the late L2 writing studies.

A close survey of the literature shows at first glance the debate whether student writings need to be corrected or not. Many researchers such as Cohen (1975), Leki (1990, 1991), Ferris (1995) and

* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi ayhank43@hotmail.com, ayhank43@gmail.com

Rivers (2009) assert the facilitative function of corrective feedback, but the issue is under heavy attack and is believed as ineffective (Kepner, 1991, Huntley, 1992; Truscott, 1999). For example, Truscott (1999) goes further and basing on anecdotal evidences concludes that grammar correction should be abandoned in L2 writing classes because it is ineffective and it has harmful effects.

Although the debate on whether error feedback facilitates accuracy and overall quality of L2 learners' writing skill is still an ongoing issue in the field, some research has provided encouraging results. Some of these encouraging results stem from studies by Cardelle and Corno (1981) and Lalande (1982) where they tested the effects of feedback on the accuracy of second version of intermediate level ESL students' compositions and unearthed the effective side of feedback. Similarly, Semke (1984), Frantzen (1995) and Chandler (2003) also examined differences between student writings who have received corrective feedback and those who have not and announced similar results stating that corrective feedback improved L2 learners' writings. Moreover, one of the prominent studies on the issue is conducted by Ferris and Roberts (2001). They examined the effect of three different types of feedback on a two draft composition with 72 ESL learners and the result displayed significant improvement on the second drafts.

Early studies have displayed varying results but what beyond argument seems to be is the great demand for feedback to written errors among both language learners and teachers. That is, a good deal of studies in the literature have investigated teacher and peer feedback and draw similar conclusion as stated by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), Miao, Badger and Zhen (2006) and Enginarlar (1993) where teacher feedback was more likely to be adopted and led to greater improvements in student writings. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), for example, carried out quantitative and qualitative analyses with 316 L2 university students searching students' awareness of the functions and influences of expert input in their writing. The result showed that whereas writers in both groups share certain beliefs about feedback and revision, each group perceived teacher feedback as serving distinct functions. In a rather recent study, on the other hand, Miao, Badger and Zhen (2006) questioned the impact between peer and teacher feedback at a Chinese university with 79 FL writing students. They examined two groups of students writing essays on the same topic, one receiving teacher feedback and one peer feedback. Data from both groups revealed that students utilised teacher and peer feedback to improve their writing but teacher feedback resulted as more effective than the peer feedback. Nevertheless, the most significant example for the Turkish context is conducted by Enginarlar (1993). He summed up his study by mentioning that effective feedback to student writing is a continuing issue of writing teachers and researchers and student reaction to various types of feedback has received relatively little attention. Thus, his study examined the attitudes of 47 freshman students to the feedback procedure employed by two English Composition I instructors. The procedure involved mainly: (a) indication of linguistic errors with codes, and (b) various types of brief comments to help students improve their drafts. The 20-item questionnaire and open-ended items revealed that the students have a highly favourable opinion of the effectiveness of this feedback procedure.

Another point, in the literature, which took a high attention, was the type of provided feedback: direct or indirect. Direct feedback is usually defined as providing the correct linguistic form; on the other hand, indirect feedback is referred to providing feedback without giving the correct linguistic form (Lee, 2004). Indirect feedback is seen simply as underlining the errors or indicating them by a symbol representing the type of the error which is also called as coded feedback (Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Several studies have investigated the effectiveness of these two approaches but the result is far from conclusive. For example, whereas Semke (1984) found no difference between the two approaches, Chandler (2003) claimed that he did it in his study with L2 writing students. On the other side, Lalande (1982) and Ferris & Roberts (2001) as mentioned earlier have searched the same issue and found the benefit of indirect feedback. Furthermore, Ferris & Roberts (2001) had also explored the difference between the types of indirect feedback but could not justify the difference. As far as we searched the literature for the Turkish EFL context, Erel and Bulut's study (2007) which investigated the possible effects of direct and indirect coded error feedback seems to be unique. Two groups of pre-

intermediate level Turkish students, one receiving direct feedback the other receiving indirect coded feedback, participated in the study. The researchers reported that while an overall comparison of the two groups for the whole semester did not yield any statistically significant difference, but the indirect coded feedback group committed fewer errors than the direct one.

However, devising the theories of foreign language learning or teaching methodologies merely on cognitive considerations will be omitting the most fundamental side of human behaviour, namely the affective domain of human behaviour who considerably influenced by affective factors. For instance, getting students to respond or write in the classroom is one of the biggest problems for language teachers. In the literature, this kind of issue is mostly attributed to students' lack of confidence and fear of making mistakes that is there is a personal affective barrier. Since this psychological barrier called anxiety plays also an important role in language learning as providing feedback, another aim of this study is to search the sources and levels of writing anxiety and to examine their relationship. Despite high interest in Learners' L2 writing revision or feedback, so far as we searched there is not any study conducted on the relation of error correction and writing anxiety. For example, the study conducted by Aydın (2008) not directly related with writing anxiety but aimed to find out the sources and levels of fear of negative evaluation as well as language anxiety among 112 prospective teachers and to determine the correlation between these two factors. The instruments used to collect data consisted of two questionnaires; a foreign language anxiety scale (FLAS) by Horwitz et al. (1986); and a scale for fear of negative evaluation (FNE) developed by Leary (1983). The author administered both of the questionnaires, the FLAS, and the scale of FNE during 10 week of Spring 2006 Semester. However, he did not tell anything about the pre- and post-test(s), or treatment but stated that the results of the analysis indicate that EFL learners suffer from language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. He concluded his study asserting that fear of negative evaluation itself is a strong source of language anxiety. Another study is which aimed especially to compare the effects of peer- and teacher feedback on the writing anxiety of Turkish prospective teachers (PTs) of English conducted by Kurt and Atay (2006). A total of 86 PTs participated in two groups. During the eight-week study, whereas PTs in the experimental group received peer feedback on their essays, the control group received teacher feedback.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

Recalling the issue and considering all the studies in the literature, it seems to be apparent that, firstly, corrective feedback has a growing influence on the writing process, and second, making errors and getting corrective feedback can be anxiety provoking; but caution should be exercised before making assertive conclusions. Nevertheless, as far as we searched the literature there is very limited empirical research which directly compares corrective feedback and language anxiety and so far a study on the "Affective and Cognitive Effects of Coded Teacher Feedback on Turkish L2 Writing Students" was not conducted.

1.2. The Purpose of the Study

As stated earlier, the debate on whether corrective feedback facilitates accuracy and overall quality of L2 learners' writing skill is still an ongoing issue in the field. However, to sum up, FL learners seem not only need to entail mastering elements of process writing but also to cope with negative effects of writing anxiety. For that reason, this study will investigate whether or not "good paragraph writing" affects language learners' both cognitive and affective levels, i.e., it is aimed to search the correlation among learners' beliefs about corrective feedback, their writing anxiety, and their writing performances.

With these concerns in mind, the following research questions will guide the present study:

- RQ 1. What are L2 learners' perceptions regarding corrective feedback?
RQ 2. What is L2 learners' attitude towards writing anxiety before and after treatment?
RQ 3. Do learners' beliefs on feedback and their writing anxiety level have any significant difference?
RQ 4. Does feedback provided by writing teachers help to improve L2 learners' paragraph writing?

2. METHOD

Since they are designed to ensure objectivity, generalizability and reliability, in this study, quantitative research methods are used. As seen in the data collection procedure, the form of this research data is quantitative; the manner of data collection is both descriptive and experimental; and the method of analysis is statistical analysis where the SPSS version 15.0 is employed. Participants are selected randomly from the study population in an unbiased manner, and finally, data from two standardized questionnaires and marks got from the writing assignments were analysed statistically to test the predetermined hypotheses regarding the relationships between specific variables.

2.1. Participants and Setting

This study is conducted in the fall term 2009-2010 at a Turkish university by participation of 125 freshmen studying English Language and Literature. Participants are enrolled in two intact groups; section I consisting 63 participants (9 male - 54 female) and section II consisting 62 participants (15 male - 47 female). They are randomly assigned as the control and experimental group, respectively. Participants' ages vary from 18 to 22 and since they have entered Higher Education Council's Student Selection and Placement Test answering properly 50 to 60 questions for English language and scored 307 to 465 points, their proficiency level varies from pre-intermediate to intermediate.

2.2. Data Collection Procedure

At the beginning of the fall-term 2009-2010, 125 freshman students enrolled in "Advanced Composition Skills I" course are informed by the study and signed the letter of consent. In this study, two questionnaires both developed by the researcher are conducted; an attitude scale towards corrective feedback and the Foreign Language Writing Class Anxiety Scale (FLWCAS) aiming to ensure comparability of the participant groups prior and after treatment as a pre- / post-tests. This means, participants completed these scales twice; first as a pre-test which was conducted the first week and as a post-test administered last week.

On the other side, the experimental part is conducted through in-class treatment where in control group all the errors are just underlined i.e. provided only un-coded feedback, whereas in experimental group all the error types underlined, coded but not corrected. The experimental part of the study lasted twelve weeks. This part of the study has mainly centred on written paragraphs to see whether there is any significant difference between groups after treatment. In the "Composition Writing Skills I" course, students analyzed and produced different types of paragraphs such as narrative, descriptive and expository paragraphs to build up writing skills emphasizing the overall organization, grammar, vocabulary choice at paragraph level. To ensure the inter-rater reliability, three raters who are faculty members and experts of the writing courses graded these paragraphs using the writing rubric developed by the researcher.

2.3. Instruments

As mentioned earlier, the main instrument to assess participants' perceptions about corrective feedback and their anxiety levels is conducting questionnaires. However, a pre-condition for this is that a questionnaire used must be both valid and reliable. For this reason, a pilot study should be conducted for the questionnaire to display validity and reliability statistically.

2.3.1 Pilot Study for the Feedback Questionnaire

According to Mackey and Gass (2005), the point of carrying out a pilot study is to test and then complete it to uncover any problems before the main study is carried out. Adopting this view, the researcher did not only examine the existing questionnaires in the literature but also collected preliminary qualitative data from the faculty members and students of the department. Eight staff members and ten students were asked for itemizing their thoughts regarding the research subject matter. The obtained items together with those found in the literature were used to compile the pilot version of the questionnaire. This pilot version of the questionnaire is handed out to five staff members of the department for checking content and face validity.

Once we compiled the pilot version of the questionnaire, it is intended to check the reliability. Thirty sophomore students answered the pilot version of the questionnaire. To compute the factor analysis of the questionnaire items, the correlation among them needs to be analyzed with help of the Statistical Package Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS). That is, in a scale the Pearson Moment correlation coefficient and test of significance of two-tailed analysis are crucial indicators for significant correlation among items which shows the internal consistency. As a result, the statistical analysis displays a significant correlation among items since the significance level of items vary between 0, 20 – 0, 80. After computing the item analysis, it is needed to go a step further to check the factor analysis of the questionnaire items in order to state a satisfactory reliability. For this, reliability analysis, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity and the table of Scree Plot is needed. As a final statement, the analysis result of Pilot Questionnaire Items indicates quite internal reliability and consistency according to the criterion for reliability of alpha by Özdamar (1999, p.523): $\alpha = .7370$; $p < .000$.

After some revision, the scale is developed as two parts. The first part contains biographical information about participants' age, gender, educational background etc. and the second part consists of 20 items about the aforementioned beliefs and perceptions. It uses a 5 point Likert type scale, requiring participants to respond to each item once whether strongly disagree (1 point), disagree (2 points), undecided (3 points), agree (4 points) or strongly agree (5 points). Completion of the scale takes about 10 minutes.

2.3.2. Foreign Language Writing Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLWCAS)

The data about students' anxiety levels will be collected through a scale at the very beginning of the course and repeated immediately after the treatment to see whether there is a significant difference in their behaviours before and after the treatment. This scale will be the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) which was developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) but it is slightly modified by the researcher to suit the requirements for the writing course ($\alpha = .8224$; $p = .000$).

3. DATA ANALYSIS & RESULTS

As mentioned in the data collection procedure, the method of analysis is statistical analysis. Therefore, the research questions will be analysed with help of statistical software package SPSS version 15.0 step by step before drawing objective conclusions.

3.1. The Feedback Scale or Statistical Data Analysis for RQ1

In the first research question, the learners' perceptions about corrective feedback are questioned through the feedback scale developed by the researcher to see whether there is a significant difference in student perceptions when they are tested and compared before and after the treatment phase. First of all, to describe the relationship between repeated measures the Pearson correlation coefficient is computed.

Table 1. Correlations for pre- and post-test feedback levels

		Feedback (pre-test)	Feedback (post-test)
Feedback pre-test *	Pearson	1	.527(**)
Feedback (post-test)	Correlation		
	Sig. (2tailed)	.	.000

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

Examining Table 1, there is a statistically relationship between variables: $r = .527$; $p = .000$. However, to examine the relationship among variables is not enough; in short, a paired samples t-test is run which do not revealed a significant difference. Stating the statistical results more detailed, the probability is $p = .027$. As an overall result, this statistical analysis enabled the researcher to accept the H_0 (null hypothesis) and reject the H_1 (research hypothesis); that any observed differences are significant. However, regarding the first research question this result needs a deeper descriptive analysis to clarify the participants' perceptions about corrective feedback. Therefore, feedback scale items are grouped into four headings to search:

- need for feedback
- type of feedback: coded or un-coded
- need for teacher or peer feedback
- the relationship of feedback and anxiety

One of the most crucial debates in the literature is whether corrective feedback is necessary or should it banned as asserted by Truscott (1999). In our case, as seen below in Tables 2 & 3 both control and experimental groups have a highly favourable opinion about the necessity of corrective feedback to students' surface level errors (compare below item6). It seems also that the treatment phase did not have any effect on their beliefs since after the treatment the experimental group still have the same belief.

Table 2. Need for feedback.

Item no	Control Group Pre-test (%)					Control Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
6	57.1	38.1	4.8	---	---	34.9	57.1	4.8	3.2	---

SA=strongly agree A=agree UD=undecided D=disagree SD=strongly disagree

Table 3. Need for feedback.

Item no	Experimental Group Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
6	66.1	27.4	6.5	---	---	57.1	42.9	---	---	---

Additionally, displayed below in Table 4, participants do not only think that feedback is necessary but also 80.7% still deems that giving feedback improves accuracy and overall quality of

writing even after the treatment phase (see item9). An unexpected result, however, is that the group is not sure about whether error correction forces learners to focus on form although they did not agree with this belief before treatment (see item14). On the other hand, participants are very much sure about the necessity of having as few errors as possible (item4) but the other way round it is very difficult for them to find their own errors in their writings (item5).

Table 4. Need for feedback.

Item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
9	24.2	50	6.5	11.3	8.1	22.6	58.1	8.1	9.7	1.6
14	14.5	14.5	9.7	50	11.3	14.5	33.9	14.5	33.9	3.2
4	59.7	33.9	1.6	3.2	1.6	32.3	54.8	3.2	8.1	1.6
5	9.7	51.6	21	14.5	3.2	8.1	61.3	8.1	21	1.6

When the type of feedback –implicit or explicit- is questioned, the range of learners who prefers implicit feedback increases from 79% to 87.1% (see Table 5 item8). Furthermore, as a check-recheck item in the bio-data part of the scale, whether the errors need to be indicated, coded and/or corrected is questioned. 56.5% of experimental group considered that the errors should be indicated, coded but not corrected since they prefer to correct them by themselves. Although learners prefer receiving corrective feedback, they do not expect the correction of each single error and they assert that teachers should be selective. (item17).

Table 5. Type of feedback.

Item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
8	30.6	48.4	8.1	8.1	4.8	33.9	53.2	4.8	6.5	1.6
17	19.4	62.9	11.3	4.8	1.6	4.8	74.2	11.3	6.5	3.2

Items 11 & 12 of the feedback scale are stated to search whether participants prefer to receive peer feedback or do they expect just teacher feedback. Both control and experimental groups want to receive peer feedback but 52.3% of the control and 51.6% of the experimental groups prefer to receive only teacher feedback. This result contradicts with Kurt & Atay's (2006) conducted in a Turkish context.

Last items of the feedback scale investigated the relation of learners' emotional state and feedback. For example, item20 unearthed the fact that just knowing to get feedback makes nearly all of the students frustrated (see below Table6). Additionally, they feel also frustrated when the teacher corrects every mistake that they make (item18). Finally, although students are not sure about their weakness in writing (see below Table6 item 19), this belief changed after treatment phase and 43.6% think that the other students do not write better than they do. This can be the case since in the treatment phase the learners had the opportunity to compare themselves with other learners but in general, it seems apparent that the respondents have simply anxiety provoking feelings when corrective feedback is the subject matter.

Table 6. Emotional state & feedback.

Item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
20	4.8	19.4	14.5	43.5	17.7	1.6	1.6	9.7	66.1	21
18	6.5	27.4	17.7	32.3	16.1	8.1	21	12.9	46.8	11.3
19	9.7	27.4	25.8	32.3	4.8	6.5	17.7	32.3	22.6	21

3.2. The Foreign Language Writing Classroom Anxiety Scale or Statistical Analysis for RQ2

Aforementioned, to analyse the second research question, which searches learners' writing anxiety level, the FLWCAS is used before and after treatment to see whether there is a significant difference. Therefore, the correlation matrix and a paired samples t-test of the data need to be run. To report the results: first of all, the correlation matrix is calculated and a strong correlation is found between experimental group subjects' anxiety levels: $r = .737$; $p = .000$. Furthermore, the paired samples t-test for the experimental group data verifies the correlation and reveals a significant difference between the anxiety levels of participants comparing the pre- and post test scores. Stating the statistical results more detailed, the probability or significance is less than .05 ($p = .001$); the obtained t-value is $t = 3.439$; the mean $M = 5.6667$ and finally %95 interval of difference does not cover the point zero. As an overall result, this statistical analysis enabled the researcher to reject the H_0 (null hypothesis) and accept the H_1 (research hypothesis); that any observed differences are significant. Although these results reveal a significant difference between the scores before and after treatment, the correlation is not in the positive but in the negative direction. That is, although participants were anxious initially, their anxiety level decreased significantly after treatment.

Nevertheless, it is crucial to have a closer look at the FLWCAS scale items which display the significant changes. Brief result of the analysis reveals that the items seem to be polarised into three general headings: self-confidence, fear of being less competent and fear of humiliation.

Table 7. Self -confidence.

item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
28	1.6	30.2	20.6	44.4	3.2	17.5	31.7	28.6	17.5	4.8
18	3.2	17.7	48.4	25.8	4.8	6.3	38.7	32.3	17.8	4.8
2	30.2	50.8	4.8	14.3	---	6.3	57.2	6.3	23.8	6.3

Stated above, data will be evaluated firstly regarding to participants' self-confidence. For instance, when their opinion asked directly, 47.6% did not agree that they are confident and relaxed on their way to writing classes, the other way round this belief changed after treatment and not only the disagreement decreased to 22.4% but also the agreement increased to 49.2 % (see Table 7 item 28). In the same line, although 20.9% of the experimental group felt confident about their writings and 48.4% was undecided, the agreement increased to 45% after treatment (item 18). Finally, 81% of experimental group worried about making mistakes in writing class (item 2), however, this rate decreased to 63.5% after treatment.

Table 8. Writing competence

item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
10	50.8	31.7	4.8	11.1	1.6	11.1	52.4	19	15.9	1.6
16	25.8	35.5	8.1	17.7	12.9	16.1	40.3	8.1	24.2	11.3
22	17.7	45.2	16.1	16.1	4.8	3.2	48.4	16.1	30.6	1.6
7	4.8	20.6	31.7	34.9	7.9	3.2	12.7	27	46	11.1

Secondly, as seen in Table 8 above, it seems that learners were not aware of their own writing competence and also of their classmates' before treatment. Nevertheless, the data results changed after treatment. For example, 82.5% of participants were worried about failing in writing class initially but

decreased to 63.5% afterwards (item 10). Additionally, before treatment, 61.3% felt anxious even they were well prepared for writing class. Conversely, it seems that they are not more anxious as they were (item16). Furthermore, 62.9% felt pressure in preparing very well for writing class, but also this changed and decreased to 51.6% (item22). And finally, learners have compared themselves with their classmates and 57.1% no more keep thinking that other students are better at writing than they are (item7).

Table 9. Fear of humiliation

item no	Experimental Pre-test (%)					Experimental Group Post-test (%)				
	SA	A	UD	D	SD	SA	A	UD	D	SD
31	17.7	30.6	24.2	16.1	11.3	6.5	53.2	6.5	25.8	8.1
24	16.1	25.8	14.5	33.9	9.7	17.7	33.9	8.1	29	11.3

Finally, Table 9 displays that the participants have the fear of humiliation which did not diminish but increased after treatment. For example, more than half of participants, 59.7%, worry that the other students will laugh at their writings (see item 31). Additionally, 51.8% still feel worried while they are writing in front of other students (item24).

3.3. Statistical Data Analysis for RQ3 – Feedback Scores / Anxiety Level

More to the point and statistically explained, RQ3 searches whether there is a significant difference between participants feedback scores and their anxiety level compared as pre- and post tests. That is, the paired samples t-test is run to compute the difference between two variables and to test if the average difference is significantly different from zero. The data outcome enables the researcher to reject the H_0 hypothesis and accept the H_1 which states a significant difference between perceptions on corrective feedback and writing anxiety: ($P < .01$; $t = -13,767$). However, the correlation is negative indicating that although learners' perceptions on corrective feedback increases, their anxiety level decreases after treatment. Thus, this study gives us some opinion about the possibility and effectiveness of using coded teacher feedback in reducing foreign language writing anxiety.

3.4. The Treatment Phase or Statistical Data Analysis for RQ4

The fourth research question searched whether or not corrective feedback provided by writing teachers help to improve L2 learners' paragraph writing when they are tested as pre-, formative- and post-tests. The results of the Friedman Test for experimental group indicates that there is a statistically significant difference in statistics test scores across the three time points, $X^2(2, n = 62) = 22.150$, $P < .005$. Especially, inspection of the median values showed a significant increase in statistics from pre-test ($M = 1.60$) to formative-test $M = 2.38$; and also from pre-test ($M = 1.60$) to post-test $M = 2.20$ (see below Tables 10&11). However, statistics for the control group does not reveal any significant difference ($P > .005$). As a brief conclusion, it seems obvious that using coded teacher feedback in treatment phase improved learners' writing performances. Since statistics in Tables 11 & 12 display that there is a correlation among the coded teacher feedback scores of learners.

Table 10: Ranks

Control	N	63
	Chi-Square	7,391
	Df	2
	Asymp. Sig.	,025
experimental	N	62
	Chi-Square	22,150
	Df	2
	Asymp. Sig.	,000

Table 11. Friedman Test Statistics(a)

Group		Mean Rank
Control	Pre-test	1,77
	Formative-test	2,22
	Post-test	2,01
experimental	Pre-test	1,60
	Formative-test	2,38
	Post-test	2,20

4. DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Although the debate on whether corrective feedback facilitates accuracy and overall quality of L2 learners' writing skill is still an ongoing issue in the field, FL learners seem not only need to entail mastering elements of process writing but also to cope with negative effects of writing anxiety. Therefore, this study investigated whether or not "good paragraph writing" affects language learners' both cognitive and affective levels, i.e., learners' beliefs about corrective feedback, their FL writing anxiety level, and their writing performances are investigated in detail. Finally regarding all research questions, the findings above suggest the following conclusions.

First of all, the most crucial debate is whether corrective feedback is necessary or should it be banned as asserted by Truscott (1999). RQ1 displays that participants have a highly favourable opinion about the necessity of corrective feedback and the treatment phase did not change their beliefs. Secondly, statistical results for RQ2 revealed a significant difference when learners' anxiety level investigated before and after treatment. However, the correlation was in the negative direction. That is, although participants were anxious, their anxiety level decreased significantly after treatment. In general, language learners mostly have the feeling of not being capable mainly in writing courses. When the language learner thinks of oneself as deficient and less competent, self-confidence can be negatively influenced. The other way round, high self-confidence can be associated with achievement in language learning which the case in this study is. For example, although participants were not sure about their self-confidence on their writings and not aware of their writing competence, it changed after treatment and the ratio decreased. However, the most significant result is that providing feedback seems to have fostered good and effective writing. The fourth research question (RQ4) analysed this issue and evidenced statistically that providing coded-feedback improved learners' writing performances effectively compared as control and experimental groups.

Finally, RQ3 searched whether there is a significant difference between participants' feedback scores and their anxiety level compared as pre- and post tests and revealed a significant difference between learners' perceptions. However, the correlation was negative indicating that although learners' perceptions on corrective feedback increases, their anxiety level decreases after treatment. At last, this study seems to prove the possibility and effectiveness of using coded teacher feedback in reducing foreign language writing and seems to reject Truscott (1999) but justify Ferris (1995).

All in all, error correction seems to be considered as a negative terminology not only by learners but also by language teachers and if it is the case, then it is not surprising that it makes learners frustrated and provokes anxiety. However, error correction needs to be considered as a revision technique which aims to help learners to improve not only the form but also the meaning of a language. Therefore, this study suggests the use of error correction in FL classroom since it can help to develop metalinguistic awareness and reduce anxiety. That is, providing feedback as language practice can foster language learners' both cognitive and affective levels. Consequently, it should be further investigated in detail in similar contexts but suggested insistently to policy makers, curriculum planners and FL writing teachers.

REFERENCES

- Aydın, S. (2008). An investigation on the language anxiety and fear of negative evaluation among Turkish EFL learners. *Asian EFL Journal, Teaching Articles*, 30(1), 421—444.
- Cardelle, M. & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 251-261.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-96.
- Cohen, A.D. (1975). Error correction and the training of language teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59, 414-422.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21, 193-204.
- Erel, S. & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Erciyes University Journal of Social Sciences*, 22, 397-415.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 329-344.
- Hedgcock, J. and Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80, 287-308.
- Huntley, H. S. (1992). Feedback strategies in intermediate and advanced second language composition. A discussion of the effects of error correction. Washington, DC. Education Resources Information Center. ERIC Database ED355809.
- Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.
- Kepner, C.G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 305-313.
- Kurt, G. & Atay, D. (2006). Prospective teachers and L2 writing anxiety. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 100-118.
- Lalande, J.R. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 285-312.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, ed. B. Kroll, 57–68. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of EFL students for error correction in college writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Miao, Y., Badger, R. and Zhen Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179-200.
- Özdamar, K. (1999) Paket programlar ile istatistiksel veri analizi : SPSS – minitab. Vol. 1-2, Ankara: Kaan Kitabevi.

- Rivers, D. (2009). A short review of three articles concerning the teaching of L2 writing across cultural contexts. retrieved 06.06.2010 from www.developingteachers.com
- Semke, H.D. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195-202.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: a response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 111-122.

Genişletilmiş Özet

Alan yazın yakından incelendiğinde, göze ilk çarpan tartışmalardan biri öğrencilerin yazma hatalarının düzeltilmesine gerek olup olmadığı tartışmasıdır. Cohen (1975), Leki (1990, 1991), Ferris (1995) ve Rivers (2009) gibi birçok araştırmacı düzeltici geri dönütün etkili olduğunu iddia etseler de, Kepner (1991), Huntley (1992) ve Truscott (1999) gibi araştırmacılar konuyu ciddi olarak eleştirilmektedir. Örneğin Truscott (1999) deneysel kanıtlara dayanmayan sonuçlarla tartışma konusunu daha da ileri götürerek hataların düzeltilmesinin etkili olmadığı gibi yabancı dil öğrenimine zarar verdiği düşüncesiyle bunun dil sınıflarında yasaklanmasını istemektedir. Fakat ilk çalışmalar farklı sonuçlar verse de, yazın alandaki birçok araştırmacının yanı sıra yabancı dil öğretmenleri ve öğrencileri geribildirim mutlaka verilmesi konusunda oldukça ısrarlı görünmektedirler.

Yazın alandaki ilk çalışmaların odak noktası öğrencilere sağlanan hata geri bildirim türü hakkında olmuştur. Kısaca, hata geri bildirimini dolaylı ve dolaysız olarak iki uç noktada tartışılmış olup araştırma desenleri de buna göre düzenlenmiştir. Bu nedenle, dolaysız geri bildirim, genellikle, hatalı dilsel biçimin düzeltici geri dönütü yani doğrusu dolaysız biçimde öğrenciye verilmesini; dolaylı geri bildirim ise, hatalı dilsel kalıbın düzeltici dönütünün direk verilmemesi fakat sadece kodlanması ve öğrenci tarafından düzeltilmesinin beklenmesi olarak tanımlanmaktadır.

Sonuç olarak, alanda bazı çalışmalar yapılmış olsa da kabul gören bir sonuç vermekten çok uzakta kalmışlardır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma, iyi paragraf yazmanın dil öğrenenlerin bilişsel ve duyuşsal düzeylerine etki edip etmediğini, yani öğrencilerin düzeltici dönüt ve yazma kaygısı inançları ile yazma başarıları arasında ilişki olup olmadığını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Çalışma, 2009-2010 güz döneminde İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı 125 birinci sınıf öğrencisinin katılımıyla bir Türk üniversitesinde yürütülmüştür. Denekler kontrol ve deney gruplarına rastgele atanmıştır. Kontrol grubunda 9’u erkek 54’ü kız olmak üzere toplam 63, deney grubunda ise 15’i kız 47’si erkek olmak üzere toplam 62 öğrenci bulunmaktadır. Öğrenciler “İleri Kompozisyon Becerileri I dersini” aldıklarında çalışma ile ilgili bilgi verilmiş ve gönüllü oldukları teyit edilmiştir. Deneklerin yaşları 18-22, dil seviyeleri de ön-orta ile orta arasında değişmektedir. Öğrencilerin düşüncelerini kıyaslamak için sınıf uygulaması öncesi ve sonrası iki anket, Düzeltici Geribildirim ve Yabancı Dil Yazma Kaygısı ölçekleri, uygulanmıştır. Ölçekler ön test ve son test olarak sınıf içi çalışması öncesi ve sonrası iki kez uygulanmış olup deneklerin grup içi çalışma öncesi düşünceleri ile sonrası arasında fark olup olmadığı kontrol edilmek istenmiştir.

Sınıf içi uygulaması ise temel olarak öğrencilerin paragraf yazma becerileri üzerine olup, derste farklı üç paragraf türü incelenmiş ve paragraf organizasyonu, dilbilgisi ve kelime seçimi gibi temel başlıklara önem verilmiştir. Bununla birlikte, sınıf-içi uygulamada yazılan paragraflarda kontrol grubundaki hataların sadece altı çizilirken, yani kodlanmamış dönüt verilirken, deney grubunda tüm hataların altı çizilmiş, kodlanmış fakat düzeltilmemiştir. Deneklerin üç paragrafı üç ayrı yazma dersi öğretim elemanı tarafından araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen yazma rubriki ile değerlendirilmiş ve ortalamaları alınarak veriler oluşturulmuştur. Deney 12 hafta sürmüştür. Çalışmanın amacı aşağıdaki araştırma sorularına yanıt bulmaktır.

1. Öğrencilerin düzeltici geri bildirim hakkındaki düşünceleri nelerdir?
2. Öğrencilerin sınıf içi uygulaması öncesi ve sonrası yazma kaygıları nasıldır?
3. Öğrencilerin geribildirim düşünceleri ile yazma kaygı seviyeleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişki var mıdır?
4. Öğretmenlerin verdiği geribildirim öğrencilerin paragraf yazma becerilerine etkisi olmuş mudur?

Araştırma soruları göz önünde tutulduğunda, istatistikî ve betimleyici analizler aşağıdaki sonuçları vermektedir. Öncelikle düzeltici geribildirim gerekli mi yoksa Truscott’un (1999) öne sürdüğü gibi yasaklanmalı mı sorusu istatistiksel veriler birinci araştırma sorusunu manidar bulmasa da ($p=.027$), tanımlayıcı analizler bazı önemli ayrıntıların altını çizmektedir. Örneğin, tüm denekler sınıf içi uygulaması öncesi zaten geribildirim gerekliliğine inanmaktadırlar. Bu oranlar sınıf içi çalışması sonucu değişmemekte, aksine deney grubunda bazı

maddelerde önemli artışlar gözlenmektedir (Tablo 2 ve 3'e bakınız). İkinci araştırma sorusu t-testi sonucu deneklerin kaygı düzeyleri arasında farklılık olduğunu test etmiş ve manidar bulmuştur ($p = .001$). Analiz sonucu öğrencilerin yüksek kaygı düzeylerinin uygulama sonrası azaldığını ispatlamaktadır. Üçüncü soru t-testi ise öğrencilerin geribildirim inançları ile kaygı düzeyleri arasında anlamlı fakat negatif yönde bir ilişki olduğunu vermektedir. Kısacası, öğrencilerin geribildirim inançları arttıkça kaygı düzeylerinde azalma olduğu sonucu çıkmaktadır ($P < .01$). Son olarak, dördüncü araştırma sorusu Friedman testi sonucuna göre manidardır ($P > .005$). Kısacası, düzeltici geribildirim uygulaması aynı zamanda yazma becerilerini geliştirdiği sonucunu vermektedir.

Her şeyden önce, düzeltici dönüt öğrenci ve öğretmenler tarafından olumsuz bir kavram olarak ele alındığında, öğrencilerin bundan korkması ve kaygı duyması pek de sürpriz sayılmamalı. Fakat hata düzeltme veya geribildirim kavramları gözden geçirme olarak algılanırsa ki bu zaten yazma sürecinin bir parçasıdır, dil öğreniminin sadece biçim de değil anlamda da geliştiğini görürüz. Bu yüzden bu çalışma yazma kaygısını azalttığı ve dil-ötesi bilinci geliştirdiği kısacası öğrencide duyuşsal ve bilişsel etkiler yarattığı için düzeltici dönütü yabancı dil sınıflarında kullanılmasını savunmaktadır. Bu tür çalışmalar genelde kabul görebilmesi için benzer bağlamlarda uzun soluklu araştırılmalı fakat her şeyden önce düzeltici dönüt yasaklanması bir tarafa dil politikalarına yön verenlere, müfredat planlayıcılarına ve tabi ki yabancı dil öğretmenlerine ısrarla tavsiye edilmelidir.

Citation Information:

Kahraman, A. (2013). Affective and cognitive effects of coded teacher feedback on FL writing students. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [Hacettepe University Journal of Education]*, 28(1), 189-201.