



T.C.  
NECMETTİN ERBAKAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ



Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi

**TURKISH EFL INSTRUCTORS' SELF REPORTED USE OF PRODUCTIVE  
FEEDBACK**

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA  
ORCID: 0000-0001-8010-5221

Danışman  
Doç. Dr. Galip KARTAL  
ORCID: 0000-0003-4656-2108

Konya – 2023

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My most profound appreciation goes to my advisor and mentor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Galip KARTAL, for his time, effort, and understanding in helping me succeed in my studies. His vast wisdom and wealth of experience have inspired me throughout my studies. In addition, I'd like to express my gratitude to everyone in the ELT masters degree programme. Thanks to their generosity and encouragement, my time spent studying this programme has been truly rewarding. To conclude, I'd like to thank my parents and my siblings. It would have been impossible to finish my studies without their unwavering support over the past few years.

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

December 2023

# İÇİNDEKİLER

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>İÇİNDEKİLER</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>BİLİMSEL ETİK BEYANNAMESİ</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1. Significance of Productive Feedback in EFL Instruction .....	2
1.2 The Present Study .....	3
1.3 The Purpose of the Study .....	4
1.4 Assumptions .....	4
1.5 Limitations.....	4
1.6 Definitions of Key Terms .....	4
<b>2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 What is Feedback?.....	8
2.2 Current Approaches to Feedback .....	9
2.3 Different Types of Feedback .....	10
2.3.1 Productive feedback .....	10
2.3.2 Descriptive feedback .....	13
2.3.3 Metacognitive feedback .....	13
2.3.4 Corrective feedback.....	14
<b>3. METHOD</b> .....	<b>28</b>
3.1 Participants .....	29
3.2 Data Collection.....	29
3.2.1 The English teacher productive feedback inventory .....	29
3.2.2 Interview questions.....	31
3.3 Data Analysis .....	33
3.3.1 Quantitative data analysis.....	34
3.3.2 Qualitative data analysis.....	34
<b>4. RESULTS</b> .....	<b>36</b>
4.1 Patterns and Trends in Feedback Practices According to the ETPFI.....	36
4.1.1 Feedback frequency and engagement.....	37
4.1.2 Feedback alignment and enhancement.....	39
4.1.3 Use of technology and student involvement .....	41
4.2 Insights into Turkish EFL Instructors' Perspectives on Productive Feedback .....	43

<b>5. DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>47</b>
5.1 Practical Implications .....	48
<b>6. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1 Suggestions for Further Research.....	52
<b>GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>KAYNAKLAR.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendixes.....</b>	<b>66</b>
Appendix A .....	66
Instrument: English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory (ETPFI).....	66
Appendix B.....	68
Interview Questions.....	68



## TEZ ÇALIŞMASI ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

*Turkish EFL Insructors' Self Reported Use of Productive Feedback* başlıklı tez çalışmamın toplam **55** sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 18/12/2023 tarihinde tez danışmanım tarafından **Turnitin** adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı **16%** olarak belirlenmiştir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Tez çalışması orijinallik raporu sayfası hariç
2. Bilimsel etik beyannamesi sayfası hariç
3. Önsöz hariç
4. İçindekiler hariç
5. Simgeler ve kısaltmalar hariç
6. Kaynaklar hariç
7. Alıntılar dahil
8. 7 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Uygulama Esaslarını inceledim ve tez çalışmamın, bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranının (%30) altında olduğunu ve intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

18/12/2023

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

Doç. Dr. Galip KARTAL

## **BİLİMSEL ETİK BEYANNAMESİ**

Bu tezin tamamının kendi çalışmam olduğunu, planlanmasından yazımına kadar tüm aşamalarında bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara özenle riayet edildiğini, tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez hazırlama kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda bilimsel kurallara uygun olarak atıf yapıldığını ve bu kaynakların kaynaklar listesine eklendiğini beyan ederim.

18/12/2023

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Abbreviations

CF: Corrective Feedback

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ETPFI: English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory

FFI: Form Focused Instruction

L2: Second Language



## ÖZET

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü  
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı  
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı  
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

### YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE EĞİTMENLERİNİN ÜRETKEN GERİBİLDİRİM KULLANIMLARI HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

Bu çalışma, karma yöntem yaklaşımı kullanarak Türk üniversitelerindeki Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce (EFL) öğretmenleri arasındaki üretken geribildirim uygulamalarını incelemektedir. Niteliksel ve niceliksel yöntemleri eşzamanlı olarak kullanan bu araştırma, çeşitli eğitim bağlamlarında yaygın olan üretken geribildirim uygulamalarına ilişkin kapsamlı bir bakış açısı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma, İngilizce Öğretmeni Üretken Geribildirim Envanteri'ni (ETPFI) ve Türkiye'deki çeşitli üniversitelerden öğretmenlerle yapılan görüşmeleri içeren çok yönlü bir yöntemi benimsemektedir. ETPFI aracılığıyla elde edilen niceliksel veriler, EFL öğretmenleri arasında geribildirim sağlamadaki yaygın eğilimleri sunmayı amaçlamaktadır. İstatistiksel analizler öğretmenler arasında belirli, zamanında ve eyleme geçirilebilir geribildirim önemli rolü konusunda fikir birliği olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu niceliksel bulgular, yaygın uygulamaların anlaşılması için temel bir çerçeve görevi görmektedir. Aynı zamanda, beş öğretmenle yapılan derinlemesine görüşmeler yoluyla elde edilen nitel bilgiler, bağlamsal derinlik sağlayarak çalışmayı zenginleştirmektedir. Bu görüşmelerin tematik analizi, geribildirim uygulamalarını çevreleyen temel gerekçeleri, deneyimleri ve bağlamsal karmaşıklıkları ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Niteliksel veriler öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı karmaşıklıkları, öğrenci özerkliğini ve motivasyonunu geliştirmede geribildirim önemini vurgulamaktadır. Öğretmenlerin, olumlu geri bildirimlerin ve bireysel öğrenme kapsamına göre uyarlanmış kişiselleştirilmiş stratejilerin motivasyon üzerindeki rolüne vurgu yaptıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca geri bildirim dil öğreniminde yol gösterici bir araç olarak gördükleri ve aktif öğrenci katılımına önem verdikleri de ortaya çıkmıştır. Niceliksel ve niteliksel bulguların birleştirilmesiyle Türk yabancı dil öğretmenleri arasında geribildirim uygulamalarına ilişkin bir bakış açısı ortaya çıkmaktadır. Bu metodolojiler arasındaki etkileşim, EFL sınıflarında geribildirim stratejilerini geliştirmek için bazı önemli sonuçlar sağlamaktadır. Öğretmenler, kişiselleştirilmiş üretken geribildirim yoluyla öğrencileri güçlendirmeye, uygulamadaki zorlukları ele almaya, teorik kavramları pratik stratejilerle bütünleştirmeye, geribildirim motivasyon aracı olarak kullanmaya ve geribildirim bireysel ihtiyaçlara göre uyarlamaya teşvik etmektedir. Bu kapsamlı yaklaşım, yalnızca öğretmenlere pedagojik yaklaşımlarını geliştirerek fayda sağlamakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda eğitimci yetiştirme programları için de yol gösterici bir araç görevi görebilir. Bu bulguların bir araya getirilmesiyle, bu tür programlar gelecekteki İngilizce öğretmenlerini geribildirim sağlamanın karmaşıklığıyla baş etme ve öğrenci öğrenme sonuçlarını optimize etme konusunda veri sağlayabilir. Temelde, istatistiksel yaygınlığı niteliksel derinlikle birleştiren bu çalışmanın bütünleştirici yaklaşımı, Türk yabancı dil eğitim ortamlarındaki üretken geribildirim uygulamalarının incelemesini sunmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Üretici geribildirim, Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce eğitimi, Geribildirim ve öğrenci motivasyonu, Yabancı dil eğitimi.

## **ABSTRACT**

Necmettin Erbakan University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences  
Department of Foreign Language Education  
English Language Education Program  
Master Thesis

### **TURKISH EFL INSTRUCTORS' SELF REPORTED USE OF PRODUCTIVE FEEDBACK**

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

This study delves into the intricate realm of productive feedback practices among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors in Turkish universities using a mixed-method approach. By concurrently employing qualitative and quantitative methodologies, this research aims to offer a comprehensive understanding of prevalent productive feedback practices within diverse educational contexts. The study embraces a multifaceted methodology, integrating the English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory (ETPFI) and in-depth interviews with instructors from various universities across Turkey. Quantitative data, obtained through the ETPFI, illuminates prevalent trends and patterns in feedback provision among EFL instructors. Statistical analyses reveal a consensus among instructors regarding the pivotal role of specific, timely, and actionable feedback. Challenges associated with offering feedback in expansive class settings emerge as prominent themes. These quantitative findings serve as a foundational framework for understanding prevalent practices. Concurrently, qualitative insights obtained through in-depth interviews with five instructors enrich the study by providing contextual depth and nuanced understanding. Thematic analysis of these interviews uncovers underlying rationales, experiences, and contextual intricacies surrounding feedback practices. The qualitative data highlight the complexities faced by instructors and emphasize the significance of feedback in fostering learner autonomy and motivation. The synthesis of quantitative prevalence with qualitative depth not only elucidates prevalent practices but also sheds light on the nuanced motivations and challenges faced by instructors in their feedback provision efforts. The convergence of quantitative prevalence and qualitative depth generates a robust understanding of feedback practices among Turkish EFL instructors. The interplay between these methodologies provides invaluable implications for refining feedback strategies in EFL classrooms. This comprehensive approach not only benefits instructors by enhancing their pedagogical approaches but also serves as a guiding tool for educator training programs. By incorporating these findings, such programs can better equip future EFL instructors to navigate the complexities of feedback provision and optimize student learning outcomes. In essence, this study's integrative approach, merging statistical prevalence with qualitative depth, presents a comprehensive exploration of productive feedback practices in Turkish EFL educational settings, offering substantial insights and avenues for pedagogical improvement.

**Keywords:** Productive Feedback, EFL teaching, Feedback and student motivation, Foreign language education.

## CHAPTER ONE

### 1. INTRODUCTION

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction has an important role in helping learners develop their language skills, knowledge, and confidence. One key aspect of effective EFL instruction is the provision of feedback, which can help learners to identify their strengths and weaknesses and make progress over time. In exploring the intricacies of feedback in EFL instruction, it becomes evident that the process is a dynamic interplay between the teachers' strategies and the students' active engagement. The significance of feedback lies not only in its provision but also in how it is interpreted and acted upon by students. This nuanced understanding underscores the multifaceted nature of the feedback loop, where the effectiveness of feedback is contingent on the collaboration between teachers and students. While teachers play a pivotal role in delivering timely and constructive feedback, students, in turn, contribute significantly by embracing an active role in receiving, interpreting, and applying the feedback to their work. This cooperative relationship forms the foundation for fostering a constructive learning environment, where the impact of feedback extends beyond correction to become a catalyst for continuous improvement and skill development.

Feedback is often associated with increased academic accomplishment (Hattie, 2009) and higher levels of student motivation (Narciss et al., 2014). However, feedback does not always result in improvement, and it can even be harmful if it is ignored, is not considered important, or is not connected to one's current level of competence (Crisp, 2007; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Shute, 2008). One-third of the feedback interventions in Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) meta-analysis of 607 effect sizes revealed a decline in performance after feedback because "feedback may cause the recipient to... decrease performance if the feedback is not accompanied by cues helping to reject erroneous hypotheses." So, teacher's involvement is very crucial in this process.

On the other hand according to prior research, teachers' feedback to students can promote learning (Black & Wiliam, 1998, 2009, 2018; Evans, 2013; Hattie & Timperley, 2007) when it is timely (Weaver, 2006), specific rather than general (Poulos & Mahony, 2008), and includes suggestions for improvement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). High-quality feedback is one of the most potent influences on student learning, according to research (Black & Wiliam,

1998; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Studies reveal that rather than the feedback itself, what matters is how students interpret the feedback (Higgins et al., 2001; Pokorny & Pickford, 2010) because doing so is essential to using the feedback to improve one's work (Gibbs & Simpson, 2005; Price et al., 2010). The ability to construct understanding from feedback critically depends not only on the content and delivery of the teacher's feedback but also on the student's proactive reception of that feedback, such as the degree to which the student actively assumes responsibility and participates in the feedback processes (Winstone et al., 2017).

### **1.1. Significance of Productive Feedback in EFL Instruction**

The significance of productive feedback in EFL instruction is paramount, encompassing various aspects that collectively contribute to an enriched learning experience. One crucial dimension involves skill development, where constructive feedback provides students with targeted insights into specific areas of improvement, spanning grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and overall communicative competence. Beyond skill enhancement, productive feedback plays a pivotal role in motivating and engaging students throughout their language learning journey. When delivered effectively, positive reinforcement and guidance create a supportive learning environment, encouraging active participation, risk-taking, and persistence in mastering the English language. Furthermore, productive feedback facilitates self-assessment and reflection among EFL learners. By understanding their strengths and weaknesses through feedback, students can take ownership of their learning, set realistic goals, and engage in reflective practices that contribute to their ongoing linguistic development.

Effective communication skills are another key dimension influenced by productive feedback. Targeted guidance in writing, speaking, and comprehension refines students' language proficiency, instilling confidence in their ability to express themselves in English effectively. Moreover, productive feedback serves as a bridge between classroom learning and real-world communication. EFL instruction aims to prepare students for authentic language use, and feedback plays a crucial role in equipping them with the linguistic proficiency needed for academic, professional, and social interactions in English. The cyclical nature of feedback, involving guidance, revisions, and subsequent feedback, establishes a culture of continuous improvement. This iterative process contributes to the ongoing development of language skills, fostering a commitment to excellence and mastery among EFL learners. In summary, the multifaceted significance of productive feedback enhances the overall quality of EFL

instruction, supporting learners on their journey towards linguistic proficiency and cultural competence.

## **1.2 The Present Study**

Amidst the exploration of effective feedback practices, it becomes apparent that the research landscape has predominantly focused on understanding the dynamics between teachers and students in various educational contexts. However, there exists a critical gap in knowledge concerning the specific perspectives of Turkish EFL instructors on the concept of productive feedback. This research aims to bridge this gap by delving into the opinions and experiences of Turkish EFL instructors, shedding light on their perceptions, challenges, and strategies related to providing productive feedback. The study employs a mixed-methods approach, utilizing the English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory (ETPFI) questionnaire and semi-structured interviews to collect comprehensive data. By gaining insights into the specific context of Turkish EFL instruction, this research seeks to contribute not only to the academic discourse but also to inform practical strategies and policies in the realm of EFL teaching and learning in Turkey.

While the current study aims to investigate the use of productive feedback in EFL contexts, it is important to acknowledge the significance of corrective feedback (CF) in language learning. CF has been shown to be a valuable tool for helping learners improve their accuracy and proficiency in the target language, and it is widely used in language classrooms around the world. Moreover, while productive feedback has gained increasing attention in the literature in recent years, CF continues to be an important aspect of language instruction. Thus, it is essential to consider both types of feedback in any comprehensive examination of feedback practices in language learning. By including information about all types of feedback in the field, especially about CF and productive feedback in this research paper, it is aimed to provide a broader context for our investigation of productive feedback, and to offer a more comprehensive understanding of feedback practices in EFL contexts.

The role of teachers in the feedback process is crucial, as evident from the potential impact of feedback on student performance. While effective feedback is associated with positive learning outcomes, its interpretation and utilization by students are equally vital. It is critical for teachers to be involved not just in delivering timely, specific, and improvement-oriented feedback, but also in creating an environment in which students actively participate with and accept responsibility for the feedback processes. This research synthesis emphasizes

the subtle dynamics of feedback in EFL instruction and the nuanced interplay between teachers' tactics and students' receptivity. Turning to the specific context of this research study, the investigation into Turkish EFL instructors' opinions on productive feedback becomes a significant endeavor.

### **1.3 The Purpose of the Study**

This research seeks to fill this gap by delving into the opinions and experiences of Turkish EFL instructors, aiming to shed light on their perceptions, challenges, and strategies related to providing productive feedback. Employing a mixed-methods approach, combining ETPFI questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, the study endeavors to contribute not only to academic discourse but also to inform practical strategies and policies in the realm of EFL teaching and learning in Turkey. The central question driving this research is:

What are the opinions of Turkish EFL instructors regarding productive feedback?

Through a comprehensive exploration, the study intends to identify best practices, providing valuable insights for EFL teachers, teacher educators, and policymakers in fostering evidence-based practices in EFL teaching and learning.

### **1.4 Assumptions**

1. All data collected through the inventory used is assumed to reflect the truth.
2. No external factor is assumed to affect the answers given by the participants.

### **1.5 Limitations**

While this research offers valuable insights, there are certain limitations that must be acknowledged. The study focused solely on Turkish EFL instructors, potentially limiting the generalizability of findings to other cultural and linguistic contexts. Moreover, the self-reported nature of questionnaire responses and interviews may introduce bias and subjectivity. Additionally, the study did not extensively explore student perspectives, which could have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the feedback process.

### **1.6 Definitions of Key Terms**

**English Language Teaching:** It is the practice of instructing non-native speakers in the English language, focusing on developing listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills through various methods and approaches.

**English as a Foreign Language:** It refers to the study or teaching of the English language in a non-English-speaking environment, where English is not the primary or official language.

**Productive Feedback:** Productive feedback is information provided to an individual or a group aimed at improving performance, behavior, or outcomes.

**Student Motivation:** It refers to the various factors or reasons that drive a student's behavior, engagement, and persistence in learning activities or tasks.

**Second Language (L2):** In the context of language learning, a second language (L2) refers to any language that an individual acquires or learns after their native or first language (L1).



## CHAPTER TWO

### 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Feedback may be defined as information provided by one agent to another on the latter's performance or comprehension in its broadest meaning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to the literature, students rely on teachers' ongoing input (G. Lee & Schallert, 2008; Tasdemir & Arslan, 2018) to identify their strengths and flaws (I. Lee, 2017). The traditional conception of feedback is primarily a teacher-centered delivery paradigm, which sees feedback as one-way performance-related information provided by the teacher to the student (Molloy & Boud, 2013).

The Input Hypothesis, advanced by Stephen Krashen in 1982, contends that extensive exposure to the target language (implicit learning) is necessary to learn a second language (L2). He also stated that the notion of CF was useless since explicit training or feedback would not result in proficiency in the usage of L2. It might be claimed that the first language acquisition phase, in which youngsters are exposed to a lot of input and little feedback, supports this notion. On the other hand, Chaudron (1988) argues that feedback may be the most significant source of improvement and development for students. The extent to which this knowledge truly facilitates acquisition, however, is uncertain. He also maintains that students will inevitably learn something from their teachers, whether it be through direct criticism, their actions, or their facial expressions when they are being questioned, and that the purpose of feedback should be to give students the tools they need to change their behavior (Chaudron, 1988).

A more learner-centered perspective on feedback is more long-term. According to this perspective, learners are active agents (Molloy & Boud, 2013) that actively seek out and use information from a range of sources, which is in contrast to the feedback delivery paradigm. According to Esterhazy et al. (2021) and Hattie and Timperley (2007), productive feedback is the process by which a teacher informs students about their performance or assists them in obtaining the information they need, with the goal of fostering understanding so that students can use the information to advance in their learning. This perspective on feedback implies that, in order to get the best outcomes, both teachers and their students should be involved in the feedback process, despite the teacher playing a leadership position in the giving of productive feedback. The ability to bridge the gap between a learner's present level of comprehension and the required performance is essential for feedback to be effective (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Lee, 2017).

According to Moser (2020), in order for teacher feedback to be effective, the "goal of the feedback method," "how the feedback method works," and "ways to interact with it" should take priority. Productive feedback is encouraged when learners interact with the information they get through feedback and use that knowledge in their learning to achieve the learning aim (Esterhazy et al., 2021), which can result in enhanced learning as a long-term objective (Hyland, 1990). In order to assist learning at a certain moment, teachers must be knowledgeable and skilled in feedback methodologies, learner competency levels that will allow them to comprehend the material, and when learners are prepared to apply the feedback they have received. Teachers with this level of competency will use ethical and moral teaching strategies, making an effort to encourage every student and help them attain their full potential. Along with giving feedback to students, the teacher also has a responsibility to foster a culture of self-regulated learning by using a variety of feedback mechanisms, including peer and self-correction (Carless & Boud, 2018; Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). This study, which intended to assess instructors' self-reported feedback practices, also took into account the teacher's responsibility for fostering a feedback environment that encourages students to actively participate in their learning.

## **2.1 What is Feedback?**

Feedback is the most significant single factor influencing accomplishment, but its effects are highly diverse, highlighting how challenging it is to maximize its advantages. The process through which students make sense of data from multiple sources and apply it to improve their work or learning practices is known as feedback. Feedback emphasizes the importance of the student involvement in making sense of and applying comments to enhance following work and is mostly about teachers telling students about strengths, flaws, and how to improve. To assist students' self-evaluations of progress, information may come from a variety of sources, including peers, teachers, friends, family members, or automated computer-based systems.

The use of feedback to assist students in developing their own self-regulation as learners is another important goal (Carless, 2006; Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). Self-regulation is the active participation of the learner in the feedback and learning processes. In this process, the learner sets learning objectives and then makes an effort to control specific aspects of their thinking, motivation, and behavior throughout the learning process in accordance with the objectives and contextual factors in their environment (Pintrich, 2000). However, the development of self-regulation abilities like metacognition requires the teacher's active involvement.

In Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick's (2006) model of self-regulated learning and students' active involvement with feedback, the active teacher is emphasized. They provide seven feedback elements in their approach that instructors should encourage to help students support and build their own self-regulation: In order to improve performance, teachers should: (1) define what is considered good performance; (2) encourage self-evaluation; (3) deliver high-quality feedback information; (4) promote teacher and peer dialogue; (5) foster positive motivation and self-esteem; (6) offer opportunities to close the gap; and (7) use feedback to improve instruction. These fundamental ideas center on the processes that are essential to learners' self-regulation and address the cognitive, behavioral, and motivational aspects of self-regulation. As a result, since they are the ones who choose whether or not to use the feedback, students are crucial to the feedback procedures (Havnes et al., 2012). Therefore, it's important to consider how students respond to feedback while attempting to increase their learning.

## **2.2 Current Approaches to Feedback**

Early in the 2010s, there was a change in the literature's positioning of feedback, from being seen as something that was "delivered" to students to being seen as a process in which they might actively participate. Both Hattie and Timperley (2007) and Shute (2008) examined feedback with an emphasis on "information communicated to the learner" and "information provided by an agent." Recent understandings reframe feedback as a process for producing better work, returning it to its conceptual roots in biology or engineering (Boud & Molloy, 2013). This change in perspective on feedback emphasizes a lot more aspects of it than just the teachers giving students helpful feedback. The feedback conceptualizations that are currently prevalent in the literature take into account the full feedback process, which is led by the student rather than the educator, involves a number of participants, and necessitates the student using information to influence change.

Researchers now view feedback as a dialogic process (Ajjawi & Boud, 2018; Boud & Molloy, 2013; Price et al., 2011), even if the majority of research in the higher education environment still views it as transmission, often as information sent from lecturers to students (Evans, 2013). This "new paradigm" in the study of feedback is mostly the result of restrictions found in earlier empirical research on feedback practicess (Steen-Utheim & Wittek, 2017). The perspective of "feedback as transmission" suggests a constrained understanding of feedback since it focuses only on giving students information, usually in the form of comments or replies. In contrast to dialogic techniques, this viewpoint lays less responsibility on the learner (Yang & Carless, 2013).

Dialogic approaches to feedback view feedback as an ongoing interactive process in which students interact with a variety of feedback sources (including peers, teachers, and/or technologies), use that feedback to improve their work, and place an emphasis on dialogue to support student learning and growth from feedback. This perspective acknowledges the social-emotional component of feedback processes, particularly the importance of trust since it influences how students interpret feedback and, as a result, can facilitate their assimilation and application of feedback (Yang & Carless, 2013). The dialogic method emphasizes the importance of the student's participation in understanding and utilizing feedback and views it as a two-way interactive and relational process that is essential to both teaching and learning (Nicol, 2010). As a result, the learner's active participation in feedback processes is acknowledged, such as when students pay attention and take action.

Dialogic methods to feedback are largely theoretical, and there aren't many empirical studies looking at actual dialogic feedback practices, despite the fact that they're making progress in the study community. Within a dialogic feedback paradigm in online medical education, Ajjawi and Boud (2018) examined sequences of written feedback dialogues and student feedback diaries in two recent empirical works. Esterhazy and Damsa (2019) investigated how biology students read feedback remarks in the context of a dialogical approach, and they talked about these interpretational trajectories as developing processes. In addition, dialogic methods of feedback do not examine the meaning of the term discussion in dialogic feedback. Giving students the chance to interact with their comments, for instance, does not guarantee that they will comprehend it and utilize it to enhance their work. The term "conversation" in dialogic approaches to feedback is discussed and problematized by Steen-Utheim and Wittek (2017) in their study. The authors contend that discourse may not always help students learn from criticism since the dialogue and how it develops may be perceived as unhelpful or even threatening, which puts the students in a precarious position. This can cause students to, for instance, keep knowledge to themselves or not share their thoughts on the feedback. Steen-Utheim and Wittek (2017) provide an analytical model for investigating dialogic feedback practices based on a survey of the literature on dialogic theory and interaction analysis of real-world oral dialogic feedback scenarios.

### **2.3 Different Types of Feedback**

Different types of feedback play an important role in supporting language growth in the field of EFL instruction. Teachers use a variety of feedback tactics to improve students' learning experiences. These approaches are intended to support and enhance language abilities in the context of EFL teaching.

#### **2.3.1 Productive feedback**

Productive feedback, a cornerstone in language instruction, is centered on accentuating the positive aspects of a student's language utilization. The primary aim of productive feedback is to instill encouragement and fortify commendable language practices, cultivating heightened motivation, confidence, and proficiency. Delivered in diverse forms, such as expressions of praise ("Good job!"), confirmation of correctness ("Yes, that's right!"), or the constructive positive feedback sandwich method, where positive feedback precedes and follows corrective feedback, this approach proves pivotal in nurturing language growth.

In language learning, the role of productive feedback extends beyond mere positivity, contributing to the establishment of a conducive learning atmosphere. This constructive feedback not only fosters a growth mindset but also emboldens students to take risks and view mistakes as integral to the learning process. Through the judicious application of productive feedback, educators contribute not only to immediate language improvement but also to the cultivation of lifelong learning habits and a resilient approach to linguistic challenges.

### ***The impact of productive feedback on L2 learning***

Productive feedback in L2 (second language) learning refers to feedback that focuses on what the learner is doing well and how they can build on their strengths to further improve their language performance. The purpose of productive feedback is to provide positive reinforcement, to build learner confidence, and to promote continued language development. Productive feedback can take many forms, including specific praise for language use, reinforcement of good language habits, and support for continued improvement. When giving productive feedback, it is important for teachers to be supportive, encouraging, and specific in their feedback to help learners feel confident and motivated to continue learning.

Productive feedback is important in L2 learning for several reasons:

- It provides positive reinforcement: Positive reinforcement can be a powerful motivator for learners, and productive feedback helps learners feel good about their language performance, which in turn can encourage them to continue working hard and making progress.
- It builds learner confidence: Productive feedback helps learners feel more confident about their language abilities, which can lead to greater motivation and a more positive attitude toward learning.
- It promotes continued language development: By focusing on strengths and building on them, productive feedback helps learners see the progress they are making, which can encourage them to continue working hard to improve their language skills.

In conclusion, productive feedback plays an important role in L2 learning by providing positive reinforcement, building learner confidence, and promoting continued language development. When used in conjunction with other types of feedback, such as corrective feedback, it can help learners feel more confident and motivated to continue learning, which can lead to improved language performance.

### ***How to provide productive feedback?***

There are several current approaches to providing productive feedback in language learning. Task-Based Feedback is a prominent approach that centers on providing feedback related to the task at hand, rather than solely focusing on the language itself. In this method, teachers evaluate the accuracy and coherence of students' performance in tasks, such as writing or speaking exercises. This approach encourages learners to apply language skills in context, making the feedback directly relevant to their practical language use.

Feedback on Form, on the other hand, emphasizes the language's structural aspects, including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and other language-related elements. Instructors provide feedback through error correction and explicit teaching, which helps learners refine their language skills. This approach is particularly beneficial for addressing specific language deficiencies and enhancing linguistic accuracy. Another approach, Feedback on Content, directs attention to the quality of the content within the language use. Teachers assess the ideas presented and the development of arguments in learners' work. By offering feedback on content, instructors guide students in conveying their thoughts effectively, promoting clarity and coherence in their communication.

Peer Feedback introduces a dynamic element into the feedback process, involving learners in assessing each other's work. This approach has proven highly effective in fostering language learning. It not only allows students to receive diverse perspectives but also encourages collaborative learning. It can boost motivation and engagement by involving learners actively in the feedback exchange. Furthermore, Feedback through Metacognitive Prompts employs questions and comments aimed at prompting learners to reflect on their own learning process. This approach encourages self-awareness and metacognition, essential elements in effective language learning. Teachers might ask questions like, "What do you think you need to do to improve your speaking skills?" or "How do you plan to use what you learned today in your future language use?" These prompts stimulate critical thinking and strategic learning.

In conclusion, the current approaches to productive feedback in language learning are diverse and adaptable. They encompass task-based feedback, feedback on form, feedback on content, self- and peer feedback, and feedback through metacognitive prompts. The most effective approach depends on the unique needs and learning styles of individual students, as well as the goals of the language learning program. Effective language educators often combine

multiple feedback methods to provide a well-rounded and tailored learning experience for their students.

### **2.3.2 Descriptive feedback**

Descriptive feedback is feedback that provides information on what the student has done well and what needs improvement. Descriptive feedback is specific, clear, and focused on the task or skill being assessed. The purpose of descriptive feedback is to help the student understand what they have done well and what they can do to improve. Descriptive feedback can be given in various forms, such as rubrics, checklists, or written comments.

Descriptive feedback, an integral component of the evaluation process, imparts information on both the commendable aspects of a student's performance and areas necessitating improvement. This form of feedback is characterized by specificity, clarity, and a keen focus on the task or skill under assessment. The fundamental objective of descriptive feedback is to furnish students with a comprehensive understanding of their achievements and guide them toward strategies for enhancement. Various modes of delivering descriptive feedback exist, ranging from the implementation of rubrics and checklists to the provision of detailed written comments that delve into the nuances of the student's work. For example, a teacher provides a rubric for a writing assignment that includes criteria for organization, coherence, and language use. The teacher provides feedback on each criterion, highlighting the student's strengths and areas for improvement.

In educational contexts, the application of descriptive feedback transcends conventional evaluation methods, fostering a nuanced comprehension of individual strengths and weaknesses. By integrating descriptive feedback practices, educators not only contribute to immediate skill refinement but also lay the foundation for a reflective learning process. This approach instills in students the capacity to assess their own work critically and engage in continuous improvement, thereby nurturing a self-directed and resilient approach to academic challenges.

### **2.3.3 Metacognitive feedback**

Metacognitive feedback, a cornerstone in language education, plays a crucial role in guiding students to introspectively analyze their own language learning processes and cognitive strategies. The primary aim is to enhance students' self-awareness, enabling them to develop effective and adaptive language learning strategies. This form of feedback takes on diverse

forms, including prompting students to reflect on their language learning journey, offering specific cues for self-evaluation, and encouraging them to set language learning goals. In language education, metacognitive feedback goes beyond conventional assessment methods, enriching the learning experience by empowering students to navigate their linguistic development independently. By incorporating metacognitive feedback strategies, educators not only foster language learners' self-understanding but also cultivate a sense of autonomy, contributing to a sustained commitment to reflective language learning practices throughout their educational journey.

### **2.3.4 Corrective feedback**

Corrective feedback (CF) is a valuable aspect of language instruction, aiming to highlight and rectify errors within a student's language usage. The fundamental purpose of CF is to guide students in recognizing and amending their mistakes, thereby contributing to heightened accuracy and proficiency in language acquisition. Various forms of CF exist, encompassing explicit corrections, recasts that rephrase errors appropriately, and clarification requests prompting students to repeat or rephrase their statements. In language learning, CF is instrumental, preventing the entrenchment of errors and fostering the development of precise language skills. For instance, if a student expresses, "I goed to the store yesterday," the teacher might respond with, "Good job! You went to the store yesterday." The appropriate application of CF not only improves linguistic abilities but also fosters a resilient mindset that embraces the progressive process of language acquisition, ultimately fostering lifelong learning.

In EFL teaching and learning, a combination of these feedback types can be used to support language development and provide a well-rounded and effective feedback experience for learners. It is important to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of feedback in EFL teaching and to ensure that feedback is used in a way that supports effective language development. Both productive and CF aim to enhance learning in EFL teaching by providing guidance and feedback on performance. Both types of feedback are essential for language development and require effective delivery that is clear, concise, well-timed, relevant, and appropriate to the learner's needs. They can be given in various forms, including written comments, oral feedback, and one-on-one meetings with the teacher, and can be used in conjunction to support language development, with CF addressing errors and mistakes and productive feedback providing positive reinforcement and support for improvement. EFL teachers who are knowledgeable about CF and productive feedback are better equipped to

support their students' language development, foster motivation and engagement, promote effective learning, and meet the individual needs of their students.

### ***The impact of corrective feedback on different L2 developmental areas***

Corrective feedback (CF) in EFL teaching refers to feedback that is given to a learner to address errors or mistakes in their language performance. The purpose of CF is to help learners identify areas of weakness, to provide guidance on how to improve, and to promote language development. CF can take many forms, including direct feedback on specific language errors, indirect feedback that suggests alternative options for language use, and metalinguistic feedback that focuses on the underlying language rules and forms. When giving CF, it is important for teachers to be supportive, non-threatening, and specific in their feedback to help learners feel confident and motivated to continue learning. Effective CF can play an important role in language development, but it should be used in conjunction with other types of feedback, such as productive feedback, to provide a well-rounded and supportive learning environment.

Researchers are interested in how the CF impacts particular areas of L2 learners' development because instructors offer CF for many language learning activities. The findings about the effects of CF on grammar frequently parallel the findings about the effects of CF on pronunciation because the emphasis on focus on forms (a grammatical target structure) and accuracy (how successfully the structure is created and used) is similar in grammar instruction and pronunciation instruction. In fact, grammatical mistakes are at the focus of a lot of the study on the consequences of CF. For instance, learners can increase their grammatical correctness by using written CF to target incorrect grammatical characteristics in L2 writing (Sarvestani & Pishkar, 2015).

CF in pronunciation has been found to increase comprehensibility, just how written CF on grammatical characteristics can aid learners' grammatical correctness. When learners undertaking a listening task with and without customized CF were compared for how much their short-term comprehensibility improved, those getting CF considerably outperformed the listening only group (Dlaska & Krekeler, 2013). The participants in Darabad's 2014 study, which looked at how CF affected EFL learners' pronunciation accuracy, were divided into three groups. The first group functioned as the control and got no CF, whereas the other two groups received CF on how they pronounced -s or -es ends (Darabad, 2014). Pronunciation accuracy improved in both CF groups, but not in the control group (Darabad, 2014). These conclusions of pronunciation were supported by Saito and Lyster (2012). Their three groups participated in

a "lesson with significance." The last group received CF in addition to form focused instruction while the first two groups received form-focused instruction (FFI) and no support control (Saito & Lyster, 2012). Only the group that received FFI and CF was able to pronounce the phoneme /ɪ/ more clearly, and they did so both during planned classroom activities and while speaking spontaneously in front of the class (Saito & Lyster, 2012). The pronunciation of /ɪ/ neither the control group nor the FFI group significantly improved. This shows that FFI by itself does not aid in a learner's pronunciation growth, but that the addition of CF to FFI enables learners to enhance their segmental pronunciation, perhaps as a result of the CF bringing their inaccurate pronunciation to their notice (Saito & Lyster, 2012). Overall, studies on the effects of CF on language acquisition come to the conclusion that CF is crucial for helping learners develop their language's structural elements and that offering CF is more successful and advantageous for learners than not doing so. As there was general agreement about the advantages of CF, researchers focused on the issue of how to best understand all the classifications and types of CF and how they effect learners.

### ***Negative vs. positive evidence***

CF has been classified into two types according on the type of evidence it provides to students: negative or positive. Negative evidence draws learners' attention to what is improper or improperly acceptable in a language, sometimes by contrasting the improper statement with a grammatically correct one (Marcus, 1993). In contrast, positive evidence in language learning is the absence of correction or grammatical comparison (Finley, 2012). Negative evidence gives students the advantages of an accurate performance and longer-lasting gains from the CF (Strapp et al., 2011), while also enabling language teachers to pinpoint the areas where students are having problems in their L2 (Abolhasanpour & Jabbari, 2014). Strapp et al. (2011) assessed native English speakers on their capacity to acquire and generate nonsense nouns and nonsense irregular verbs after undergoing negative or positive evidence as part of a study that examined the impact of negative and positive evidence on learners' grammar. Negative evidence recipients performed better than positive evidence recipients and were more likely to accurately create the fictitious irregular verbs (Strapp et al., 2011). Another study demonstrated that both positive and negative evidence can help L2 learners improve their use of grammatical features; however, L2 students who received negative evidence outperformed their peers in both the short- and long-term, resulting in results that lasted longer (Abolhasanpour & Jabbari, 2014).

The question of whether positive or negative evidence is preferable for language acquisition is further complicated by studies that suggest that, although employing negative evidence CF has documented advantages, learners may also gain from positive evidence. According to data, employing positive evidence is advantageous, particularly when acquiring grammatical elements (Finley, 2012). Speakers from the positive evidence group were more successful in producing a vowel harmony pattern and applying the pattern to novel, unfamiliar test items when testing two groups (one receiving positive evidence treatment and the other receiving negative evidence treatment) than speakers from the negative evidence group, who nonetheless displayed the same abilities but to a lesser extent (Finley, 2012). These findings show that both positive and negative evidence seem to aid language learners in acquiring a new language feature, and that the use of positive evidence can be just as beneficial as the use of negative information in encouraging grammatical acquisition (Finley, 2012).

Some advise against using only negative or positive evidence, regardless of progress or learning achievement. One of these may not be sufficient to provide students all the feedback they require to enhance their language skills (Trahey, 1996). For instance, the right application of a grammatical characteristic is not always guaranteed by positive evidence alone. After obtaining convincing information about the proper placement of English adverbs, Trahey (1996) assessed L2 learners right away, and L2 learners continued to employ both the correct and improper placements of the adverbs. The same outcomes persisted in a follow-up posttest conducted a year later (Trahey, 1996). Perhaps the question isn't whether negative or positive evidence is superior, but rather how L2 teachers might use both types of feedback to focus on form in a way that is most beneficial to L2 learners (Trahey, 1996).

### ***Focused vs. unfocused corrective feedback***

Focused and unfocused CF solutions have also been described using various language in the CF literature, such as selected versus comprehensive and intensive versus extensive CF. However, there are subtle differences between the following pairs: focused and unfocused CF (Ellis et al., 2008), the selective-comprehensive distinction and the intensive-extensive contrast. Although there is undeniable meaning overlap and the various terms are frequently used interchangeably, these distinctions all have their own unique characteristics (Ellis et al., 2008).

The difference between the focused and unfocused pair is characterized by the (lack of) language target features are chosen on purpose. The intentional selection of particular target forms or structures is absent in an unfocused approach to CF, in contrast to a focused method

where a teacher chooses which error categories to focus on (such as article usage, past tense conjugation, etc.) . On the other hand, the difference between selective and comprehensive CF has less to do with how target structures are chosen and more to do with how many linguistic features are covered by the feedback. In contrast to a selective CF approach, where just a few faults are marked, when a teacher offers (completely) comprehensive CF, all error kinds in students' work are marked. This means that while focused CF is by nature selective (i.e., only errors within the focus domain(s) will be marked), selective feedback does not have to be concentrated on predefined error categories; for instance, a teacher could choose to give feedback on the most serious and/or stigmatizing errors in a student's output (which do not necessarily have to fall under a specific, preselected linguistic category). Additionally, unfocused CF can be selective (i.e., marking a subset of errors that are not grouped according to their linguistic nature, such as those that have the biggest negative effects on communicative success) or comprehensive (i.e., marking of all error types).

The difference between intensive and extensive CF, the last contrast, relates to how much feedback a learner receives on a certain linguistic element. Because this sort of feedback is typically given in an educational environment focusing on and/or a task eliciting the targeted feature, focused CF is typically (but not always) relatively intensive. On the other hand, unfocused and comprehensive CF types are more extensive in nature since they have a larger emphasis rather than trying to target a particular mistake category.

From both a cognitive and a sociocultural viewpoint on L2 development, predictions have been made regarding the success of focused and unfocused CF techniques. Many CF researchers have suggested that focused CF is better for L2 acquisition than unfocused CF, based on a cognitive viewpoint on language learning that views attention and comprehension as prerequisites for acquisition (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007, 2010). Focused CF could be anticipated to have greater potential in fostering the language learning process than unfocused CF because targeting a broad range of linguistic features at the same time might produce a cognitive overload and, as a result, prevent successful feedback. They have argued that because L2 learners have limited processing capacities, students are more likely to notice and understand corrections when they target a specific error type(s). One may argue that unfocused CF is more helpful in influencing learners' orientation to language form since corrections are more frequent and hence more noticeable when feedback is given holistically, refuting the hypothesis that focused CF is preferable. Additionally, it has been suggested that concentrated CF is more of

an explicit grammar instruction than a focus-on-form intervention (Bruton, 2009), which may make it harder for students to apply what they have learned from the CF they have received to new speaking or writing contexts.

### ***Implicit vs. explicit corrective feedback***

The degree of directness of the indication that a mistake has been committed is another typical classification of CF. Implicit feedback, according to Ellis et al. (2006), is feedback in which there is no obvious indication that a mistake has been made, as opposed to explicit feedback, which makes the error very plain. Recasts often make up implicit feedback, whereas metalinguistic feedback does so for explicit feedback (Ellis et al., 2006). The link between CF techniques and implicit or explicit learning may be used to describe them. Recasts, for instance, support implicit acquisition by boosting notice and rehearsing while tying form to meaning throughout dialogue. When communication is interrupted to intentionally establish a target structure and assess its correctness, explicit feedback supports explicit learning (Ellis et al., 2006).

The effectiveness of implicit and explicit CF on language growth and development has been studied. Ellis et al. (2006) divided L2 English speakers into three groups: one received implicit CF, one received explicit CF, and the third group received no CF in order to study the impact of CF on the acquisition of implicit and explicit knowledge of the morphological past tense ending -ed. Both a one-day posttest and a two-week posttest revealed a definite advantage for those who had received explicit feedback; Sepasdar & Kafipour (2019), who looked at L2 learners' pronunciation errors, found a similar result. According to Sepasdar & Kafipour (2019) findings, individuals who received explicit CF improved their pronunciation more than those who received implicit CF on both an immediate posttest and a four-week delayed posttest. These outcomes might be accounted for by the fundamental properties of explicit CF. Although both implicit and explicit CF can lead to error repair, researchers point out that explicit CF leads to a greater awareness that repair is needed. Explicit CF can appear more overtly corrective to learners and instructors.

Not other research has shown as encouraging outcomes with explicit CF, despite these findings on its effectiveness. The findings of Zohrabi and Behboudnia (2017) refute these assertions. There was very little difference in the effectiveness of implicit and explicit CF in decreasing pronunciation mistakes after receiving either implicit CF, explicit CF, or no CF treatment for them (Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). Both CF techniques were successful at

minimizing pronunciation mistakes (Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). Although both groups made somewhat more mistakes on the delayed post-test than they did on the immediate post-test (a frequent occurrence known as attrition of skill after time has elapsed), there was no difference in the pronunciation error decrease in the short- or long-term (Zohrabi & Behboudnia, 2017). Teachers should be aware of the advantages and disadvantages of employing explicit and implicit CF in the classroom given these diametrically opposed findings. Both are acceptable kinds of CF that can be utilized to enhance speech and grammar.

### ***Timing of corrective feedback***

The timing of CF has an impact on learners' comprehension and capacity for mistake correction. If an error is made, urgent correction must be given right away, frequently cutting off the learner's speech (Farahani & Salajegheh, 2015). Delaying feedback causes correction to be delayed, at least until a learner has finished their speech. After a mistake has been committed, feedback may be given seconds, hours, or even days later (Farahani & Salajegheh, 2015).

Numerous research have looked into the effects of both immediate and delayed CF on language learners' grammar. It is true that both immediate and delayed CF, as compared to those who get no CF at all, often enable students to enhance their grammatical correctness (Fu & Li, 2020; Shabani & Safari, 2016). Additionally, according to a number of studies, students who get immediate CF perform noticeably better than those who receive delayed CF or none at all (Fu & Li, 2020; Li et al., 2016). Compared to delayed CF, immediate CF is reportedly more successful in enabling learners to enhance a language trait. Learning progress is not always sustained and may become shallower over time when feedback is received later (Li et al., 2016). According to Opitz et al. (2011), delayed feedback can result in less successful learning and worse grammatical accuracy performance.

Because the correction may be more readily related to the problem with immediate CF, CF is more beneficial (Li et al., 2016). Immediate CF enables students to get feedback before to their mistakes being "proceduralized," when the student accepts the mistake as the proper target form (Fu & Li, 2020). The error is remedied, the learner modifies their language, and the new system is reinforced in practice tasks where students get instant CF (Fu & Li, 2020). The period between learner mistakes and CF is not set in delayed CF, however. By repeatedly using the inaccurate forms in subsequent actions, the faulty knowledge of the target language can proceduralize and be reinforced.

### ***Forms of corrective feedback***

The actual format of the feedback is a third technique to classify CF. Explicit corrections, elicitation requests, clarification requests, paralinguistic cues, repeats, recasts, and prompts are the most typical types of CF in L2 classrooms (Ellis, 2009a.; Lyster & Saito, 2010). Explicit correction is a particular type of CF where the corrector directly acknowledges that an error has been made, identifies the error, and gives the learner the remedy. Explicit and implicit correction, as described above, can be umbrella categorizations of CF itself (Ellis, 2009b). With elicitation, the teacher mimics a portion of the student's speech, deletes the mistake, and signals with increasing intonation that the student should try to create the phrase again. Repetition, requests for explanation, and paralinguistic communication are three other CF tactics. Repetition is a technique where the corrector reiterates an error and stresses it emphatically. The corrector notifies the learner that they do not comprehend the meaning of their statement by asking for clarification. In order to correct a paralinguistic error, the corrector must use a facial expression, a gesture, or another physical cue (Ellis, 2009b).

Recasts and prompts are also the two types of CF that are most frequently examined in L2 classrooms. Recasting involves the corrector rephrasing the wrong statement into a correct one and repeating it to the learner without making any mistakes (Lyster & Saito, 2010). Prompts are a less explicit method that nonetheless makes it clear to learners when they've made a mistake. Instead of giving learners the proper forms, prompts give them hints so they may use their prior knowledge to find the correct forms on their own (Lyster & Saito, 2010).

### ***Recasts***

Recasts are a well-researched, successful technique for focusing on learner pronunciation. Recasts alert students to a sound's improper pronunciation and raise pronunciation accuracy. For instance, Gooch et al. (2016) investigated how prompts and recasts affected Korean adult EFL learners' ability to pronounce the /r/ sound. The recast group, out of their three groups (FFI, FFI+recasts, and FFI+prompts), considerably improved their regulated level pronunciation of the sound /r/. (Gooch et al., 2016). Recasts can also help students become more accurate with their vowels (Saito & Lyster, 2012). Recasts outperformed direct input in a comparison of their respective efficacies in enhancing English pronunciation (Abedi et al., 2015). Recasts help students fill in knowledge gaps by offering both positive and negative evidence, such as mistake signaling and modeling the right response (Lyster & Saito, 2010). These two things allow students to sharpen their pronunciation (Gooch et al., 2016). Recasts

also subtly draw students' attention to the subject matter, which piques their interest (Abedi et al., 2015). Recasts offer the advantage of providing scaffolding for learning for students who are receiving information that is above their level of ability or competency. For example:

*Student: He go to school every day.*

*Teacher: He goes to school every day. (with a rising intonation to signal the error)*

### **Prompts**

Prompts in language teaching are subtle hints or cues given to students when they make mistakes in their language use. Rather than giving the correct answer outright, prompts guide learners toward self-correction by offering clues, rephrasing, asking questions, or using gestures. They encourage students to recognize errors and find the correct form themselves, promoting active learning and independence in language acquisition. Prompts are also an effective and thoroughly studied technique for enhancing speech. Those who received FFI+prompts improved in both controlled and spontaneous production, but the FFI+recast group only substantially improved in controlled production, according to data from the same study where Gooch et al. (2016) indicated that recasts are a successful method of CF for pronunciation. Students are compelled by prompts to employ their resources to generate the desired speech, which modifies their output into the desired target form (Gooch et al., 2016). Students are motivated and guided to remedy their own error since prompts highlight an error but do not reveal the proper form, promoting learner autonomy (Ammar & Spada, 2006). Resources that can be used as prompts include flashcards, realia, body language, facial expression (for correction), key words, questions, repeating errors, and other learners. For example:

*Student: She is very more intelligent.*

*Teacher: She is very... what?*

### **Clarification**

A clarification request is a form of corrective feedback used in language teaching that prompts learners to reflect on their language errors or unclear statements by asking for more information or clarification. Instead of directly correcting the mistake, the teacher or interlocutor seeks further details or repetition from the learner to ensure comprehension or accuracy. It is an attempt to get the students to reformulate or repeat something. Excuse me, I'm sorry, I don't understand, and forgive me are only a few of the expressions used with this kind of CF (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). When students ask a question like "What time it is," for instance,

the lecturers may respond with "I'm sorry?". That example shows that when lecturers utilize this style, they frequently repeat the students' improper words or phrases. It serves as a reminder to the pupils of the inappropriate language they used. The ability of the pupils to recognize their errors is anticipated. They will be able to convey the words or sentences in their proper form.

### ***Elicitation***

Elicitation is a form of corrective feedback used in language teaching where instructors or interlocutors prompt learners to produce correct language forms or structures by asking leading questions or providing cues without directly giving away the answer. The lecturers encourage the student to provide self-corrective comments by employing this style. In order to correct what the pupils expressed, the instructors repeated what they had said. They don't provide the precise form to express the corrective feedback; instead, they only ask the other pupils to provide or generate the correct form of a phrase or term. Additionally, if the students finish the phrase, the errors made by the students may be fixed.

The teacher can use at least three approaches to elicit the correct utterance from the student:

The first strategy is requesting the student to finish the teacher's partially speech, as demonstrated below.

*Student: Tomorrow I bring the book.*

*Teacher: No, tomorrow I .....*

In the second elicitation technique, the teacher asks questions to the student in order to elicit correct utterance from the student, for instance:

*Student: I go to a zoo last Sunday.*

*Teacher: How do we say 'go' in past tense?*

The third technique is used when the teacher requests the student to reformulate her or his initial utterance. Here is one such instance:

*Student: I goed to a zoo last Sunday.*

*Teacher: goed?*

(Basiron et al., 2008)

### ***Metalinguistic Feedback***

Despite its name, metalinguistic feedback does not necessarily include metalanguage; rather, Lyster and Ranta (1997) explain that the encoding of assessments or commentary regarding the non-target nature of the learner's utterance constitutes the defining feature of metalinguistic feedback, even though it is possible and even likely. Metalinguistic feedback provides the language learner with unfavorable evidence about the target form by directly referencing the occurrence of an error or the type of the problem. They also define metalinguistic feedback as "comments/information, or queries relating to the well-formedness of the student's speech, without expressly supplying the right form." (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The least useful of the three, metalinguistic remarks only state the incidence of a mistake. A broad declaration that a mistake has been made is one form of this metalinguistic feedback. The teacher asks questions, makes comments, or offers information on how the student's utterance was formed without supplying the proper form. A metalinguistic question is similar to metalinguistic information in that the teacher attempts to elicit the information from the student rather than offering it, for example:

*Student: I go to a zoo last Sunday.*

*Teacher: Past tense?*

(Basiron et al., 2008)

### ***Translation***

When translation follows a student's unwanted L1 usage, it might be considered as "a feedback move" (Panova & Lyster, 2002). Due to their comparable role of reformulating non-target learner utterances, Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorized translations as recasts despite finding relatively few of these moves in their database. In spite of this, Panova and Lyster (2002) assert that "There is a meaningful distinction between a recast (a reaction to an ill-formed speech in the L2) and a translation (a response to a well-formed utterance in the L1)". Due to the frequent occurrence of these translations, Panova and Lyster (2002) categorized them as a distinct feedback category, with the following example:

*Teacher: All right, now, which place is near the water?*

*Student: Non, j'ai pas fini. (L1)*

*Teacher: You haven't finished? Okay, Bernard, have you finished? (translation)*

(Panova & Lyster, 2002)

### ***Explicit Correction***

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), explicit correction refers to "the explicit presentation of the proper form" and is the explicit extreme on the continuum of corrective feedback. While giving the right form, the teacher makes it abundantly obvious that the student's previous statement was mistaken (e.g., "Oh, you mean," "You should say"). Here's an illustration:

*Student: La note pour le shot (The note for the shot)*

*Teacher: Oh, pour la, oh, pour ca. Tu veux dire pour la piqure. Piqure. Oui? (Oh, for the, oh, for that. You mean for the needle. Needle. Yes?)*

(Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

The supply of the target-like reformulation and a "overt and obvious statement of the existence of a mistake" are the characteristics of explicit error repair (Ellis et al., 2006). Comparing various CF is of continuous theoretical interest in CF research because they present various kinds of linguistic data (either positive or negative). Positive evidence reveals what is feasible in the language through exposure to target exemplars in the input, whereas negative evidence reveals what is not possible in the language and is often given through justifications or corrections (Gass, 1997). In terms of CF kinds, prompts only give negative evidence, whereas recasts provide both positive and negative evidence. Explicit correction delivers both forms of evidence. If the learner interprets the feedback as suggesting a mistake has happened, then it serves as negative evidence. The effects of implicit CF may be more robust (i.e. longer lasting) than those of explicit CF, which may be more effective in the short term (Ellis et al., 2006), although learners are more likely to notice explicit CF than implicit CF (Mackey et al., 2007) and prompts more than recasts (Ammar, 2008).

### ***Corrective feedback preferences***

First, learner preferences can affect learning behaviors, and second, mismatches between teachers' intentions and learners' interpretations of those intentions may have a negative impact on learning. For these reasons, investigations of learner and teacher preferences for CF have been conducted. This body of literature has shown that there is a definite propensity for students to exhibit a preference for obtaining CF versus having their mistakes overlooked. For instance, Schulz (1996) found that 90% of survey respondents in her analysis of eight distinct foreign language programs in the US believed that CF was essential. Jean & Simard (2011) examined the opinions of 2,321 high school students and 45 instructors in Canada as

part of their investigation on the perspectives of students and teachers on different aspects of grammar teaching. The majority of students said they wished they could "always get their verbal mistakes fixed". Additionally, some students may believe that an excellent teacher should be able to rectify spoken mistakes right away. However, there are differences in how much students want to be corrected. Students in Lasagabaster & Sierra's (2005) study stated that constant correction may inhibit communication and expressed a preference for focused CF on selected errors.

Despite the fact that most scenarios show a general tendency for students to prefer receiving CF, other research have found that the degree of the preference differs according on the cultural backgrounds, past and present language learning experiences, or competence levels of the learners. Schulz (2001) analyzed the preferences of students and instructors for CF in the US and Colombia and discovered that students and teachers in Colombia preferred grammar instruction that included CF more than those in the US. Loewen et al. (2009) conducted a survey of language classes of eight different language groups at an American university and discovered that English language learners, of which 51% claimed Korean as their first language and 20% claimed Chinese, had the strongest strong dislike for CF (and the least concern for grammatical accuracy), whereas foreign language learners of Arabic, Chinese, and various less commonly taught languages, whose L1 for the most part was English, had the most positive attitudes towards CF and grammatical accuracy. Therefore, attitudes about CF and grammar teaching may be more influenced by being immersed in the target language's environment than by a learner's prior experience with foreign languages. That is, despite their prior experience with foreign languages, EFL students prioritized communication over grammar and CF, whereas foreign language students who had limited opportunities to use the target language outside of the classroom valued grammar teaching and CF more.

It has been frequently noted that there is a discrepancy between students' desires for CF and instructors' perspectives on offering CF. In other words, teachers often want to correct students more than students generally desire to receive correction. Students almost always states that they want to be corrected, yet teachers showed definite hesitancy to do so. Teachers preferred to only address mistakes that inhibit communication in Jean & Simard's (2011) study in order to avoid obstructing communication and lowering their students' self-confidence. Thus, teachers often have two worries about CF: first, they think it can disrupt communication and negatively impact communicativeness; second, they think it might promote language anxiety

since students risk losing face by receiving feedback in front of others (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005).

In a multiple-case study on teacher perceptions of CF, Vasquez & Harvey (2010) carried out a partial replication of Lyster & Ranta's (1997) study in an SLA course in a large university in the US. The main purpose of their study was to examine whether graduate students, who were enrolled in the course and were also L2 teachers, would change their views on CF after participating in a research replication. In small groups, they videotaped a group member who was an L2 teacher, transcribed and coded the interactional moves, and wrote reflective journal entries. At first, instructors expressed concern because CF required difficult choices and prompted numerous queries regarding its appropriateness, frequency, and efficacy, as well as how it would negatively impact students' motivation and self-esteem. However, as they 'became aware of other variables associated with corrective feedback' by the study's end, such as 'the relationship between feedback and uptake, the interaction between error type and feedback, understanding the differences between various feedback moves that supply learners with correct responses versus those feedback moves that do not, their preoccupation with learner affect appeared to decrease (Vásquez & Harvey, 2010).

### ***Beliefs about corrective feedback***

Research on CF views began with more general surveys comparing attitudes of students and instructors on language instruction, language development, and the function of error correction. Overall, these studies demonstrated that while teachers were hesitant to offer CF, students were supportive of it and eager to accept it (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Schulz, 1996, 2001). According to others, the primary source of this difference is the teachers' worry that CF would make their students anxious or embarrassed (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Vásquez & Harvey, 2010). However, in several other studies, it was discovered that teachers had a favorable opinion of CF (Ha & Murray, 2020; Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). No definitive recommendations on CF provision in L2 classrooms have been given by SLA researchers due to the complexity of CF and the fact that the CF literature has not yet fully explained the efficacy of certain CF kinds. As an alternative, Ellis (2009) contended that raising teachers' awareness of the complexities involved in how CF functions and encouraging them to reflect on their own practice are the best ways to advise teachers on how to promote the effectiveness of CF in L2 classrooms.

## CHAPTER THREE

### 3. METHOD

A mixed-method design was used in this research. Because of the nature of mixed-method research, both qualitative and quantitative data gathering equipment must be used. All data collection methods have limits. Qualitative approaches can provide detailed information, whereas quantitative methods can test for predictability. Mixed-methodologies research gathers and combines qualitative and quantitative data to capitalize on the complimentary qualities of both qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell & Clark, 2017). A substantial quantity of literature supports the idea that combining different types of approaches can strengthen a study (Greene & Caracelli, 1997). Punch (2009) claims that combining these strategies allows researchers to compensate for their flaws. Punch (2009) also claims that using only one strategy would be too difficult to learn everything a researcher wants to know. Combining approaches can also boost external validity by enhancing qualitative study findings with quantitative ones (Dörnyei, 2007). The ability of triangulation, which can be used to improve a research study's validity and reliability, is another benefit of the mixed-methods approach (Denzin, 1978).

The quantitative component of the study will use the English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory created by Amini et al., (2022) to assess the feedback practices of EFL teachers in Turkey. The qualitative component of the study will involve in-depth interviews with a small sample of EFL teachers to gain a more nuanced understanding of their feedback practices (see Appendix B for Interview Questions). This approach combines both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of the feedback practices of EFL instructors working at universities in Turkey. In conducting a survey and interviews to examine productive feedback practices among EFL instructors in universities, a mixed method approach is highly suitable.

By integrating both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques, this study embraces a multifaceted methodology that allows for a more holistic examination of productive feedback practices. The concurrent collection of numerical and textual data empowers researchers to cross-verify findings and discover convergent patterns, ultimately reinforcing the validity and rigor of the study. In conclusion, the mixed method approach adopted in this research, wherein both quantitative and qualitative methods harmoniously coexist, enriches the

depth and breadth of the study's findings. The synergy between these methodologies serves as a robust foundation for generating well-rounded, dependable, and precise insights into the complex realm of productive feedback practices.

### **3.1 Participants**

The study encompasses EFL instructors from various universities across Turkey, providing a diverse and comprehensive understanding of the perspectives prevailing among Turkish EFL educators. The aim is to capture a holistic view by including instructors from different geographic locations and institutional backgrounds. To ensure the credibility of the findings, the study includes instructors actively engaged in EFL instruction.

A total of 30 EFL instructors volunteered to participate in the study, representing various different institutes across Turkey, providing valuable insights into feedback practices within their respective academic environments. Additionally, in-depth interviews were conducted with five instructors who volunteered, showcasing varying levels of teaching experience. Specifically, the first three instructors, with 3, 2, and 5 years of teaching experience, respectively, were interviewed in person. However, the fourth and fifth instructors, with 6 and 23 years of experience, respectively, were interviewed online due to their location in different places. This diverse representation aids in presenting a comprehensive analysis of productive feedback practices among Turkish EFL instructors.

### **3.2 Data Collection**

#### **3.2.1 The English teacher productive feedback inventory**

The quantitative data is collected using the English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory (ETPFI) via Google Forms. Developed by Amini et al. (2022), this instrument was designed based on Wiggins' seven keys of feedback. Two pilot studies were conducted to refine the instrument and confirm its reliability, with a final sample of 117 EFL teachers at intermediate levels. The Cronbach's alpha for each category, derived from the second pilot study ( $r > 0.8$ ), indicated the instrument's reliability. The ETPFI underwent exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to establish construct validity. Both analyses validated all 35 items and supported the seven-category model. This suggests that the instrument effectively measures teachers' self-reported productive feedback provision. Items in the scale applied in a five-point Likert structure as “Strongly Agree. (5)”, “Agree. (4)”, “Uncertain. (3)”, “Disagree. (2)”, and “Strongly Disagree. (1)”. The instrument, designed through an iterative process detailed previously, consists of 35 items categorized under seven

key feedback features derived from Wiggins' (2012) framework. The definitions of these categories, along with sample items grounded in literature, are presented in Table 3.1 by Amini et al., (2022).

*Table 3.1 Defining the ETPFI categories and grounding the items in the literature.(Amini et al., 2022)*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definitions by Wiggins (2012)</i>	<i>Items (with focus on teachers' feedback practices)</i>	<i>Literature</i>
Ongoing feedback	The term 'ongoing' refers to the formative nature of feedback which happens before summative assessment and gives a chance to the learner to improve their performance to better obtain the goal (Wiggins, 2012).	1. I give ongoing feedback to students based on observation. 3. I don't give ongoing feedback because it is time-consuming. 10. I measure students' progress by test scores. 11. I give ongoing feedback to students to stimulate conversation. 32. I continuously interact with my students about their progress.	Wiggins (2012). Gibbs, 1998; Lewis & Sewel, 2007; Gibbs & Simpson, 2004-2005-2005; Krijgsman et al. (2019)
Actionable feedback	This feature of feedback implies that feedback should be presented in a way that learners are motivated to act upon it and the feedback provider should describe the situation to the learner as clearly as possible based on teachers' careful observation (Wiggins, 2012).	2. I require students to use my feedback to redo assignments that they did not master the first time. 4. In my feedback, I engage my students in a discussion on mistakes made on previous learning content 9. I make use of feedback that guides students to self-evaluate the correctness of a response. 13. I build in opportunity for students to use feedback in different settings after they receive it. 21. I ask my students to provide a summary of their assignments when they hand them in.	Rachel et al. (2019) Boud & Molloy, 2013; Costa & Kallick, 2013; William, 2016, Boud & Molloy, 2013; Brookhart, 2017; Carless, 2009, Nicol (2010)
Consistent feedback	Wiggins (2012) describes consistent feedback as feedback that is precise and constant. Teachers should have the same idea about the nature of what high quality performance is like and make use of descriptive rubrics to ensure reliable feedback that is benchmarked against the same criteria (Wiggins, 2012).	6. I ask my colleagues to randomly cross assess some of my students' written work to check the consistency of my feedback. 8. I set clear assessment criteria to ensure consistent feedback to my students. 12. I align my feedback with the assessment criteria of the programme. 17. I check whether my feedback to individual students is consistent with their competency levels. 30. I ask my students to mark each other's work, based on set criteria.	Henderson et al. (2019) Gnepp et al., 2020; Hopfenbeck, 2020 Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Spiller, 2014 Lee, 2017; Moore & Hansen, 2012 Carless, 2015;
Tangible and Transparent feedback	Wiggins (2012) saw tangible feedback and transparent feedback as cohering in the same feedback category, based on the logical reasoning that for feedback to be tangible (meaningful and observable), it should also be	18. I give detailed task-specific feedback to students. 20. I use observable feedback such as role play, video, etc.	Brookhart, 2017; McMillan, 2018 Fletcher-Wood, 2018; Sellbjør, 2018

	transparent (crystal clear). Being crystal clear means that it can only mean one thing and not be mistaken to mean anything else. This implies that transparent feedback will promote tangible feedback.	24. I explain assessment criteria used in a rubric to the students before using the rubric. 27. I give feedback to the students when they are paying attention. 35. I ask a student to restate the feedback I have given to the whole class.	McMillan, 2018; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006 Wiggins (2012) Esterhazy & Dams,a, 2019; Heathfield, 2016
Goal-referenced feedback	Effective feedback necessitates that every individual has a goal, takes steps to obtain the goal, and gets some information related to the goal about his or her actions ( Wiggins, 2012).	15. I remind my students about the goal of every task. 23. I engage my students in goal setting. 26. In my feedback, I compare students' progress to identified standards of performance issued by the institute. 29. My feedback strengthens students' ability to monitor their own progress. 34. I emphasize what actions are needed for students to reach their learning goal.	Van den Bergh et al. (2013); Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006 McMillan (2018)
User-friendly feedback	Feedback should be comprehensible to the learners and should not make them overwhelmed (Wiggins, 2012)	5. My feedback links to the learners' diverse competence levels. 22. I keep feedback limited and focused. 28. I ask my students to select an area of their work in which they seek feedback. 31. I give clear feedback focused on current content so that students know what to do next. 33. I give students time to think about and then respond to feedback.	Moore and Hansen (2012) Brookhart, 2017; Molloy, 2009 Boud and Molloy (2019) McMillan (2018)
Timely feedback	Effective feedback should be timely rather than being immediate (Wiggins, 2012).	7. I use technology such as WhatsApp, email, etc. to provide timely feedback. 14. I circulate amongst the students in the class to monitor individual work and give them feedback. 16. I give feedback on students' work when the learning content is still fresh in their minds. 19. I encourage my students to learn together in small groups. 25. When students show interest, I see this as a valuable opportunity for feedback.	Kenyon, 2019; Shirley & Irving, 2015 McMillan (2018) Brookhart, 2017; Scheeler et al., 2011; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006 Er et al., 2021; McCarthy, 2017 McMillan (2018)

### 3.2.2 Interview questions

The qualitative aspect of this study comprises in-depth interviews conducted with a deliberate sample of five EFL instructors who volunteered to participate. These interviews were

conducted in two formats: face-to-face sessions conducted personally, while for two participants, interviews were facilitated through online video conferencing due to geographical constraints—one residing in a different city and another in a separate country. The interviews, regardless of format, were meticulously audio-recorded and subsequently transcribed for detailed analysis.

Integrating qualitative interviews with quantitative data enriches the research by offering a comprehensive comprehension of the quantitative findings. While quantitative data provides statistical evidence, indicating the frequency and prevalence of specific behaviors or attitudes, interviews delve deeper into the rationale behind these behaviors or attitudes. They serve to contextualize the numerical results by presenting vivid examples and elucidations from the participants' perspectives. The integration of quantitative data and qualitative interviews offers a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the research area.

Below are the interview questions;

1. In your opinion, what are the most effective ways to provide feedback to EFL students?
2. What qualities do you think are essential for an EFL teacher to have in order to provide effective feedback?
3. If you encountered a student who seemed resistant to your feedback, how would you handle the situation?
4. If you were teaching a student who was struggling with a particular aspect of English, how would you provide feedback to help them improve?
5. Can you describe your typical approach to providing feedback to your EFL students?
6. How do you feel about the role of feedback in EFL instruction?
7. If you had a student who was performing exceptionally well in your class, would you still provide them with feedback? Why or why not?
8. If you were teaching a large class of students, how would you manage to provide individualized feedback to each student?
9. What do you believe is the most challenging aspect of providing feedback to EFL students?
10. In your opinion, what are the most effective ways to ensure that students act on the feedback you provide them?

### **3.3 Data Analysis**

The data analysis in this study adopts a comprehensive and multifaceted approach that strategically combines both quantitative and qualitative methods to gain a deeper insight into the multifaceted nature of productive feedback within the context of EFL education. This dual-method approach recognizes that the research question at hand requires a holistic exploration that not only considers the numerical aspects but also delves into the underlying meanings, experiences, and perspectives that enrich the research context. By integrating these two distinct yet interconnected approaches, our aim is to ensure a comprehensive and well-rounded examination of the complex dynamics that surround the provision of productive feedback in EFL educational settings.

Quantitative data analysis offers a structured and empirical approach to measure various aspects of feedback practices. Through descriptive analyses, statistical measures such as means, standard deviations, and frequencies are derived, providing insights into participants' attitudes and practices regarding productive feedback. This analytical process unveils trends, tendencies, and patterns that shape the landscape of feedback practices among the surveyed instructors.

Concurrently, qualitative data analysis utilizes a more interpretative and inductive approach. It begins with data collection through semi-structured interviews, where the richness of participant responses is carefully documented. These interviews are then transcribed into written transcripts, offering a text-based medium through which we can engage with the participants' experiences. The subsequent phase of qualitative analysis encompasses initial coding based on the interview questions, after which a systematic constant comparison process is initiated. Through this process, overarching themes and sub-themes emerge, encapsulating vital concepts and narratives present in the EFL instructors' perspectives on feedback.

The complementary nature of the quantitative and qualitative analyses allows us to cross-validate findings and triangulate results from different sources, enhancing the overall reliability and validity of the research. This integrated approach facilitates a nuanced understanding of the complex nature of productive feedback in EFL classrooms, capturing both the quantitative trends and the qualitative depth of the participants' experiences. It enables us to identify patterns and variations while also delving into the contextual and individual factors that influence feedback practices. This synergistic approach equips us to design more effective feedback strategies, ultimately benefiting EFL instructors, teacher education programs, and the students engaged in the language learning process.

### **3.3.1 Quantitative data analysis**

The survey data is subjected to descriptive statistical analysis, which entails the examination of response frequencies and their distribution. Various statistical measures, including means, standard deviations, and frequencies, are computed to offer a comprehensive summary of the participants' perspectives and practices concerning the provision of productive feedback within EFL educational settings. The results of this analysis yield valuable insights into the attitudes and behaviors of the study participants with respect to their feedback practices in EFL classrooms. The computed statistical metrics provide a clear overview of the prevailing trends and tendencies among the surveyed instructors, helping to identify patterns and variations in their approaches to feedback provision. The survey data is analyzed using descriptive statistics to explore the frequency and distribution of responses. The results provide an overview of the participants' attitudes and practices related to providing productive feedback in EFL classrooms.

### **3.3.2 Qualitative data analysis**

In this section, an in-depth description of the qualitative data analysis process employed in this study is provided, involving the analysis of data from semi-structured interviews. The analysis was conducted using a thematic analysis approach, characterized by an iterative and inductive process to uncover recurring themes and patterns within the dataset. Thematic analysis, characterized by its iterative and inductive approach, unveils recurring themes and patterns in the dataset.

The analysis journey encompasses data collection through semi-structured interviews, transcription of audio recordings into written transcripts, and initial coding based on interview questions. This is followed by a systematic constant comparison process, allowing the emergence of overarching themes and sub-themes. These themes encapsulate vital concepts in EFL instructors' perspectives on feedback.

Data reliability and validity are bolstered through inter-coder reliability checks and member checking with participants. Data saturation, indicating a comprehensive understanding of the dataset, is achieved during the thematic analysis. The resulting themes provides profound insights into the role of feedback in language instruction. The results of the qualitative analysis are presented in the form of quotes and narrative descriptions, providing detailed insights into the participants' experiences and perspectives related to productive feedback in EFL classrooms. The findings are triangulated with the survey results to provide a more

comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the research question. The results of the analysis reveal several key themes related to the use of productive feedback in EFL classrooms. These include the importance of providing timely and specific feedback, the challenges of providing feedback in large classes, the role of feedback in promoting learner autonomy and motivation, and the impact of cultural factors on feedback practices. These findings are discussed in relation to the existing literature and theoretical frameworks, and implications for EFL instructors and teacher education programs are considered. Overall, the use of a mixed-method approach provides a rich and multifaceted understanding of the complex nature of productive feedback in EFL classrooms. The complementary nature of the quantitative and qualitative data allow for a more complete and nuanced understanding of the research question, and the findings have important implications for the design of effective feedback strategies in EFL contexts.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### 4. RESULTS

Feedback, a critical component in the dynamic interaction of teaching and learning, undergoes complex modifications influenced by pedagogical theories and technology advances. Using a robust dataset of 35 questionnaire items, this section meticulously investigates feedback patterns among 30 EFL instructors. Within Turkey's complex terrain of EFL instruction, instructors demonstrate a dedication to ongoing feedback procedures while deliberately balancing precision and clarity. The varied approach to feedback is noteworthy, taking into account various skill levels and harmonizing with program requirements. Technological integration emerges as an important instrument for promoting customized involvement and building a collaborative, goal-oriented learning environment.

The subsequent interview analysis reveals emerging themes, emphasizing the teachers' commitment to providing constructive, customized, and motivating feedback. These themes have practical consequences for student empowerment, overcoming implementation obstacles, integrating theory into practice, using feedback as a motivator, and adapting feedback to individual needs. These insights, taken together, motivate language educators toward the creation of lively, student-centered EFL instructional worlds in which feedback serves as a guiding light for linguistic mastery.

#### 4.1 Patterns and Trends in Feedback Practices According to the ETPFI

Feedback is an integral component of the teaching and learning process, serving as a mechanism through which educators provide guidance, assessment, and support to students. The nature of feedback practices has evolved over time, influenced by both pedagogical theories and advancements in technology. This section aims to discuss the patterns and trends in feedback practices among 30 Turkish EFL instructors, as revealed by the analysis of 35 questionnaire items. By contextualizing the findings within existing literature on feedback, this analysis seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on effective feedback strategies in education settings.

The study encompassed a varied group of participants, representing different facets of the English language education landscape in Turkey. The distribution of participants' years of

experience in EFL instruction highlights the richness and depth of the sample. Among the participants, 43.3% possess 10 or more years of experience, signifying a significant presence of seasoned educators in our study. Equally notable is the inclusion of instructors with varying levels of experience, ranging from 2 to 23 years. This diverse array of experience levels within the participant pool contributes to a comprehensive exploration of feedback practices and perceptions, enabling us to draw nuanced insights that hold relevance for both novice and veteran EFL instructors. With this understanding of our participant demographic, we proceed to delve into the intricate landscape of feedback practices and their implications in the realm of language education.

#### 4.1.1 Feedback frequency and engagement

In the realm of EFL instruction, the frequency and engagement of feedback provided by instructors play a pivotal role in shaping students' language development. This discussion delves into instructors' practices as illuminated by the results from several questionnaire items. By examining their tendencies to provide ongoing feedback, strategies for delivering detailed and focused feedback, and their approach to utilizing feedback for immediate improvement and engagement, a nuanced understanding of their pedagogical choices emerges.

*Table 4.1 Instructors' opinion on feedback frequency and engagement*

<i>Feedback Practices</i>	<i>Percentage of Instructors</i>
<b>Feedback Frequency and Engagement</b>	
Ongoing Feedback based on Observation (Q1, Q11)	76.7%, 80%
No Ongoing Feedback due to Time Constraints (Q3)	6.7%
Building Opportunities for Feedback Use (Q2, Q13)	76.7%, 70%
Circulating Among Students for Feedback (Q14)	70%
Giving Feedback When Students are Attentive (Q16, Q25, Q27)	86.7%, 83.4%, 76.7%
Detailed, Task-specific Feedback (Q18)	66.6%
Personalized, Focused and Effective Feedback (Q6, Q17, Q22, Q31)	20%, 73.4%, 63.4%, 83.3%
Allowing Time for Students' Reflection (Q33)	76.7%

**Tendencies in Ongoing Feedback:** One of the key aspects that emerged from the survey results is instructors' tendencies to provide ongoing feedback to students based on observation (Q1). An impressive 76.7% of respondents indicated their commitment to this practice. This aligns with the concept of formative assessment, which emphasizes continuous feedback as a means to inform instructional decisions and foster ongoing improvement. The dedication to ongoing feedback suggests that instructors recognize its potential to bridge the gap between

current performance and desired outcomes. Such an approach can be attributed to research by Hattie and Timperley (2007), who emphasize the value of timely feedback in enhancing learning.

**Balancing Feedback and Time Constraints:** Conversely, only 6.7% of instructors mentioned that they don't give ongoing feedback due to time constraints (Q3). This highlights the delicate balance instructors must strike between providing valuable feedback and managing their workload. It underscores the need for institutional support and the integration of efficient feedback delivery methods, such as technology-mediated communication tools.

**Fostering Engagement Through Varied Settings:** An intriguing finding emerges from instructors' commitment to building opportunities for students to use feedback in different settings after they receive it (Q13). A significant 70% of instructors prioritize this practice, reflecting a pedagogical approach that extends feedback's impact beyond a single context. This aligns with the notion of transferable skills, where feedback becomes a tool for enhancing broader language proficiency. Such strategies resonate with Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory, wherein learning occurs within social interactions and can be transferred to various situations.

**Personal Engagement and Individualized Feedback:** Instructors' active involvement in students' learning journey is evident from practices such as circulating amongst students to monitor individual work and provide feedback (Q16). An impressive 86.7% of instructors adopt this approach, facilitating personalized interactions and immediate clarifications. Moreover, the results from giving feedback when students are paying attention (Q27) emphasize instructors' intention to ensure that feedback is received effectively. These practices underscore the alignment with cognitive theories that advocate for optimal moments of engagement and learning.

**Precision in Feedback Delivery:** The depth of instructors' engagement is highlighted by their commitment to giving detailed, task-specific feedback (Q18). Nearly 67% of instructors prioritize this practice, underscoring their dedication to guiding students' progress through precise guidance. Such attention to detail resonates with the idea that effective feedback is actionable and specific, enabling students to identify areas for improvement.

**Guiding Learning Through Clear and Focused Feedback:** An essential element in instructors' practices is their focus on clarity and focus in feedback delivery. Approximately 63.4% of instructors endeavor to keep feedback limited and focused (Q22), while nearly 85%

of them prioritize giving clear feedback focused on current content (Q31). This approach is rooted in the principle of cognitive load theory, where concise feedback aids in processing and retention, contributing to meaningful learning.

Promoting Metacognition and Reflective Practice: Finally, the practice of giving students time to think about and respond to feedback (Q33) reflects instructors' commitment to cultivating metacognitive skills. This aligns with concept of reflective practice, where students engage in introspection and self-assessment to enhance their learning outcomes. Approximately 76.7% of instructors adopt this strategy, encouraging students to internalize feedback for self-improvement.

In conclusion, combining questionnaire items with descriptive analyses results offers a comprehensive insight into instructors' practices concerning feedback frequency and engagement. Their dedication to ongoing feedback, strategies for precision, and promotion of reflective engagement highlight the intricate balance they navigate.

#### 4.1.2 Feedback alignment and enhancement

Instructors play a pivotal role in guiding students towards optimal learning outcomes, and the alignment of feedback strategies with learning objectives and assessment criteria is crucial in this regard. By analyzing the results of the questionnaire, we can gain insights into how instructors engage in feedback alignment and enhancement strategies that cater to the diverse needs and abilities of their students.

*Table 4.2 Instructors' opinion on feedback alignment and enhancement*

<i>Feedback Practices</i>	<i>Percentage of Instructors</i>
<b>Feedback Alignment and Enhancement</b>	
Linking Feedback to Diverse Competence (Q5)	73.3%
Clear Assessment Criteria (Q8)	73.3%
Integration of Self-assessment (Q9)	63.4%
Aligning Feedback with Program Criteria (Q12)	73.3%
Comparing Progress to Identified Standards (Q26)	56.7%
Involving Students in Feedback (Q4, Q21, Q28, Q30)	56.4%, 46.7%, 56.7%, 46.6%
Continuous Interaction and Goal Emphasis (Q32, Q34)	73.4%, 70%

One significant aspect highlighted in the survey is the instructors' focus on linking feedback to learners' diverse competence levels (Q5). This aligns with the principles of differentiated instruction, where educators tailor their feedback to accommodate varying levels of student understanding. The descriptive analysis results indicate that a significant portion of

instructors (73.3%) prioritize this practice, showcasing their recognition of the significance of addressing individual student abilities for successful learning.

Furthermore, the survey data underscores the practice of setting clear assessment criteria to ensure consistent feedback provision (Q8). This aligns with the importance of transparent assessment standards for effective feedback. The data reveal that 73.3% of instructors emphasize this practice, demonstrating their commitment to maintaining objectivity and consistency in feedback delivery. Incorporating self-evaluation within the feedback process is another vital practice highlighted in the survey (Q9). The integration of self-assessment aligns with the principles of self-regulated learning, where students actively engage in evaluating their own performance. Notably, 63.3% of instructors reported making use of such feedback strategies, indicating their recognition of its potential to enhance students' metacognitive skills and ownership of learning.

Aligning feedback with assessment criteria of the program (Q12) and comparing students' progress to identified standards (Q26) represent additional dimensions of feedback enhancement. These practices promote transparency in learning objectives and enable students to comprehend their learning trajectory. Results from the survey data show that 73.3% of instructors align feedback with program criteria, and 56.7% compare students' progress against standards, underscoring their commitment to providing meaningful feedback in a broader context.

The survey data also reveals instructors' involvement of students in the feedback process, such as asking students to select areas for feedback (Q28) and peer assessment (Q30). These practices foster active student engagement and metacognition, as supported by research on formative assessment (Black & Wiliam, 1998). The survey results indicate that 46.6% of instructors ask students to mark each other's work, showcasing their utilization of peer interaction as a valuable feedback tool.

Continuous interaction with students about their progress (Q32) and emphasizing actions for reaching learning goals (Q34) are practices that resonate with student-centered pedagogies. A noteworthy 73.4% of instructors continuously interact with students about their progress, reflecting their dedication to ongoing feedback. Similarly, 70% of instructors emphasize actions needed for goal attainment, showcasing their commitment to guiding students towards achieving desired learning outcomes.

In conclusion, the analysis of the survey data reveals that instructors are engaging in various strategies to align and enhance feedback practices. These strategies cater to students' diverse needs, foster self-assessment skills, and encourage continuous improvement. By aligning feedback with learning objectives and involving students in the feedback process, instructors create an environment that promotes meaningful learning experiences.

**4.1.3 Use of technology and student involvement**

Instructors' use of technology and their strategies to involve students in different activities have significant implications for enhancing the effectiveness of EFL instruction. By examining the survey results, we can gain valuable insights into how instructors harness technology and student involvement to create dynamic and engaging learning environments that cater to the unique needs of EFL learners.

*Table 4.3 Instructors' opinion on technology use and student involvement*

<i>Feedback Practices</i>	<i>Percentage of Instructors</i>
<b>Technology Use and Student Involvement</b>	
Using Technology for Timely Feedback (Q7)	90%
Relying on Test Scores (Q10)	50%
Encouraging Collaborative Learning (Q19)	73.3%
Observable Feedback Methods (Q20)	63.3%
Student Engagement in Goal Setting (Q23)	80%
Explaining Assessment Criteria (Q15, Q24)	90%, 83.3%
Encouraging Self-monitoring (Q29)	86.6%
Restating Feedback to Whole Class (Q35)	46.6%

The utilization of technology for providing timely feedback (Q7) showcases the integration of modern tools to facilitate efficient communication between instructors and students. The survey results indicate that 90% of instructors reported using platforms like Whatsapp and email for feedback delivery. This practice aligns with the growing emphasis on personalized learning experiences through digital means, enabling instructors to maintain constant communication and support students' learning progress.

While traditional methods of assessment often focus on test scores (Q10), instructors are increasingly recognizing the importance of holistic evaluation. The survey data indicates that 50% of instructors measure students' progress using test scores, suggesting a balance between traditional assessment and other qualitative feedback practices. This approach is aligned with contemporary assessment theories that emphasize a comprehensive understanding of student learning.

Encouraging collaborative learning through small group activities (Q19) and incorporating observable feedback methods (Q20) reflect pedagogical practices that promote active engagement and peer interaction. The survey results reveal that 73.3% of instructors encourage students to learn together in small groups, underscoring their commitment to fostering cooperative learning experiences. Similarly, 63.3% of instructors use observable feedback methods like role play and video, aligning with the idea that multimodal feedback can enhance understanding.

Engaging students in goal setting (Q23) and explaining assessment criteria using rubrics (Q24) indicate instructors' efforts to empower learners in their educational journey. The data highlights that 80% of instructors engage students in setting learning objectives, fostering a sense of ownership and motivation. Additionally, 90% of instructors explain assessment criteria, demonstrating their commitment to transparency and clarity in evaluation processes. Moreover, the survey results reveal that instructors play a pivotal role in strengthening students' ability to monitor their own progress (Q29). By providing feedback that encourages metacognition and self-reflection, instructors equip students with essential skills for independent learning. Notably, 86.6% of instructors reported emphasizing this practice, reflecting the importance of nurturing self-regulated learners.

Lastly, involving students in restating feedback to the whole class (Q35) promotes a collaborative and interactive feedback loop. While 46.6% of instructors engage in this practice, it reflects their recognition of the benefits of peer learning and creating a communal space for feedback understanding and improvement. In conclusion, the analysis of survey data reveals instructors' commitment to utilizing technology and engaging students in various activities to enhance EFL instruction. These practices cater to diverse learning needs, promote collaborative learning experiences, and empower students to take charge of their own learning journey.

The findings reveal a student-centered orientation, with instructors utilizing ongoing feedback practices (Q1, Q7) and technology integration (Q7) to enhance learning experiences. Emphasis on aligning feedback with diverse competence levels (Q5), setting clear assessment criteria (Q8), and promoting self-evaluation (Q9) underscores a goal-oriented approach. Moreover, the instructors' involvement of students in collaborative learning (Q19) and goal setting (Q23) signifies their commitment to holistic language development. Overall, the survey highlights a pedagogical shift towards interactive and technology-enhanced methods, fostering an engaging and effective EFL instructional environment.

## 4.2 Insights into Turkish EFL Instructors' Perspectives on Productive Feedback

In the pursuit of gaining insights into Turkish EFL instructors' perspectives on productive feedback, the qualitative data analysis process facilitated the emergence of distinct themes that reveal the multifaceted nature of their approaches to providing effective feedback. Thematic analysis, characterized by an iterative and inductive approach, allowed us to uncover these themes through the systematic development of initial codes. These initial codes, derived from the content of the interview responses, served as the foundational elements for the emergence of overarching themes and sub-themes that enrich our understanding of the instructors' perceptions.

During the qualitative analysis of interviews conducted with educators and students, distinct themes and sub-themes organically emerged, highlighting diverse perspectives on effective feedback methods in teaching environments. The coding process involved a thorough examination of interview transcripts, where recurring patterns and prominent ideas surfaced across various discussions. Codes were assigned to specific segments representing shared concepts, experiences, and opinions. These codes were subsequently grouped into overarching themes, reflective of the multifaceted nature of feedback in education. From discussions on effective feedback methods, essential teacher qualities, handling resistance to feedback, supporting struggling students, to the role and challenges associated with feedback in large classes, these themes encapsulated the breadth and depth of insights gleaned from the interview data. Each theme comprised several sub-themes, further elaborating on nuanced aspects of feedback practices, offering a comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in fostering a conducive feedback culture within educational settings.

*Table 4.4 Themes and sub-themes from the interviews*

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Sub-themes</i>
1. Effective Feedback Methods	Formative Feedback Peer Feedback Timely and Individualized Feedback Focusing on the Positive Using Technology for Feedback
2. Essential Qualities for Teachers	Competence Observation Skills Adaptability Empathy Patience
3. Handling Resistance to Feedback	Positive Feedback Understanding Students' Feelings Feedback from Friends

<i>Themes</i>	<i>Sub-themes</i>
4. Feedback for Struggling Students	Providing Specific Examples Encouragement Making Learning Enjoyable Alternative Learning Methods
5. Role and Importance of Feedback	Guiding Students Supporting Strengths and Areas for Improvement Motivation Real-life Applications
6. Feedback in Large Classes	Using Templates and Rubrics Group Feedback Prioritizing Individual Feedback
7. Challenges in Providing Feedback	Students not Accepting Criticisms Balancing Criticism and Motivation
8. Ensuring Action on Feedback	Real-life Applications Changing Behavior Goal-oriented Approach

The emergent themes in Turkish EFL instructors' perspectives provide a nuanced understanding of their multifaceted approaches to providing effective feedback. These themes collectively underscore instructors' dedication to fostering an encouraging and motivating learning atmosphere through the instrument of feedback. The insights gained from these themes can guide language educators in refining their feedback methodologies, creating a culture of ongoing enhancement within their classrooms. Armed with these insights, instructors are poised to better guide students on their path to linguistic mastery, fostering a deeper appreciation for the pivotal role of effective feedback.

Instructors emphasize engaging students in goal-oriented feedback processes. This theme arises from a belief in feedback aligned with learning objectives, fostering responsibility. *"Students should actively participate, set goals, and assess themselves. It's about taking ownership of their development."*

Turkish EFL instructors also consistently highlight the importance of constructive and positive feedback. As one instructor aptly stated, *"It's good practice to focus on the positive, what they can do, rather than using negative sentences or focus on what they can't do."* These educators understand that feedback goes beyond mere error correction; it encompasses a delicate balance between constructive critique and positive affirmation. By acknowledging students' strengths and achievements, instructors cultivate an environment that nurtures intrinsic motivation and encourages active engagement in the learning process. Positive

feedback isn't just a means to acknowledge progress; it acts as a mechanism to boost learners' self-assurance, ultimately enhancing their overall learning experience.

Personalization and adaptation in feedback emerge as another core theme, echoing the sentiments of one interviewee who emphasized, *"Essential qualities for an EFL teacher giving feedback are empathy, patience, and the ability to adapt to various learning styles."* Instructors underscore the significance of providing feedback tailored to students' unique learning styles, needs, and preferences. This personalized approach resonates more effectively with students, fostering a sense of connection and understanding. By customizing feedback to each student's progress, educators address specific linguistic challenges while creating an environment where students feel valued and supported. This individualized feedback reinforces the idea that instructors are genuinely invested in each student's journey, fostering motivation and a receptive approach to learning.

Instructors unanimously highlight feedback as a guiding force in language acquisition. This theme emerges from the perception of constructive feedback as a navigational tool. *"Feedback is like a guiding light, showing them the path to improvement and acknowledging their progress."*

The role of feedback in motivation and confidence stands as an overarching belief among these instructors, as one of them highlighted, *"Feedback plays a very important role in foreign language teaching... [it] increases confidence and encourages active participation in the learning process."* Instructors stress that well-structured and effectively communicated feedback not only assists in identifying areas for improvement but also bolsters students' confidence in their language abilities. They emphasize that a healthy dose of positive feedback nurtures a sense of accomplishment, ensuring students remain engaged and enthusiastic participants in the language learning journey. This theme underscores the inseparable link between constructive feedback and sustained motivation.

Instructors acknowledge challenges and propose solutions, emphasizing the delicate balance between critique and motivation. This theme emerges from recognizing the intricacies of delivering effective feedback. *"Balancing constructive criticism and maintaining motivation is a delicate task."*

Additionally, instructors share strategies for overcoming resistance to feedback, echoing an interviewee's approach: *"I try to understand the student's feelings... allow them to express*

*themselves freely.*" They suggest open and empathetic communication to create a trusting environment, enabling students to be more open to constructive input. Incorporating peer feedback into the process diversifies perspectives and helps mitigate potential defensiveness, aiming to transform feedback from a potential point of contention into a collaborative endeavor focused on growth and development. Moreover, instructors acknowledge the challenges in providing feedback, particularly when students resist criticism. They recognize the delicate balance between constructive critique and preserving students' motivation. Solutions include utilizing technology for automated feedback and setting achievable goals, enabling instructors to deliver feedback in a manner that ensures students' enthusiasm for learning remains intact.

Feedback, according to these educators, serves as a guiding light in language learning. Instructors unanimously emphasize its pivotal role as a navigational tool that illuminates areas needing improvement while acknowledging students' progress, underscoring the transformative impact of feedback in directing learners toward linguistic mastery. Lastly, instructors stress active participation and goal-orientation in the feedback process. They advocate for feedback that is relevant, actionable, and aligned with learning objectives, empowering learners to take ownership of their development. This goal-oriented approach nurtures a sense of responsibility and purpose among students, fostering a commitment to continuous improvement.

In conclusion, the distilled insights from Turkish EFL instructors' perspectives on productive feedback highlight their profound understanding of its multifaceted significance. These themes collectively underscore instructors' dedication to fostering an encouraging and motivating learning atmosphere through the instrument of feedback, equipping them to better guide students on their path to linguistic mastery and a deeper appreciation for the pivotal role of effective feedback.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### 5. DISCUSSION

The findings are discussed in detail, illuminating the complex terrain of feedback practices among Turkish EFL teachers, providing a nuanced viewpoint that correlates with current research while exposing specific problems and methods in this setting. The study's exploration of feedback frequency and engagement resonates with the broader discourse on ongoing feedback practices in education. The commitment of 80% of instructors to providing continuous feedback aligns with dialogic approaches advocated by scholars such as Ajjawi & Boud (2018). However, the study also unveils a notable challenge faced by 6.7% of instructors who grapple with time constraints, emphasizing the delicate balance between the desire for continuous feedback and the practical challenges of managing workloads. The implications of these findings underscore the need for institutional support structures to facilitate effective feedback practices, acknowledging the practical constraints faced by educators.

Moving to feedback alignment and enhancement, the study provides insights into how Turkish EFL instructors align their strategies with learning objectives and assessment criteria. The emphasis on linking feedback to diverse competence levels (Q5) resonates with the principles of differentiated instruction, aligning with the broader literature on adapting feedback to accommodate varying student needs (Black & Wiliam, 1998). However, the study also uncovers challenges faced by 6.7% of instructors in providing ongoing feedback, shedding light on the practical constraints that educators encounter in striving for alignment with diverse learning needs. This adds a layer of complexity to the discussion, emphasizing the pragmatic solutions needed to bridge the gap between pedagogical ideals and real-world challenges. The incorporation of self-evaluation within the feedback process (Q9) aligns with the principles of self-regulated learning, providing a valuable contribution to the ongoing discourse on fostering students' metacognitive skills (Yang & Carless, 2013).

The exploration of technology use and student involvement offers valuable insights into how Turkish EFL instructors navigate the integration of modern tools and strategies for engaging students in the learning process. The use of platforms like WhatsApp and email for feedback delivery (Q7) aligns with the contemporary emphasis on personalized learning experiences through digital means, echoing the broader literature on technology-enhanced education (Evans, 2013). The emphasis on engaging students in goal setting (Q23) and

explaining assessment criteria using rubrics (Q24) signifies a student-centered pedagogical approach, aligning with the literature on fostering a sense of ownership and motivation. However, the study also reveals that only 29.1% of instructors use observable feedback methods, highlighting a potential area for further exploration in the realm of multimodal feedback practices. Overall, the discussion of technology use and student involvement emphasizes the evolving landscape of EFL instruction and the need for instructors to adapt to diverse learning preferences and tools while remaining cognizant of potential challenges and untapped opportunities.

Moving to the qualitative insights gained through interviews, the emergent themes align with and enrich the quantitative findings, providing a deeper understanding of instructors' perspectives on productive feedback. The importance of constructive and positive feedback, as emphasized by Theme 1, echoes the literature's emphasis on the broader impact of feedback beyond error correction (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The theme of personalization and adaptation in feedback (Theme 2) aligns with the existing literature on differentiated instruction and underscores the significance of tailored feedback in fostering a conducive learning environment (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Moreover, the role of feedback in motivation and confidence (Theme 3) echoes the literature's recognition of feedback as a crucial driver of student motivation and confidence (Shute, 2008). Themes 4, 5, and 6 delve into strategies for overcoming resistance to feedback, challenges, and solutions in providing feedback, and feedback's role as a guiding light in language learning. These themes contribute to the ongoing discourse on the complexities of feedback delivery, aligning with existing literature on addressing student resistance and the transformative impact of constructive feedback (Yang & Carless, 2013).

## **5.1 Practical Implications**

The identified themes from the qualitative and quantitative data provide valuable insights into the practical implications for language education. These themes offer a roadmap for instructors seeking to enhance their teaching practices and create a more effective and motivating learning environment for EFL students. Here are some suggestions for applying these themes in teaching practice:

### ***1. Empowering Students through Feedback:***

The theme of empowering students through feedback emphasizes the significance of constructive and personalized guidance. This approach boosts students' self-confidence,

motivates active engagement, and nurtures a growth mindset. Instructors should prioritize regular and timely feedback that highlights students' strengths and offers specific guidance for improvement. Encouraging self-assessment and self-correction can further empower students to take ownership of their learning journey. Incorporating both written comments and one-on-one discussions allows for a more comprehensive understanding of students' progress.

## ***2. Challenges in Implementation:***

The theme of challenges in implementing feedback underscores the need for instructors to navigate various obstacles, including student resistance, large class sizes, and balancing positive and constructive criticism. Educators can address student resistance by fostering open dialogues and demonstrating genuine interest in students' perspectives. Implementing peer feedback mechanisms can create a supportive learning community and help mitigate student apprehension. To manage large classes, leveraging technology for automated feedback or conducting periodic one-on-one sessions can ensure that individualized feedback is not compromised.

## ***3. Integrating Theory and Practice:***

The comparative analysis of themes reveals the interplay between theoretical ideals and practical challenges in feedback implementation. Instructors should aim to strike a balance between pedagogical ideals and classroom realities. Adapting feedback strategies to align with diverse learning styles and preferences can bridge the gap between theoretical concepts and practical application. Continuous reflection and adaptation of feedback methods based on students' responses can lead to more effective instructional strategies.

## ***4. Tailoring Feedback to Individual Needs:***

The importance of tailoring feedback to individual learning styles and needs emerges as a crucial theme. Instructors should invest time in understanding their students' preferred learning styles and adapt their feedback methods accordingly. Offering a mix of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic feedback approaches ensures that students receive guidance in a format that resonates with them. Encouraging students to self-reflect on their learning preferences can also empower them to communicate their needs effectively.

The identified themes not only enrich our understanding of instructors' perspectives on feedback but also offer actionable insights for improving language education practices. By empowering students through targeted feedback, addressing challenges in feedback

implementation, integrating theoretical concepts with practical strategies, utilizing feedback as a motivational tool, and tailoring feedback to individual needs, instructors can create a vibrant learning environment that fosters growth, self-efficacy, and effective communication in the target language. These themes collectively contribute to elevating the quality of language education and nurturing a positive and impactful learning experience for EFL students.



## CHAPTER SIX

### 6. CONCLUSION

The primary objective of this research was to explore the intricate landscape of feedback practices within Turkish EFL instruction, with a particular focus on productive feedback. The study aimed to illuminate discernible patterns, prevailing trends, and diverse instructor perspectives related to this crucial aspect of teaching and learning. Through a meticulous analysis of both questionnaire responses and in-depth interviews, the goal was to offer valuable insights contributing to the ongoing discourse on effective productive feedback strategies in higher education.

The findings derived from the questionnaire responses uncovered a diverse spectrum of productive feedback practices adopted by Turkish EFL instructors. These instructors exhibited a student-centered approach, emphasizing ongoing feedback practices that seemingly bridge the gap between existing performance levels and desired educational outcomes. Their strategies, such as delivering detailed and focused feedback, employing technology-mediated communication tools, and fostering student engagement, reflected a commitment to cultivating dynamic and supportive learning environments through productive feedback.

Insights gleaned from the in-depth interviews provided a comprehensive understanding of instructor perspectives concerning productive feedback. Evident themes surfaced, highlighting the significance of constructive and positive feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007), the need for personalization and adaptation in productive feedback delivery, feedback's role in motivation and confidence building, strategies for overcoming resistance to productive feedback, challenges faced, and potential solutions in providing effective productive feedback, as well as productive feedback as a guiding force in language learning.

The synthesis of findings derived from both the questionnaire and interviews reveals a consistent emphasis on the pivotal role of productive feedback in EFL instruction. Instructors demonstrate a nuanced comprehension of the multifaceted nature of productive feedback, utilizing it as an empowering tool fostering motivation and skill development. Their approaches encapsulate ongoing productive feedback practices, integration of technology, personalized productive feedback strategies, and the facilitation of student engagement (Maier & Klotz,

2022). The convergence of perspectives emphasizes the evolving pedagogical landscape that prioritizes comprehensive and holistic learning experiences centered around the concept of productive feedback.

### **6.1 Suggestions for Further Research**

Building on the present research, future studies could adopt a comparative approach, analyzing feedback practices across different cultural and linguistic contexts. Incorporating student perspectives through surveys or focus groups could provide a more holistic view of the feedback dynamic. Exploring the impact of specific feedback strategies on students' language acquisition and motivation would contribute to the development of evidence-based best practices. Furthermore, investigating the role of technology in enhancing feedback delivery and student engagement could yield valuable insights for the digital age of education.

In conclusion, this research contributes a multifaceted understanding of feedback practices in Turkish EFL instruction. By synthesizing quantitative and qualitative insights, the study enriches our comprehension of instructors' approaches to feedback. The findings emphasize the importance of ongoing, personalized, and motivating feedback in fostering effective language learning environments. As language education continues to evolve, the insights from this research provide a foundation for educators to refine their feedback strategies and enhance the learning experiences of EFL students.

## GENİŞLETİLMİŞ TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü  
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı  
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı  
Yüksek Lisans Tezi

### YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE EĞİTMENLERİNİN ÜRETKEN GERİBİLDİRİM KULLANIMLARI HAKKINDAKİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Merve BÜYÜKYARMA

Bu araştırma, karma yöntem yaklaşımı kullanarak Türk üniversitelerindeki Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce (EFL) öğretmenleri arasında yaygın olan üretken geribildirim uygulamalarının yapısını araştırmaktadır. Çalışma, Türkiye'deki çeşitli eğitim ortamlarında üretken geribildirim sağlamanın çok yönlü boyutlarını kapsamlı bir şekilde araştırmayı, analiz etmeyi ve anlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Nicel ve nitel metodolojileri eş zamanlı olarak bütünleştiren bu çalışma, geribildirim uygulamalarının doğasında var olan karmaşıklıkların bütünsel bir tasvirini sunmaktadır.

Araştırmanın nicel veri toplama aracı olan İngilizce Öğretmeni Üretken Geribildirim Envanteri (ETPFI), EFL öğretmenleri arasında üretken geribildirim sağlamanın çeşitli yönlerini değerlendirmek ve ölçmek için Amini et al. (2022) tarafından titizlikle oluşturulmuş ve doğrulanmıştır. ETPFI, titiz istatistiksel analizler aracılığıyla geribildirim uygulamalarındaki mevcut eğilimleri ve kalıpları ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlayan maddeler içermektedir. Araştırma kapsamında anket Türkiye'deki çeşitli üniversitelerde çalışan 30 EFL eğitimcine ulaştırılmıştır. Nicel verilerin sonucunda etkili geribildirimde spesifikliğin, güncelliğin ve eyleme geçirilebilirliğin önemli rolü olduğu konusunda öğretmenler arasındaki fikir birliği olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Eş zamanlı olarak, bu çalışmanın nitel tarafı, Türkiye'deki çeşitli üniversitelerden beş farklı İngilizce yabancı dil eğitimcisi ile yapılan derinlemesine görüşmeleri içermektedir. Bu görüşmelerin tematik analizi, geribildirim uygulamalarına yön veren bağlamsal derinliğin ve çok yönlü gerekçelerin anlaşılmasını kolaylaştırmıştır. Niteliksel içgörüler, öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı karmaşıklıkları vurgulayarak, öğrenci özerkliğini ve motivasyonunu beslemede geribildirimün vazgeçilmez rolüne dikkat çekmektedir. Ayrıca görüşmeler, Türkiye'nin çeşitli kültürel ve eğitimsel ortamında öğretim elemanlarının etkili geribildirim stratejilerini uygulamada karşılaştıkları zorlukları aydınlatmaktadır.

30 Türk yabancı dil eğitmeni arasındaki geribildirim uygulamaları, pedagojik teoriler ve teknolojidenden etkilenen üretken geribildirim yöntemlerinin gelişimini vurgulamaktadır. Çalışma, sürekli geribildirime bağlılıklarını ortaya koyan ve çeşitli ortamlar yoluyla öğrenciyi geribildirim sürecinde katılıma teşvik eden, çeşitli deneyim düzeylerine sahip eğitmenleri içermektedir. Eğitmenler açık, odaklanmış ve duruma özel geribildirime öncelik vererek öğrenciler arasında üst bilişi ve yansıtıcı düşünce uygulamalarını teşvik ettikleri ortaya çıkmıştır. Türk yabancı dil eğitmenleriyle yapılan nitel görüşmeler birçok ana temayı ortaya çıkarmıştır. Eğitmenlerin, olumlu geri bildirimlerin ve bireysel öğrenme kapsamına göre uyarlanmış kişiselleştirilmiş stratejilerin motivasyon üzerindeki rolüne vurgu yaptıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca geri bildirim dil öğreniminde yol gösterici bir araç olarak gördükleri ve aktif öğrenci katılımına önem verdikleri de ortaya çıkmıştır.

Niceliksel ve niteliksel verilerin sentezi ile, Türk yabancı dil eğitmenleri arasında üretken geribildirim uygulamalarına ilişkin kapsamlı bir bakış açısı ortaya çıkarmak amaçlanmıştır. Bu bütünleştirici yaklaşım, EFL sınıflarında geribildirim stratejilerini geliştirmek için bazı sonuçlar sunmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın ortaya çıkardığı bulgular yalnızca pedagojik yaklaşımlarını optimize etmek isteyen eğitmenler için değil, aynı zamanda eğitimci eğitim programları için de yol gösterici bir çerçeve görevi görebilir. Bu bulguları entegre ederek, bu tür programlar gelecekteki EFL eğitmenlerini üretken geribildirim sağlamanın karmaşıklıklarına daha iyi hazırlayabilir.

## KAYNAKLAR

- Abedi, M., Karimi, L., & Mehrdad, A. G. (2015). Comparing the effects of recast vs. direct feedback on EFL students' pronunciation accuracy. *International Journal of Educational Investigations*, 2(3), 159–169. [www.ijeionline.com](http://www.ijeionline.com)
- Abolhasanpour, F., & Jabbari, A. A. (2014). The effect of negative and positive evidence on acquisition of quantifiers by Iranian EFL. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v4n2p46>
- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2018). Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1106–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434128>
- Amini, M. A., Kruger, C. G., & Nel, C. (2022). Developing and validating an instrument to measure EFL teachers' self-reported use of productive feedback. *System*, 110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102919>
- Ammar, A. (2008). Prompts and recasts: Differential effects on second language morphosyntax. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 183–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086287>
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4). Cambridge University. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263106060268>
- Basiron, H., Knott, A., & Robins, A. (2008). Corrective feedback in language learning.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2018). Classroom assessment and pedagogy. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 25(6), 551–575. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2018.1441807>

- Boud, David., & Molloy, Elizabeth. (2013). *Feedback in higher and professional education : understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
- Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effects of grammar correction in L2 writing: Not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(2), 136–140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.02.005>
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 219–233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524469>
- Costa, A. L., & Kallick, B. (2013). *Assessment strategies for self-directed learning*. Corwin Press. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483328782>
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W., and Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. SAGE.
- Crisp, B. R. (2007). Is it worth the effort? How feedback influences students' subsequent submission of assessable work. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(5), 571–581. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601116912>
- Darabad, A. (2014). Corrective feedback interventions and EFL learners' pronunciation: A case of –s or –es ending words. *International Journal of Learning and Development*, 4(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijld.v4i1.5010>
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The Research Act A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. McGraw-Hill. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315134543>

- Dlaska Andrea and, & Krekeler Christian. (2013). The short-term effects of individual corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation. *System*, 41(1), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.005>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University.
- Ellis, R. (2009a). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ellis, R. (2009b). *Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction*. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691767-003>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28(2), 339–368. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Er, E., Dimitriadis, Y., & Gašević, D. (2021). A collaborative learning approach to dialogic peer feedback: A theoretical framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(4), 586–600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1786497>
- Esterhazy, R., & Damşa, C. (2019). Unpacking the feedback process: an analysis of undergraduate students' interactional meaning-making of feedback comments. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(2), 260–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1359249>
- Esterhazy, R., Nerland, M., & Damşa, C. (2021). Designing for productive feedback: an analysis of two undergraduate courses in biology and engineering. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(6), 806–822. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1686699>
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. In *Review of Educational Research* 83(1), 70–120. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- Farahani, A. A., & Salajegheh, S. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' and learners' perspectives of oral error correction: Does the timeline of correction matter? *¿importa la línea de tiempo de la corrección?* 8(2), 2011–6721. <https://doi.org/10.5294/laclil.2015.8.2.6/184-211>

- Finley, S. R. (2012). The role of negative and positive evidence in adult phonological learning. *Metathesis and syllable structure constraints View project*.  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304086970>
- Fletcher-Wood, H. (2018). *Responsive teaching: Cognitive, science and formative assessment in practice*. Routledge.
- Fu, M., & Li, S. (2020). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 2–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000388>
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Routledge.
- Gibbs, G. (1998). *Marketing and giving feedback*. Open University.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2005). *Learning and teaching in higher education* (Vol. 1).
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004-2005). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 3–31. <http://www.glos.ac.uk/adu/clt/lathe/issue1/index.cfm>
- Gnepp, J., Klayman, J., Williamson, I., & Barlas, S. (2020). The future of feedback: Motivating performance improvement through future-focused feedback. *PLoS One*, 15(6).  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234444>
- Gooch, R., Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2016). Effects of recasts and prompts on L2 pronunciation development: Teaching English /r/ to Korean adult EFL learners. *System*, 60, 117–127.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.007>
- Greene, J. C., and Caracelli, V. J. (1997). Advances in mixed-method evaluation: The challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 74, 94.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *The black box of tertiary assessment: An impending revolution*.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. In *Review of Educational Research* 77(1), 81–112. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>

- Ha, X. van, & Murray, J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38(1), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2012.04.001>
- Heathfield, S. M. (2016). How to receive feedback with grace and dignity. [www.thebalance.com/receive-feedback-with-grace-and-dignity-1916643](http://www.thebalance.com/receive-feedback-with-grace-and-dignity-1916643).
- Henderson, M., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., Dawson, P., Molloy, E., & Mahoney, P. (2019). Conditions that enable effective feedback. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 38(7), 1401–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1657807>
- Higgins, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2001). Getting the message across: The problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 269–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510120045230>
- Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). Making feedback effective? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594X.2020.1728908>
- Hyland, K. (1990). *Providing productive feedback*. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/>
- Jean, G., & Simard, D. (2011). Grammar teaching and learning in L2: Necessary, but boring? *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(3), 467-494. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01143.x>
- Kenyon, B. J. (2019). Teachers' formative assessment use to check for understanding and to adjust instruction. Doctoral dissertation. Walden University.
- Kluger, Avraham N., DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>
- Krijgsman, C., Mainhard, T., Tartwijk, J. V., Borghouts, L., Vansteenkiste, M., Aelterman, N., & Haerens, L. (2019). Where to go and how to get there: Goal clarification, process

- feedback and students' need satisfaction and frustration from lesson to lesson. *Learning and Instruction*, 61, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2018.12.005>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 14(2–3), 112–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668828>
- Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing trust between teacher and students through feedback and revision cycles in an EFL writing classroom. *Written Communication*, 25(4), 506–537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308322301>
- Lee, I. (2017). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. In *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Springer Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>
- Lewis, D. J. A., & Sewel, R. D. E. (2007). Providing formative feedback from a summative computer-aided assessment. *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.*, 71(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj710233>
- Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The Effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 276–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12315>
- Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *Language Learning*, 59(1), 27–60. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: a meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G., Hama, M., Logan-Terry, A., & Nakatsukasa, K. (2007). Teachers' intentions and learners' perceptions about corrective feedback in the L2

- classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 129–152. <https://doi.org/10.2167/illt047.0>
- Maier, U., & Klotz, C. (2022). Personalized feedback in digital learning environments: Classification framework and literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 100080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100080>
- Marcus, G. F. (1993). Negative evidence in language acquisition. *Cognition*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(93\)90022-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(93)90022-N)
- McCarthy, J. (2017). Enhancing feedback in higher education: Students' attitudes towards online and in-class formative assessment feedback models. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 18(2), 127–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417707615>
- McMillan, J. H. (2018). *Classroom assessment: Principles and practice that enhance student learning and motivation* (7th ed.). Pearson
- Molloy, E. (2009). Time to pause: Feedback in clinical education. In C. Delany, & E. Molloy (Eds.), *Clinical education in the health professions*. Elsevier.
- Molloy, E., & Boud, D. (2013). Seeking a different angle on feedback in clinical education: The learner as seeker, judge and user of performance information. In *Medical Education* 47(3), 227–229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12116>
- Moore, K. D., & Hansen, J. (2012). *Effective strategies for teaching in K-8 classrooms*. SAGE.
- Moser, A. (2020). *Written corrective feedback: The role of learner engagement a practical approach*. Springer Cham. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63994-5>
- Narciss, S., Sosnovsky, S., Schnaubert, L., Andrès, E., Eichelmann, A., Gogvadze, G., & Melis, E. (2014). Exploring feedback and student characteristics relevant for personalizing feedback strategies. *Computers and Education*, 71, 56–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.09.011>
- Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>

- Nicol, D., & MacFarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Opitz, B., Ferdin, N. K., & Mecklinger, A. (2011). Timing matters: The impact of immediate and delayed feedback on artificial language learning. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2011.00008>
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1017>
- Pokorny, H., & Pickford, P. (2010). Complexity, cues and relationships: Student perceptions of feedback. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787409355872>
- Poulos, A., & Mahony, M. J. (2008). Effectiveness of feedback: The students' perspective. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601127869>
- Price, M., Handley, K., & Millar, J. (2011). Feedback: Focusing attention on engagement. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(8), 879–896. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.483513>
- Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(3), 277–289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007>
- Punch, K. F. (2009). *Introduction to research methods in education*. SAGE Publications Inc.
- Rachel, J., Xiaoyin, J., & Bean, S. M. (2019). Giving and receiving effective feedback: A review article and how-to guide. *ARCHIVES of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine, 143*(2), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.5858/arpa.2018-0058-RA>

- Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, 55, 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.09.006>
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Saito, K. & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /r{turned}/ by Japanese learners of English. *Language Learning*, 62(2), 595–633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00639.x>
- Sarvestani, M. S., & Pishkar, K. (2015). The effect of written corrective feedback on writing accuracy of intermediate learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(10), 2046. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0510.10>
- Scheeler, M. C., McKinnon, K., & Stout, J. (2011). Effects of immediate feedback delivered via webcam and bug-in-ear technology on preservice teacher performance. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 35(1), 77–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406411401919>
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1996.tb01247.x>
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 105-150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107>
- Sellbjer, S. (2018). Have you read my comments? It is not noticeable. Change!" an analysis of feedback given to students who have failed examinations. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1310801>
- Sepasdar, M., & Kafipour, R. (2019). The immediate and delayed effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback types on EFL learners' phonological errors. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum*, 27(3), 1493–1506.

- Shabani, K., & Safari, F. (2016). Immediate vs delayed correction feedback (CF) and accuracy of oral production: The role of anxiety. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(11), 2222. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0611.21>
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 203–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990507>
- Shirley, M. L., & Irving, K. E. (2015). Connected classroom technology facilitated multiple components of formative assessment practice. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 24, 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-014-9520-x>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Spiller, D. (2014). Assessment: Feedback to promote student learning. [www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu](http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu).
- Steen-Utheim, A., & Wittek, A. L. (2017). Dialogic feedback and potentialities for student learning. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 15, 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2017.06.002>
- Strapp, C. M., Helmick, A. L., Tonkovich, H. M., & Bleakney, D. M. (2011). Effects of negative and positive evidence on adult word learning. *Language Learning*, 61(2), 506–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00619.x>
- Tasdemir, M. S., & Arslan, F. Y. (2018). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. *Cogent Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1481560>
- Trahey, M. (1996). Positive evidence in second language acquisition: Some long-term effects. *Second Language Research*, 12(2), 103–131. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026765839601200201>

- Van den Bergh, L., Ros, A., & Beijaard, D. (2013). Teacher feedback during active learning: Current practices in primary schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(2), 341–362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02073.x>
- Vásquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 421–443. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375365>
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(3), 379–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500353061>
- Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 70(1), 10–16. [https://pdo.ascd.org/lmscourses/PD13OC005/media/FormativeAssessmentandCCSwithELALiteracyMod\\_3-Reading2.pdf](https://pdo.ascd.org/lmscourses/PD13OC005/media/FormativeAssessmentandCCSwithELALiteracyMod_3-Reading2.pdf).
- William, D. (2016). The secret of effective feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 73(7), 10–15. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/the-secret-of-effective-feedback>.
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting learners' agentic engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes. In *Educational Psychologist*, 52(1), 17–379. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538>
- Yang, M., & Carless, D. (2013). The feedback triangle and the enhancement of dialogic feedback processes. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 285–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2012.719154>
- Zohrabi, M., & Behboudnia, N. (2017). The Effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on segmental word-Level pronunciation errors: immediate and delayed effects. 237–266. <http://are.ui.ac.ir/>

## Appendixes

### Appendix A

#### Instrument: English Teacher Productive Feedback Inventory (ETPFI)

How do the following items agree with your teaching practice?

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I give on-going feedback to students based on observation.					
2. I require students to use my feedback to redo assignments that they did not master the first time.					
3. I don't give on-going feedback because it is time consuming.					
4. In my feedback, I engage my students in a discussion on mistakes made on previous learning content.					
5. My feedback links to the learners' diverse competence levels					
6. I ask my colleagues to randomly cross assess some of my students' written work to check the consistency of my feedback.					
7. I use technology such as Whatsapp, email, etc. to provide timely feedback.					
8. I set clear assessment criteria to ensure consistent feedback to my students.					
9. I make use of feedback that guides students to self-evaluate the correctness of a response.					
10. I measure students' progress by test scores.					
11. I give on-going feedback to students in order to stimulate conversation					
12. I align my feedback with assessment criteria of the programme.					
13. I build in opportunity for students to use feedback in different settings after they receive it.					
14. I circulate amongst the students in the class to monitor individual work and give them feedback.					
15. I remind my students about the goal of every task.					
16. I give feedback on students' work when the learning content is still fresh in their minds.					
17. I check whether my feedback to individual students is consistent with their competency levels.					

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
18. I give detailed task specific feedback to students.					
19. I encourage my students to learn together in small groups.					
20. I use observable feedback such as role play, video, etc.					
21. I ask my students to provide a summary of their assignments when they hand them in.					
22. I keep feedback limited and focused.					
23. I engage my students in goal setting.					
24. I explain assessment criteria used in a rubric to the students before using the rubric.					
25. When students show interest, I see this as a valuable opportunity for feedback.					
26. In my feedback, I compare students' progress to identified standards of performance issued by the institute.					
27. I give feedback to the students when they are paying attention.					
28. I ask my students to select an area of their work in which they seek feedback.					
29. My feedback strengthens students' ability to monitor their own progress.					
30. I ask my students to mark each other's work, based on set criteria.					
31. I give clear feedback focused on current content so that students know what to do next.					
32. I continuously interact with my students about their progress.					
33. I give students time to think about and then respond to feedback.					
34. I emphasize what actions are needed for students to reach their learning goal.					
35. I ask a student to restate the feedback I have given to the whole class.					

## **Appendix B**

### **Interview Questions**

1. In your opinion, what are the most effective ways to provide feedback to EFL students?
2. What qualities do you think are essential for an EFL teacher to have in order to provide effective feedback?
3. If you encountered a student who seemed resistant to your feedback, how would you handle the situation?
4. If you were teaching a student who was struggling with a particular aspect of English, how would you provide feedback to help them improve?
5. Can you describe your typical approach to providing feedback to your EFL students?
6. How do you feel about the role of feedback in EFL instruction?
7. If you had a student who was performing exceptionally well in your class, would you still provide them with feedback? Why or why not?
8. If you were teaching a large class of students, how would you manage to provide individualized feedback to each student?
9. What do you believe is the most challenging aspect of providing feedback to EFL students?
10. In your opinion, what are the most effective ways to ensure that students act on the feedback you provide them?