

**WRITTEN ESSAY FEEDBACK GIVEN BY A TEACHER
AND AS EXPERIENCED BY STUDENTS**

Bachelor's thesis

Marja Eskelinen

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Languages

English

September 2016

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Marja Eskelinen	
Työn nimi – Title Written essay feedback given by a teacher and as experienced by students	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatin tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Syyskuu 2016	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 32 + 3 (liite)
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Kirjallinen tuottaminen on olennainen osa kielten kouluopetusta Suomessa. Perinteisesti kirjalliset tuotokset arvioidaan ja opettaja antaa niistä palautetta. Tämä kandidaatin tutkielma selvittää yhden lukiorryhmän osalta, millaista palautetta opettaja antoi heidän kirjoittamistaan esseistä ja kuinka oppilaat kokivat tämän palautteen.</p> <p>Tutkielmassa on käytetty sekä laadullisia että määrällisiä tutkimusotteita. Ensin oppilaat kirjoittivat lukiokurssillaan essee, jotka opettaja arvosteli ja antoi niistä kommentteja. Sitten nämä essee kommentteineen kerättiin ja palautteelle tehtiin sisällönanalyysi teorialähtöisesti Hattien ja Timperleyn mallin (2007) mukaan. Palaute oli pääosin varsin positiivista ja kannustavaa, ja sitä oli useamman kommentin verran jokaisessa esseessä. Analysoidun palautteen pohjalta koottiin kyselylomake, johon oppilaat vastasivat.</p> <p>Kyselylomakkeessa kyseltiin muiden muassa, kuinka oppilaat kokevat palautteen yleisesti, sekä koskien tehtävätasolla ja tehtävän prosessoinnin tasolla annettua palautetta. Myös kehusanojen arvottaminen ja vaihtoehtoiset palautemekanismit olivat osa kyselylomaketta. Kyselyvastausten perusteella oppilaat arvostavat saamaansa palautetta ja kokevat sen tukevan oppimista. Osa vastaajista oli sitä mieltä, että palautetta voisi olla myös enemmän. Erityisesti suullisen ja kirjallisen palautteen yhdistelmä oli kaikkien vastaajien mielestä paras tapa saada palautetta esseistä.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Language teaching, written feedback, students' experiences, English as a foreign language (EFL)	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2 BACKGROUND.....	4
2.1 Written feedback given by a teacher	4
2.2 Categorizations of feedback	6
2.2.1 Hyatt’s model	6
2.2.2 Hattie and Timperley’s model	7
2.3 Usefulness of feedback.....	8
2.4 Students’ experiences	10
3 THE PRESENT STUDY.....	12
3.1 Aims of the present study and research questions	12
3.2 Data and methods	14
3.2.1 The analysis of the written feedback in essays	14
3.2.2 The questionnaire for students.....	15
4 RESULTS.....	16
4.1 Feedback given by the teacher.....	17
4.2 Students’ experiences of the feedback in general.....	18
4.2.1 Students’ experiences of <i>Feedback about the task</i>	21
4.2.2 Students’ experiences of <i>Feedback about processing the task</i>	22
4.2.3 Students’ experiences of praise	23
4.3 Students’ feedback preferences	24
5 DISCUSSION.....	26
6 CONCLUSION	28
Bibliography	31
Appendix 1: Kandidaatin tutkielman kyselylomake.....	30

1 INTRODUCTION

Learning to write is an important component in learning a foreign language and traditionally writing has been an essential part of English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching in Finland. Writing skills are a part of the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education along with speaking, listening and reading skills (Opetushallitus, 2014). In the context of teaching to write, written compositions produced by pupils or students have usually been graded and commented by their teacher. Teachers give written feedback, in which they mark the mistakes and point out the good aspect of the written piece of work.

There exists a vast amount of research on written feedback given by a teacher from several perspectives. However, as Montgomery and Baker (2007: 84) have noted, the focus of the research has been largely on how teachers should provide written feedback instead of how they actually do it in practice. Therefore the present study aims to fill this gap in research. The study has two main objectives: first, it explores what kind of written feedback teachers actually give and secondly, how students experience the feedback they received.

The study was conducted in two phases. The first phase was a qualitative one. As a part of their English course students wrote essays which a teacher assessed, and then the written feedback given by the teacher on these written productions was analysed in detail using qualitative content analysis as the method of research. The second phase of the study took a more quantitative approach: based on the content analysis that was formed on the basis of the written feedback, a questionnaire was formulated. The questionnaire comprised of questions concerning students' experiences of the feedback they had received. When these two phases and aspects were combined, some insights on the feedback conventions and their influences could be found.

The present study will provide an overview of the project. First, it will provide a literature review of the topic of written feedback given by a teacher and then moves on to discuss the present study. Detailed aims of the study will be presented, as well as information about the method of gathering data and analysing it. Then research findings will be reported and discussed. Furthermore, some important points and suggestions for future research and implications will be brought up in the conclusion.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Written feedback given by a teacher

Ferris (2015: 531) claims that the topic of written corrective feedback has been in the centre of research in second language writing over the past 20 years. She also notes (2015: 532) that there have been a range of philosophical stances and approaches to the questions of if and how to correct learners' errors in foreign language writing. These have varied from intensive error correction to marking barely any errors or none at all, and to targeted corrective feedback and giving metalinguistic explanations along with the corrections. However, it should be kept in mind that written feedback can be more than just correcting grammar and spelling mistakes. For example, Brookhart (2008: 31) has suggested that written feedback is a genre of its own since after all, writing good feedback requires understanding that language has more functions than just describing the world we live in, it also constructs it. Therefore the present study is interested in the written feedback as a whole, not just error correction.

Ramaprasad (as cited in Burke and Pieterick 2010: 13) has defined feedback as "information about the gap between actual performance level and the reference or standard level, which is subsequently used to alter that gap". According to this definition, feedback that supports learning needs to be meaningful, understood and correctly acted upon. In addition, Brookhart (2008: 2) has been studying the characteristics of feedback. As pointed out by him, high quality feedback can be quite powerful since the effect of formative feedback lies in the double-barrelled approach that addresses both cognitive and motivational factors simultaneously. Cognitively well-structured feedback provides students with information they need in order to understand where they are in their learning and what to do next. The motivational aspect means that once students understand what to do and why, they tend to develop a feeling that they have control over their own learning. The value of feedback is also acknowledged in the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (Opetushallitus 2014: 46-61). According to it, feedback is a part of student assessment and it is an essential tool for teachers to assist their pupils to learn and develop.

Bitchener and Knoch (2015: 406) have reported that over the decades teachers have believed that learning to write and getting corrective feedback on written texts is an essential part of learning a foreign language and hence writing tasks have been quite common in language

classrooms. Hyland and Hyland (2001: 185-186) as well Hyland (2003: 177) also point out that providing students with written feedback is one of the most important functions of a teacher since it offers the kind of individual attention that is rarely possible under normal classroom conditions. They even claim that the interpersonal aspects and negotiating a relationship with learners are often overlooked functions of written feedback. This phenomenon takes place because individual attention is generally acknowledged as informational, only channelling reactions and advice to improve learning.

Hyland and Hyland (2001: 186) also mention that teachers are usually conscious of the potential feedback has for creating a supportive learning environment and therefore one has to be discreet when constructing corrective comments. They continue that after all, writing is quite a personal performance and students' motivation and self-confidence as writers can be negatively affected if they receive too much criticism. Praise, on the other hand, can be used to reinforce appropriate language use and foster students' self-esteem and confidence. Montgomery and Baker (2007: 83) support this argument of the nature of feedback by stating that teachers are often aware of students' experiences of written feedback and try to provide them with helpful advice but they might not fully understand how much feedback they actually give on local (i.e. spelling, grammar and punctuation) and global (i.e. ideas, content and organisation) levels.

Clearly research concerning written feedback given by teachers is a wide and varied field of study that has links to psychology, linguistics and pedagogy. However, according to Montgomery and Baker (2007: 84) the focus of the research has been on how teachers should provide written feedback instead of how they actually do it in practice. In other words, research has been quite theory-oriented instead of aiming to explore what the reality of feedback conventions is in schools. In addition, student experiences are also somewhat downplayed in research even though the aim is to support their learning with the help of written feedback. For example, Burke and Pieterick (2010: 72) point out that there exists a gap between teacher and student perceptions of the role of feedback in student learning. Also Hyland (1998: 256) notes that there has been relatively few studies investigating the responses by student writers to the written feedback given by a teacher.

2.2 Categorizations of feedback

2.2.1 Hyatt's model

Feedback can be classified in a number of ways depending on the research focus. For example, Hyatt's (2005) model of tutor comments classifies written feedback given by a teacher into separate categories (as cited in Burke and Pieterick 2010: 86). According to Hyatt's model, feedback comments can be divided into six areas: *phatic*, *developmental*, *structural*, *stylistic*, *content* and *method & administration*.

Comments that help a teacher to build rapport with the student are classified as *phatic*. These could include encouraging and supporting comments that create positive emotions with the recipient of the feedback, or comments that consolidate an already existing relationship with the participants, i.e. the teacher and the student.

Developmental comments, on the other hand, help the student to develop their piece of writing. They provide the student with alternatives and options to think about when considering future writing tasks. The student is supposed to become better at constructing a text and also using a foreign language in writing form.

Structural comments are linked to developmental comments. However, they focus on strictly considering the structure of the text: coherence of text units, sentences, paragraphs, or the assignment itself as a whole. In other words, comments on how to improve one's technical writing skills.

Stylistic comments concern grammar and referencing. The aim is to improve the student's accuracy in writing.

Comments that evaluate the accuracy and appropriateness of subject content are called *content* comments. The student is supposed to learn to see their text in a bigger picture and to critically view it as a whole.

Finally, comments regarding *method and administration* refer to the research method underpinning the work and also the requirements of the given task. This form of feedback is especially important when assessing academic texts in a higher education context.

2.2.2 Hattie and Timperley's model

Another useful tool to categorize written feedback given by a teacher is the model by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97). It distinguishes four major levels of feedback. This model is more abstract than the previous one but has clear principles on how to approach written feedback given by a teacher. Hattie and Timperley claim that the type of feedback and the way it is given can be differentially effective. Therefore, they provide a conceptual analysis of feedback which reviews the evidence related to its impact on learning and achievement.

The first level of their model is *Feedback about the task* which is about how well a task has been accomplished or performed, and whether the written piece of work is correct or incorrect. For example, information about errors, neatness or format, the depth or quality of the task and also a need for more information are typical examples of this kind of feedback. It can also include directions to combine more, different or correct information.

The second level is named *Feedback about processing the task*, and it is aimed at the processing of information, learning processes requiring understanding or completing the task. In other words, it focuses on the information about how the student approached the task, the quality of the performance and possible alternative strategies that could have been used.

The third one is *Feedback about self-regulation* which is mainly about comments on self-confidence and encouraging appropriate assistance-seeking behaviour. This feedback type refers to the way students monitor, direct and regulate actions towards the learning goal. Therefore, it includes interplay between commitment, confidence and control. Features like self-control, self-direction, self-discipline and autonomy are aspects of feedback about self-regulation and it can lead to seeking, accepting and accommodating feedback information. There are six major aspects in this kind of feedback: the capability to create internal feedback and to self-assess, the willingness to invest effort into seeking and dealing with feedback information, the degree of confidence or certainty in the correctness of the response, the attributions about success or failure, and the level of proficiency in seeking help.

The fourth and final level is *Feedback about the self as a person* and it is highly personal. It consists of the use of praise or criticism aimed at one as a person instead of focusing on the written composition. This kind of feedback typically contains little task-related information and is rarely converted into more engagement, commitment to the learning goals, enhanced self-efficacy or understanding about the task.

Hattie and Timperley claim that Feedback about the task and Feedback about processing the task are effective since students can see the connections between what they did and the results they got. Feedback about self-regulation is only effective if it enhances self-efficacy and finally, Feedback about the self as a person is actually considered non-developmental because it does not contain information that could be used for future learning and it can affect the students' perceptions of themselves as learners.

On the other hand, this study could be criticised because it downplays the emotional aspects feedback can have for students. All the feedback influences the learner one way or another and non-formative feedback that focuses on the learner as a person can affect the learning motivation, which is linked to the overall performance of learning tasks. For example, Burke and Pieterick (2010: 79) have identified the emotional aspect of receiving feedback. They claim that students tend to read feedback as a statement of praise or blame on them as individuals and the emotional reaction to feedback can be significant. Therefore, one could say that teachers could use praise and encouragement in consideration to raise students' attainment and performance.

Both the classification presented by Hyatt (as cited in Burke and Pieterick 2010: 86) and the four major levels of feedback by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97) are applicable when categorizing written feedback given by a teacher. However, their primary contexts of use are slightly different. Hyatt's model is perhaps more suitable for students in higher education whereas Hattie and Timperley's levels can be applied to any written feedback.

2.3 Usefulness of feedback

Clearly written feedback has an impact on learners and the type of feedback and the way it is given can be differentially effective. Glover and Brown (2006: 2) state that in order for the feedback to be effective, students have to act on it to improve their future work and learning. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) (as cited in Glover and Brown, 2006: 2) have suggested that this is most likely to happen if the feedback:

1. Is frequent, timely, sufficient and detailed enough
2. Can be linked to the purpose of the assessment task and criteria
3. Is understandable, given the students' level of sophistication
4. Focuses on learning rather than marks by relating explicitly to future work and tasks

However, Guénette (2007: 40) notes that when considering improving the accuracy of written production there is a debate whether giving corrective feedback is beneficial at all or not. She claims that there is no evidence that corrective feedback is a decisive factor in the attainment of language fluency and accuracy. Indeed, a number of studies cited in Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005: 192), e.g. Kepner (1991), Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998), Robb, Ross and Shortreed (1986), Semke (1984) and Sheppard (1998) have argued that feedback does not directly improve students' writing accuracy. Neither Taylor and Hoedt (1996) nor Gee (1972) found evidence for significant difference in the quality of writing of the students after receiving feedback (as cited in Hyland and Hyland 2001: 187). In addition, Hayes and Daiker (1984) and Wall and Hull (1989) (as cited in Hyland 1998: 255) indicate that the feedback teachers give is inconsistent, confusing, unclear, vague or overemphasise the negative aspects of the written piece of work.

Especially the value of error correction as an element of teacher given feedback is a controversial issue. It could be even argued that error correction as a feedback method can be of no use. Hyland (1998: 255) reports that a number of researchers, e.g. Mazano and Arthur (1977), Searle and Dillon (1980) and Sommers (1982) go even further and suggest that often written feedback is of poor quality, focuses on the wrong issues and could be ignored, misunderstood or misinterpreted by student writers. Truscott (1996: 360) has extreme views on the issue and he has claimed that grammar correction is not only ineffective but it is actually harmful and should not be done. Therefore, Hyland (2004: 181) suggests that teachers should not only respond to grammar issues but to whole texts and all aspects of writing: structure, organization, style, content and presentation.

2.4 Students' experiences

According to a study by Hyland (2000) (as cited in Glover and Brown (2006: 11) 90 % of students believed that feedback could help them identify their strengths and weaknesses, generate a sense of achievement and improve their marks on future assignments. Also Hyland (1998: 257) concluded that written feedback given by a teacher is highly valued among language learners and they try to use most of the usable feedback they have been given. However, in order to achieve this objective, the feedback needs to be of good quality.

On the other hand, Cottrell (2001: 117-118) has identified a range of student frustration with feedback. She has suggested that students are unlikely to use intrusive or demoralizing feedback. Also feedback that is too detailed or offers too many suggestions for improvement is of little use. She especially stresses how important it is that students should be able to understand the feedback, they should be motivated by it and act on it.

Among others, Burke and Pieterick (2010: 75-79) have investigated written feedback given by a teacher and how students feel about it. Based on students' comments on feedback, they have drawn some conclusions. First of all, students want the right amount of feedback. Too much feedback can cause confusion but on the other hand, students also report dissatisfaction with feedback that lacks detail. They prefer clear information on their performance in relation to the learning outcomes set for the task. Secondly, feedback needs to be accessible. In concrete terms this means that students need to be able to read written comments but in more abstract terms, it also refers to the comprehensibility of the feedback. Thirdly, consistency in feedback is important. This consistency applies both within and between assessments and means that students expect the alignment between marks and teacher comments. Fourthly, students want prompt feedback. In other words, they want to know the results of their assignments before proceeding in their learning and with other assignments. Fifthly, feedback should be constructive and provide direction. Feedback is not very helpful if it is too vague, focuses on negative features or fails to provide guidance. Students want feedback that aids their learning process. Generally they accept corrective feedback but only if it shows how to improve in future tasks. Sixthly, feedback should be non-judgemental. Usually the difference between assessment and judgement lies in the language used and therefore teachers should be aware of these marginal semantic differences. Finally, students would like to see more examples in feedback in order to improve their work.

Paulus (1999: 283) has concluded in her study that teachers could utilize peer feedback in their writing classrooms since students found this kind of feedback effective and useful. She also suggests that a multiple-draft process combined with meaningful peer and teacher feedback results in better written products. Hyland (2003: 179) supports Paulus's proposition and states that when doing draft writing, students prefer comments on ideas and organisation in earlier drafts and on grammar in later drafts.

To conclude, it should also be kept in mind that individual learners may have very different kind of perceptions of what constitutes useful feedback (Hyland 1998: 279-180). Hyland suggests that to help prevent miscommunication, teachers and students should have a detailed discussion about their expectations and aims with regard to feedback. To complement this, Bitchener et al. (2005: 202) and Hyland (2003: 192) claim that face-to-face conferencing with students has certain advantages since the interactive nature of the situation allows teachers to respond to the needs of their students, clarify meanings and resolve ambiguities.

According to Montgomery and Baker (2007: 84), the focus of the research has been on how teachers should provide written feedback instead of how they actually do it in practice. The present study aims to fill this gap. It is interested in what kind of feedback teachers actually give in a real life school context and how students feel about the feedback they are given. This sort of dual approach is of use since it focuses not only on the feedback but also students' experiences are taken into account. Therefore, better and more useful feedback conventions can be developed for future practices in teaching writing in English.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

3.1 Aims of the present study and research questions

Feedback and instruction are intertwined and in order to adopt this instructional purpose, feedback needs to provide information especially concerning the task or process of learning that fills a gap between what is already understood and what is wanted to be understood (Sadler 1989, as cited in Hattie and Timperley 2007: 82). In other words, feedback should convey information that is targeted to a student to help one improve in one's tasks. In the context of the present study, the point of interest is to approach the topic of written feedback both with qualitative (i.e. analysing the feedback) and quantitative-qualitative (i.e. surveying students' experiences of the feedback) methods.

The present study has two main research objectives, the first being the actual written feedback given by a teacher and the second students' experiences of it. The aim of the study is to investigate what kind of written feedback a teacher gave on students' essays and the students' experiences of that feedback. The research questions are as follows:

1. What kind of feedback did the teacher give?

The first research question is the only one that concerns the feedback written by the teacher. The starting point of the language analysis is the model by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97) but all the features that arise from the feedback will be taken into consideration. The analysis of the written feedback given by the teacher is essential for the study since without it no student experiences can be examined. The rest of the study focuses on students' experiences. The research questions concerning the perspectives of the students are divided into three sub-questions. The first one of these sub-questions is:

2. a) How did the students experience the feedback provided by their teacher?

This question includes both the quantitative and qualitative features of the feedback: is there enough of it, does it facilitate learning, how does it make students feel etc. Along with this question the objective of the present study changes from the data provided by the teacher to data provided by students. This research question is quite wide and offers opportunities to focus on anything important that the students might bring up. The second sub-question 2.b) is closely related to this one, with the difference that its point of view is narrower:

2. b) Is written feedback beneficial at all in the students' opinion?

It is meaningful to find out whether students feel they learn from written feedback given by a teacher or not. It might be the case that students do not value the feedback they are given and do not find it beneficial when considering their learning. On the other hand, they might appreciate the feedback to an extent and think that it facilitates their learning significantly. Of course, their experiences might be more neutral and their opinions are something between these two opposites. Also the type of feedback can play a role in their experiences. Therefore, the last sub-question is:

2. c) What type of feedback do students perceive beneficial when considering improving their writing skills in English?

This question deals with the features that arise from the actual feedback. The categorisation by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97) is used to clarify the feedback types that students prefer. Also other optional methods of giving feedback, such as oral feedback or peer-feedback, are taken into consideration.

In summary, the present study aims to explore written essay feedback provided by one English teacher to one class of students, and the students' experiences of that feedback. There will be two phases in the study: first, qualitatively analysing the feedback data and secondly, clarifying student experiences using both qualitative and quantitative analysis.

3.2 Data and methods

The data was collected in a classroom in an upper-secondary school in central Finland in late January and early February in 2015. The class consisted of ten third-year students in their preparation course for the Finnish matriculation examination. There were both female and male students in the class and they were all aged 18 or older.

The students wrote a handwritten essay in English at home as part of their course work and their teacher marked these essays and gave written feedback. This written feedback given by a teacher constitutes the first set of the data of the present study. The essay was a written composition between 150 and 250 words, similar to those in the Finnish matriculation examination. There were several headlines to choose from and the students had also a range of text types and writing styles to choose from and they wrote in letter, comment and Facebook post formats. The topics they had chosen included anger, climate change, expressing gratitude, Finnish history and how they were doing in their everyday life. The essay writing task was a rehearsal for the actual matriculation examination.

3.2.1 The analysis of the written feedback in essays

The study was executed in two phases. First, the essay feedback written by the teacher was analysed in great detail with the help of qualitative content analysis (QCA) and utilizing the model of feedback by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97). Hattie and Timperley's feedback levels can be applied to any written feedback, whereas Hyatt's (as cited in Burke and Pieterick 2010: 86) model is perhaps more suitable for students in higher education. Therefore, the model by Hattie and Timperley will be used in the present study. This first set of data consisted of 9 essays since one student did not hand in his/her essay before the deadline. All the students were quite skilled at essay writing since every one of them got good marks ranging from 75 to 88 out of 99.

QCA was used as a tool to code this first set of data. Schreier (2012: 1) defines it as "a method for describing the meaning of qualitative material in a systematic way". The interpretation process is complex since meanings are not given, but constructed based on the data and the model by Hattie and Timperley. Therefore the analysis was also theory-driven. In the case of the present study it was the research question one "What kind of feedback did the

teacher give?” that specified the angle from which to examine the data. The reason for using QCA was justified as a method since the data was rich in nature and open to interpretation.

Schreier (2012: 5) points out that in practice QCA requires the researcher to ‘translate’ all the meanings occurring in the data that are of interest into the categories of a coding system. Then, the successive parts of the data are classified according to these categories. Hence, QCA is systematic, flexible and reduces data. QCA starts with consistently examining all the data and deciding for each part where in the coding system fits. However, one can always tailor the coding system to correspond with the pool of data. In other words, QCA is a flexible method since the means of analysis can be adjusted. This increases both the reliability and validity of the analysis. Finally, since only the relevant data that fits the coding system is taken into consideration, the overall amount of data will reduce in the analysis process.

3.2.2 The questionnaire for students

Based on the QCA of the written feedback a questionnaire of about three pages (Appendix 1) was formulated, and it included some examples from the actual feedback. The questionnaire had six sections: first, it started with general claims about feedback, secondly followed by the levels of *Feedback about the task* and thirdly, *Feedback about processing the task* defined by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97). Fourthly, there was also a section for praise words since the feedback included a lot of them. The fifth section was titled as “other” and it included some yes/no questions about, for example, oral and peer-feedback. In the end, as the sixth section, there was space for free comments about feedback. The levels of *Feedback about self-regulation* and *Feedback about the self as a person* as defined by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97) were not included in the questionnaire since these levels did not appear in the analysed feedback.

In the second phase of the study all ten students answered the questionnaire. This took place in the beginning of an English lesson of the same particular course and the researcher was there to supervise the answering process. The questionnaire was in English and some words in it were unfamiliar to the students but the researcher had the opportunity to make sure all students understood what they were asked to do. The students found the questionnaire quite straightforward and it took approximately 10-15 minutes for them to finish it.

As the last part of the research process these questionnaires were quantitatively analysed and some conclusions were drawn based on the findings.

4 RESULTS

Both the written essay feedback provided by the teacher and the questionnaire based on it offered some interesting insights about the reality of feedback conventions in the context of writing essays in English. The analysed feedback was uniformed and one could find clear patterns in it. On the other hand, the questionnaire revealed that the students' perceptions were divergent and they ranged in every category.

In this section research findings will be reported and discussed in detail by answering one research question at a time. First the focus will be on the feedback the teacher gave. Section 4.1 will answer the first research question "What kind of feedback did the teacher give?" and reflect on the feedback model by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97) and the principles of QCA.

Then the perspective changes to exploring the students' experiences according to the questionnaire answers. The rest of the sections will answer sub-questions 2.a), 2.b) and 2.c). Section 4.2 will present students' experiences at a general level answering the research question 2.a) "How did the students experience the feedback provided by their teacher?" and the research question 2.b) "Is written feedback beneficial at all in the students' opinion?". Section 4.2 has three subsections: 4.2.1 "Students' experiences of *Feedback about the task*", 4.2.2 "Students' experiences of *Feedback about processing the task*" and 4.2.3 "Students' experiences of praise" that will take more specific looks at these issues.

Chapter 4.3 will provide an answer to the last sub-question 2.c) "What type of feedback do students perceive beneficial when considering their language learning?"

4.1 Feedback given by the teacher

This section will report the findings of the QCA done to the written feedback given by the teacher and answer to the first research question “What kind of feedback did the teacher give?”. At a general level the feedback students received was positive in nature and somewhat rambling in form. The language of the feedback was mainly English but in some of the papers there were single notes in Finnish mainly concerning word choices or the layout of the text. For example, there were points such as, *Ilmiö-sana ei oikein sovi, Happening on vähän epämääräinen, truth = totuus, reality = todellisuus* and *Oikeassa yo-ssa korjaa tämä niin ettei tule tänne loppuun, tulee siistimpi vaikutelma*. There was quite a lot of corrective commenting added between the lines of the essays. This procedure included underlining, circling of words, crossing out words, suggesting better expressions, exclamation marks to point out important notions and arrows pointing to sides for more detailed information about a specific mistake.

In addition, there were some points listed at the end of every paper. This feedback was always in English and consisted of full sentences. Usually these comments were about the language, content and style of the essay. There were also words of encouragement and suggestions for better performance next time. All of this feedback was handwritten and occasionally slightly hard to read, understand and interpret.

When applying Hattie and Timperley’s (2007: 90-97) model, the feedback included the levels of *Feedback about the task* and *Feedback about processing the task* on several occasions but totally lacked the levels of *Feedback about self-regulation* and *Feedback about the self as a person*. This phenomenon might be due to the fact that there is a clear link between the performance and the result at the two first mentioned levels and hence students might benefit from this kind of feedback the most. In contrast, *Feedback about self-regulation* and *Feedback about the self as a person* can be considered more or less vague and may give the wrong impression so the teacher might avoid using them.

There were aspects of *Feedback about the task* in every paper. The teacher had underlined grammar errors and corrected them, as well as offered information about errors. There were also comments on neatness of format that regarded margins, spacing and use of paper sheet. Comments on the depth or quality of the work were common and there were observations such as *Structure of the text is very good* and *You could have elaborated the contents even*

more. When the teacher had been unsure about what the student had meant, there were clarification questions like *Are you talking about...?*

Feedback about processing the task was also a prevalent feature in the feedback. This level included information about how students had approached the task. For instance, there were comments like *Personal touch that makes it interesting and fun to read* and *All in all, you succeeded in doing exactly what was asked*. The quality of performance was another focus at this level, and there were comments like *You tackled some very concrete and important things. And managed well!* or *You might have benefited from proof-reading*. In addition, there were also suggestions for possible alternative strategies that could have been used. These comments included phrases like *At some point I suggested how to make a sentence more versatile vocabulary-wise*, *Perhaps the first paragraph → two separate ones* and *4 times 'it is' in the first paragraph. Remove at least 1-2, otherwise a very good opening*.

As already mentioned in the data and methods section, all of the students performed quite well in their writing, and as a consequence there were a set of praise words in the feedback which made it seem encouraging and supportive. The intensifier *very* was linked with words *fluent*, *nice* and *good* but there were also single-word expressions like *good*, *skillful* and *excellent*. Comments like *fun and clever* and *well-structured* were also used in some cases. In addition, the teacher had also used semiotic markers like smiley faces (☺) and plusses (+) to point out good parts in the essays.

4.2 Students' experiences of the feedback in general

The questionnaire answers provide the data for sections 4.2 and 4.3. The focus of this section is on the second research questions b) "How did the students experience the feedback provided by their teacher?" and c) "Is written feedback beneficial at all in the students' opinion?". These questions are somewhat overlapping but some observations can be made. In addition, subsections 4.2.1 "Students' experiences of *Feedback about the task*", 4.2.2 "Students' experiences of *Feedback about processing the task*" and 4.2.3 "Students' experiences of praise" will take more specific looks at these issues.

In the first part of the questionnaire titled as “In general” students were asked to rate a number of procedures (see Table 1) according to how often they took place in their lives when considering written feedback on their essays provided by their teacher. The scale was from one to five (1=never, 3=sometimes, 5=always).

Table 1 Student’s experiences of the feedback in general

In general						
1. Answer according to how often these procedures take place (1= never, 3=sometimes, 5=always)						
10 respondents (10/10)						
	1	2	3	4	5	AVERAGE
I read the received feedback with thought	(0/10)	(1/10)	(2/10)	(3/10)	(4/10)	4.0
I understand the feedback I have received	(0/10)	(0/10)	(1/10)	(5/10)	(4/10)	4.3
I find the feedback beneficial	(0/10)	(0/10)	(1/10)	(7/10)	(2/10)	4.1
I find the feedback justified	(0/10)	0/10)	(2/10)	(6/10)	(2/10)	4.0
The amount of feedback is sufficient	(0/10)	(1/10)	(4/10)	(3/10)	(2/10)	3.6
There is a correlation between the feedback and the grade	(0/10)	(0/10)	(1/10)	(8/10)	(1/10)	4.0
The feedback is constructive and provides direction	(0/10)	(0/10)	(2/10)	(6/10)	(2/10)	4.0
The feedback is non-judgemental	(0/10)	(1/10)	(0/10)	(5/10)	(4/10)	4.2
There are enough examples in the feedback	(0/10)	(2/10)	(1/10)	(6/10)	(1/10)	3.6
I make use of the feedback in future tasks	(1/10)	0/10)	(4/10)	(3/10)	(2/10)	3.5

Based on the questionnaire responses (see Table 1) it can be stated that at a general level research findings demonstrate that students value written feedback given by a teacher and find it useful when considering their learning. They read the feedback they have received with thought (average 4.0) and understand the feedback they have received (average 4.3), and usually find it beneficial (average 4.1) and justified (average 4.0). They can see that there is a correlation between the feedback and the grade (average 4.0) and in addition, they think that the feedback is constructive and provides direction (average 4.0). All the respondents agreed that the feedback helped them to identify their strengths and weaknesses in the “Other” part of the questionnaire.

However, there was some variation in how the respondents reacted to and developed from the feedback. Most of the respondents (=7) answered that they had read the received feedback with thought always or nearly always but three out of ten admitted that they had paid attention to it only sometimes or less often. In addition, on average they made use of the feedback in future tasks only sometimes (average 3.5).

When considering these statements in the light of the sub-question 2.c) “Is written feedback beneficial at all in the students’ opinion?” one could argue that yes, it is beneficial according to their own first-hand experience. However, when comparing the rest of their questionnaire answers and academic studies on the topic, it could be also argued that actually only about half of them actually benefit from it since they make use of it in future tasks. The rest of the students do not even actively go through the feedback with thought so there is a contradiction between what they think (i.e. written feedback is beneficial) and do (i.e. act on the feedback).

One could also argue that some of the respondents value the feedback at a superficial level but when considering their development in writing in English, they do not really make use of the guidance it provides or the tools it presents for learning. This could also explain why the teacher had commented on, for example, margins or spacing even though the students at this level should be aware of the layout of an essay. Even though these practices are taught in primary school, students may not really internalise them if they are just notes on a paper.

According to the questionnaire the respondents acknowledged that the feedback was non-judgemental (average 4.2) and only one of them reported in the “Other” part of the questionnaire that they have ever become demotivated because of negative feedback. Based on these observations, students show positive orientation towards feedback and are not usually afraid of it or discouraged by it.

One more phenomenon that came into prominence in the questionnaire was the amount of feedback and examples. There was a lot of variation when considering both of these aspects but half of the respondents (=5) (average 3.6) wanted to receive either more feedback on a whole, more examples of their errors or both. On the other hand, the other half was quite pleased with the amount of feedback and examples they had got. The amount of feedback in the essays was quite standard and there were no major differences between papers

In the light of the sub-question 2.b) ”How did the students experience the feedback written by their teacher?” it seems that in general the students’ have quite positive attitudes towards

written feedback given by the teacher and they are willing to receive it. Some of the respondents would like to receive even more of it. Usually the students feel encouraged by the feedback and find it beneficial for their language learning.

4.2.1 Students' experiences of *Feedback about the task*

This subsection will investigate how students perceived the levels of feedback at the level of *Feedback about the task* (see Table 2) as presented by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97). All the subcategories (i.e. error correction, information about errors, comments on neatness or format, comments on depth or quality of the work, and clarification request) from the model were included in the questionnaire and students were asked to rate them from one to five (1=not useful, 3=somewhat useful, 5=extremely useful) according to how useful they perceived those in the context of receiving written feedback.

Table 2 Student's experiences of Feedback about the task

Feedback about the task						
2. How useful do you consider the following? (1= not useful, 3=somewhat useful, 5=extremely useful) 10 respondents (10/10)						
	1	2	3	4	5	AVERAGE
Error correction	(0/10)	(1/10)	(1/10)	(5/10)	(3/10)	4.0
Information about errors	0/10)	(0/10)	(3/10)	(3/10)	(4/10)	4.1
Comments on neatness or format (e.g. about margins, spacing, use of concept paper, handwriting)	(0/10)	(1/10)	(3/10)	(6/10)	(0/10)	3.5
Comments on depth or quality of the work (e.g. Structure of the text is very good, You could have elaborated the contents even more)	(0/10)	(0/10)	(2/10)	(6/10)	(2/10)	4.0
Clarification requests (e.g. Are you talking about...?)	(0/10)	(2/10)	(2/10)	(5/10)	(1/10)	3.5

Students found error correction (average 4.0), information about errors (average 4.1) and comments on depth or quality of the work (average 4.0) the most useful. These are the kind of features that provide information that can be used to improve the performance in future tasks so it might explain why students prefer these aspects. However, comments on neatness or format (average 3.5) and clarification requests (average 3.5) were considered to be only somewhat useful. This phenomenon might be explained by the fact that these kinds of

comment are more strictly limited to specific assignments and therefore students do not see the potential value they could have for development in writing in English.

4.2.2 Students' experiences of *Feedback about processing the task*

This subsection will investigate how students perceived the levels of feedback at the level of *Feedback about processing the task* (see Table 3) as presented by Hattie and Timperley (2007: 90-97). Also all of these subcategories (i.e. information how one approached the task, the quality of performance and possible alternative strategies that could have been used) from this feedback level were included in the questionnaire and students were asked to rate how much they valued them on a scale from one to five (1=not at all, 3=to some extent, 5=very much).

Table 3 Student's experiences of *Feedback about processing the task*

Feedback about processing the task						
3. How much do you value feedback about your writing process? (1= not at all, 3=to some extent, 5= very much) 10 respondents (10/10)						
					AVEARGE	
Information about how you approached the task (e.g. a personal touch that makes it interesting and fun to read)	1 (0/10)	2 (1/10)	3 (2/10)	4 (5/10)	5 (2/10)	3.8
The quality of performance (e.g. You tackled some very concrete and important things. And managed well! You might have benefited from proof-reading)	1 (0/10)	2 (1/10)	3 (2/10)	4 (5/10)	5 (2/10)	3.8
Possible alternative strategies that could have been used (e.g. at some point I suggested how to make a sentence more versatile vocabulary-wise, Perhaps the first paragraph → 2 separate ones)	1 (0/10)	2 (2/10)	3 (2/10)	4 (3/10)	5 (3/10)	3.7

According to the questionnaire answers (see Table 3) students valued *Feedback about processing the task* on average only to some extent, both information about how one approached the task and information about the quality of the performance scoring 3.8 on average and suggestions of possible alternative strategies that could have been used scoring 3.7 on average. Even though these comments included a variety of encouraging expressions, students did not see their essential meaning to give guidance for writing. Apparently also

these features are more bound to a specific written piece of composition and students are not fully capable of making use of them in the future assignments.

4.2.3 Students' experiences of praise

On a scale from one to five (1=negative, 3=neutral, 5=very positive) (see Table 4) students had to select how positive they considered praise words that were found in the feedback. There was a significant amount of variation in the answers but some conclusions could be drawn.

Table 4 Student's experiences of Praise

Praise						
4. How positive do you feel about the following expressions? (1=negative, 3=neutral, 5=very positive)						
10 respondents (10/10)						
						AVERAGE
Very fluent	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (1/10)	4 (2/10)	5 (7/10)	4.5
Very nice	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (2/10)	4 (7/10)	5 (1/10)	4.3
Very good	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (2/10)	4 (4/10)	5 (4/10)	4.2
Good	1 (0/10)	2 (1/10)	3 (5/10)	4 (3/10)	5 (1/10)	3.4
Skillful	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (0/10)	4 (7/10)	5 (3/10)	4.3
Excellent	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (0/10)	4 (2/10)	5 (8/10)	4.8
Fun and clever	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (1/10)	4 (6/10)	5 (3/10)	4.2
Well-structured	1 (0/10)	2 (0/10)	3 (1/10)	4 (6/10)	5 (3/10)	4.2
☺	1 (0/10)	2 (2/10)	3 (3/10)	4 (4/10)	5 (1/10)	3.4
+	1 (1/10)	2 (2/10)	3 (4/10)	4 (3/10)	5 (0/10)	2.9

Unanimously the most positive praise word was *excellent* scoring 4.8 on average, followed by *very nice* and *skillful* that scored 4.3 and *very good*, *fun and clever* and *well-structured* that scored 4.2. Indeed, all the adverbs with the intensifier *very* scored above the average of four, whereas the plain *good* scored only 3.4 and was considered quite neutral with only a slightly positive connotation. Also the smiley-face (☺) was considered neutral with the average of 3.4 but the plus mark (+) was actually regarded slightly negative with the average of 2.9.

All the listed expressions were praise words so it is somewhat surprising that the students may not necessarily feel positive about them. Of course, it might be that there is a trace of distortion since when answering the questionnaire the students might have felt that they needed to rank these words without fully acknowledging that anything below three was towards negative perceptions.

4.3 Students' feedback preferences

The last sub-question was 2.c) "What type of feedback do students perceive beneficial when considering improving their writing skills in English?" This section will report some observations on the students' feedback preferences that came forward in the questionnaires, especially in the "Other" part and in free comments. The focus in these parts of the questionnaire was especially on alternative ways of giving and receiving feedback.

Even though the students valued written feedback they do seem to acknowledge the variety of forms that feedback can take. Nine out of ten respondents had received and given peer-feedback at some point of their lives and six of them had liked it as a method of receiving feedback. One problem concerning peer-feedback according to one student was that typically only few students are courageous enough to really criticise and suggest improvements. In other words, it seems that students do not feel competent and qualified enough to comment on each other's essays.

The one feedback method that the students unanimously found beneficial was oral feedback. Actually, half of the respondents (=5) preferred it over written feedback. One clear factor that one student brought up in the comment section in the questionnaire was that when the teacher gives oral feedback one can observe his/her body language. Therefore, at least this respondent found the nonverbal communication quite an important feature in the oral feedback. Another respondent also noted that oral feedback might be better than written feedback because one understands it better than just notes and marks on the paper. In addition, the teacher can clearly tell what went wrong and how one could fix it when feedback is given face-to-face. However, yet another respondent mentioned also the problem that oral feedback is easier to forget.

It was a consistent and unanimous pattern in the questionnaires that the students found the combination of oral and written feedback the most useful method of receiving feedback. The students claimed that they are both useful and work for them. The benefits of oral feedback are supported by written feedback which is something that can be used for revision and future learning.

In the comment section of the questionnaire some respondents especially emphasised that they wanted to learn from their mistakes. Positive feedback was seen important but they felt

that identifying their problems and weaknesses benefited their learning the most. Therefore, they valued explicit feedback of their errors and mistakes so that they could improve their performance in future assignments. One student also pointed out that as they develop in their writing, the amount of both oral and written feedback should increase.

5 DISCUSSION

In summary it can be stated that the written feedback provided by the teacher was positive in nature and there were several comments on it. The teacher had responded to the whole text and aspects of writing: structure, organization, style, content and presentation just like Hyland (2004: 181) had suggested of high quality written feedback. However, at some points the feedback might have been somewhat challenging to interpret. For instance, Hyland (1998: 255) have reported that Mazano and Arthur (1977), Searle and Dillon (1980) and Sommers (1982) have found similar features in written feedback given by a teacher: inconsistency, confusing aspects, unclarity, vagueness or overemphasising the negative aspects.

Based on the questionnaire responses it can be stated that at a general level research findings (see Table 1) were in accordance with Hyland's (1998: 257) finding that students value written feedback given by a teacher and find it useful when considering their learning. They do not find it either judgemental or demotivating. Therefore the feedback does not discourage students and one could assume that they would pay more attention to it and consciously aim to develop from it. However, the research findings of the present study suggest that this is not always the general trend in learning to write in English.

The notion that the students find the feedback beneficial but do not always act on it might be one of the most interesting findings of the present study. When reflecting on Glover and Brown's (2006: 2) point about feedback being effective if students act on it to improve their future work and learning, it seems that the feedback might not be effective since students may not develop from it. These finding agree more with Guénette's (2007: 40) suggestion that written feedback might not actually facilitate learning substantially. However, there was variation among respondents and half of them were significantly more prone to make use of the feedback in future tasks than the other half.

There was also a noticeable mismatch in the students' preferences when regarding the amount of written feedback and examples: The first half was content with the present amount but the other half would have liked to receive more comments and examples on their writing. Therefore, one could conclude that the teacher could write even more explicit feedback in order to offer the sufficient amount of comments to every student. However, it could also be argued that there is no real usefulness in writing more feedback since students seem not to even make use of it.

Even though students value written feedback they are also aware of other methods of giving and receiving feedback. Most of the respondents were familiar with peer-feedback and had liked it as a feedback method but it was pointed out that students do not always feel they are qualified to assess their peers' texts.

The combination of written and oral feedback from the teacher was unanimously experienced as the best method of receiving feedback on written compositions. Also Bitchener et al. (2005: 202) and Hyland (2003: 192) have acknowledged the benefits of face-to-face conferencing with students since the interactive nature of the situation allows teachers to respond to the needs of their students, clarify meanings and resolve ambiguities. However, it is usually the matter of lack of time that prevents teachers from bringing this kind of manoeuvres into use.

6 CONCLUSION

The present study examined written feedback given by a teacher and students' experiences of it in a Finnish upper-secondary school context. It had two main research aims and approaches: first, to investigate what kind of written feedback a teacher gave and how students responded to that feedback. In other words, the present study wanted to find out how the students felt about the feedback they had received, did it facilitate their learning and what type of feedback they found the most beneficial for their learning?

The written feedback given by a teacher was rich and encouraging in nature. However, even though there were several comments on the feedback, some students would have wanted to receive more of it. The feedback included the levels of *Feedback about the task* and *Feedback about processing the task* from Hattie and Timperley's (2007: 90-97) theory on several occasions, and students found those kind of comments good but valued the first mentioned more. The feedback was highly positive in nature and included a number of praise words but students did not feel totally positive about all these encouraging expressions. The combination of written and oral feedback was unanimously the best way of receiving feedback according to the respondents.

For example, Guénette (2007: 40) has noted that when considering improving the accuracy of written production there is a debate whether giving corrective feedback is of use or not. Also the research findings of the present study suggest that students have difficulties to link the present work and the feedback from it to future assignments. They do read the feedback and think they learn from it but on the other hand, they do not necessarily make the full use of it when considering their future writing. In other words, they do not reflect on what they have done in the past and how to improve based on their previous performance.

One solution to this problem could be process or draft writing, like Paulus (1999: 283) and Hyland (2003: 179) have also suggested. The current situation in schools is that students write the paper, get feedback and a grade, and then move on straight to the next task. However, working on the same task and learning from one's mistakes in practice could facilitate learning to an extent. The process writing approach could be executed in a way that the teacher gives feedback about processing the task but only points out the errors and mistakes, and then students get to correct them themselves. This method of giving feedback might demand somewhat more work from the teacher but the students could benefit from it since

they would have to process their learning instead of being given correct answers without any effort.

When regarding the reliability of the present study it should be noted that the scope of the study was very limited since it only consisted of one teacher and ten quite well-performing students. In addition, the essay writing task was a rehearsal for the matriculation examination and therefore the teacher might have paid extra attention to the quality of the feedback she gave. As a consequence, there is little possibility to generalise the results to other contexts outside this particular class. The future studies on the topic of giving and receiving feedback should expand the perspectives to consider also younger and older learners of different ability levels and school contexts. More quantitative data is needed in order to find out the reality of feedback conventions but also qualitative data from both students and teachers should be collected so that personal experiences would be in the focus of collecting data and hence bring more validity to the research.

One notion that arose with the findings of the present study, and should be studied more in future research, is the significance of oral feedback combined with written feedback. Apparently the human interaction aspect makes oral feedback appealing to students since it is one of the rare occasions where one can discuss privately with the teacher and reflect on one's learning while building rapport with the teacher. When the groups are big and there is sense of a hurry in the air, implementing one-to-one feedback sessions with students to the schedule of a language class can be quite challenging. However, it is something that should be strived for. This approach brings up also new research interests regarding the oral feedback conventions. Future research could investigate, for example, what kind of feedback is given orally? How is the feedback situation? How direct is the feedback? How do participants in the situation behave? The approach to the topic could even be interdisciplinary combining language sciences, educational sciences, psychology and sociology.

Another interesting aspect of giving and receiving feedback in future research could be the age of pupils or students. How does it affect the experience of receiving feedback? Does the teacher do something differently when learners are quite young? Is oral feedback more emphasised in those situations? What about sensitive teenagers or adult learners that already have quite a lot of experience of receiving feedback, do they respond differently to feedback? Also the teacher's point of view and experience of giving feedback to students could be studied.

It should also be noted that some of the academic papers cited in the literature review are quite old, even up to 30-40 years old. World and educational practices around it have changed quite a lot during those decades so it is worth asking how outdated those papers are. It might be that the way teachers gave written feedback a quarter of a century ago was different from now and maybe there has been some improvement. Also practices in different parts of the globe might be totally different. Therefore, also longitudinal or cross-cultural research could be an applicable approach in future research on the topic.

Bibliography

- Bitchener, J. and Knoch, U. (2015). Written corrective feedback studies: approximate replication of Bitchener & Knoch (2010a) and Von Beuningen, De Jong & Kuiken (2012). *Language Teaching* 48 (3), 405–414.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S. and Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14 (3), 191–205.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- Burke, D. M. and Pieterick, J. A. (2010). *Giving students effective written feedback*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Cottrell, S. (2001). *Teaching study skills and supporting learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ferris, L. (2015). Written corrective feedback in L2 writing: Connors & Lunsford (1988); Lunsford & Lunsford (2008); Lalande (1982). *Language Teaching* 48 (4), 531–544.
- Glover, C. and Brown, E. (2006). Written feedback for students: too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? *Bioscience Education* 7 (1), 1–16.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16 (1), 40–53.
- Hattie, J. and Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 77 (1), 81–112.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7 (3), 255–286.
- Hyland, F. and Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill - Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10 (3), 185–212.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Montgomery, J. L. and Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16 (2), 82–99.
- Opetushallitus (Finnish National Board of Education). (2014). *Perusopetuksen opetusuunnitelman perusteet*. Opetushallitus.

- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8 (3), 265–289.
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. London: Sage.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning* 46 (2), 327–369.

Vastaamalla tähän kyselyyn hyväksyt, että vastauksiasi käytetään kandidaatin tutkielman, ja mahdollisen pro gradu – tutkielman, aineistona. Vastaukset säilytetään luottamuksellisesti ja analysoidaan anonyymisti.

The following questions are about teacher written essay feedback. Please, answer to the questions according to your own perceptions on written feedback on a scale from 1 to 5 for questions 1-4, and yes or no for the rest of the questions.

In general

1. Answer according to how often these procedures take place (1= never, 3=sometimes, 5=always)

I read the received feedback with thought	1	2	3	4	5
I understand the feedback I have received	1	2	3	4	5
I find the feedback beneficial	1	2	3	4	5
I find the feedback justified	1	2	3	4	5
The amount of feedback is sufficient	1	2	3	4	5
There is a correlation between the feedback and the grade	1	2	3	4	5
The feedback is constructive and provides direction	1	2	3	4	5
The feedback is non-judgemental	1	2	3	4	5
There are enough examples in the feedback	1	2	3	4	5
I make use of the feedback in future tasks	1	2	3	4	5

Feedback about the task

2. How useful do you consider the following? (1= not useful, 3=somewhat useful, 5=extremely useful)

Error correction	1	2	3	4	5
Information about errors	1	2	3	4	5
Comments on neatness or format (e.g. about margins, spacing, use of concept paper, handwriting)	1	2	3	4	5
Comments on depth or quality of the work (e.g. Structure of the text is very good, You could have elaborated the contents even more)	1	2	3	4	5
Clarification requests (e.g. Are you talking about...?)	1	2	3	4	5

Feedback about processing the task

3. How much do you value feedback about your writing process? (1= not at all, 3=to some extent, 5= very much)

Information about how you approached the task (e.g. a personal touch that makes it interesting and fun to read)	1	2	3	4	5
The quality of performance (e.g. You tackled some very concrete and important things. And managed well!, You might have benefited from proof-reading)	1	2	3	4	5
Possible alternative strategies that could have been used (e.g. at some point I suggested how to make a sentence more versatile vocabulary-wise, Perhaps the first paragraph → 2 separate ones)	1	2	3	4	5

Praise

4. How positive do you feel about the following expressions? (1=negative, 3=neutral, 5=very positive)

Very fluent	1	2	3	4	5
Very nice	1	2	3	4	5
Very good	1	2	3	4	5
Good	1	2	3	4	5
Skillful	1	2	3	4	5
Excellent	1	2	3	4	5
Fun and clever	1	2	3	4	5
Well-structured	1	2	3	4	5
😊	1	2	3	4	5
+	1	2	3	4	5

Other

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 5. Has negative feedback ever made you feel demotivated? | yes | no |
| 6. Do you think that feedback helps you identify your strengths and weaknesses? | yes | no |
| 7. Have you ever received oral feedback? | yes | no |
| 8. Do you prefer written feedback over oral feedback? | yes | no |
| 9. Do you find oral feedback beneficial? | yes | no |
| 10. Have you ever received peer-feedback? | yes | no |
| 11. If yes, did you like it as a method of receiving feedback? | yes | no |
| 12. Have you ever given peer-feedback? | yes | no |

Comment on anything that comes in mind when considering feedback in general, especially on what kind of feedback you consider to be beneficial for your learning. You can also answer in Finnish.
