REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM
MASTER'S THESIS

ENHANCING ACADEMIC WRITING PERFORMANCE THROUGH FEEDBACK LITERACY TRAINING: A QUASI- EXPERIMENTAL STUDY IN A TURKISH EFL PREPARATORY PROGRAM

EMİNE TANRISEVEN
227C5040

THESIS SUPERVISOR
PROF. DR. SUZAN KAVANOZ

2026

REPUBLIC OF TÜRKİYE
YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES EDUCATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAM
MASTER'S THESIS

ENHANCING ACADEMIC WRITING PERFORMANCE THROUGH FEEDBACK LITERACY TRAINING: A QUASI- EXPERIMENTAL STUDY IN A TURKISH EFL PREPARATORY PROGRAM

EMİNE TANRISEVEN
227C5040
ORCID NO: 0009-0007-1972-3881

THESIS SUPERVISOR
PROF. DR. SUZAN KAVANOZ

JANUARY 2026

The study titled "Enhancing Academic Writing Performance Through Feedback Literacy Training: A Quasi- Experimental Study in a Turkish EFL Preparatory Program" prepared by Emine TANRISEVEN has been found successful with majority vote as a result of the defense exam held on 16/01/2026 and has been accepted by our jury as a Master's thesis in the English Language Teaching Program.

Supervisor	**Signature**
Prof. Dr. Suzan KAVANOZ	.....

Jury Members	**Signature**
Doç. Dr. Burcu ÜNAL	.....
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Gülay KIRAY	.....

ÖZET

GERİ BİLDİRİM OKURYAZARLIĞI EĞİTİMİYLE AKADEMİK YAZMA PERFORMANSININ GELİŞTİRİLMESİ: TÜRKİYE'DE BİR İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK PROGRAMINDA YARI DENEYSEL BİR ÇALIŞMA

Bu çalışma, bir Türk yükseköğretim kurumundaki hazırlık düzeyindeki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak (EFL) öğrenen öğrencilerin yazma becerileri üzerinde geri bildirim okuryazarlığına yönelik bir müdahalenin etkisini incelemektedir. İkinci dilde yazma öğretiminde geri bildirimin temel bir bileşen olduğu yaygın biçimde kabul edilse de birçok öğrenci, öğretmen geri bildirimiyle etkili biçimde etkileşime girebilmek için gerekli beceri, tutum ve stratejilere sahip değildir (Carless & Boud, 2018; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Bu araştırmanın amacı, geri bildirim okuryazarlığının açık biçimde öğretilmesinin öğrencilerin akademik yazma çıktılarında iyileşme sağlayıp sağlamadığını incelemektir. Çalışma, yarı deneysel bir desen kullanılarak yürütülmüştür. Aynı düzeydeki (A2–B1) iki mevcut sınıf kontrol (n=22) ve deney grubu (n=21) olarak atanmıştır. Altı hafta boyunca deney grubu, düzenli yazma görevlerine ek olarak yapılandırılmış geri bildirim okuryazarlığı eğitimi almıştır. Bu eğitim; öğretmen geri bildirimini yorumlama, değer verme ve revizyon süreçlerinde uygulama becerilerine yönelik etkinlikleri içermektedir. Bu sırada kontrol grubu, standart yazma müfredatını ve düzenli öğretmen geri bildirimini herhangi bir ek eğitim olmaksızın takip etmiştir. Öğrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlığı düzeylerindeki değişimi ölçmek amacıyla, dört boyuttan oluşan (Takdir, Olumlu Tutum, Etkili Geri Bildirime Yönelik Farkındalık ve Geri Bildirimi Kullanma Açıklığı) Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlığı Ölçeği (Yıldız vd., 2022) her iki gruba da ön test ve son test olarak uygulanmıştır. Buna ek olarak, her iki grup tarafından gerçekleştirilen ön ve son yazma görevleri; kurum tarafından uygulanan dereceli puanlama anahtarına göre örgütlenme, tutarlılık, içerik uygunluğu, dil bilgisi, sözcük kullanımı ve noktalama ölçütleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmiştir. Bulgular, deney grubunun kontrol grubuna kıyasla daha yüksek düzeyde gelişim gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı eğitimi alan öğrenciler, müdahale sonrası metinlerinde fikirlerin daha net ifade edilmesi, daha tutarlı bir yapı ve daha yüksek dil doğruluğu sergilemişlerdir. Bu sonuçlar, öğrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlığını geliştirmeye yönelik çalışmaların yazma becerilerinin güçlendirilmesinde ve geri bildirime daha özerk ve düşünceli bir yaklaşım geliştirilmesinde kritik öneme sahip olduğunu göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: geri bildirim okuryazarlığı, yabancı dilde yazma, yazma performansı, akademik yazma öğretimi, Türk hazırlık öğrencileri

ABSTRACT

ENHANCING ACADEMIC WRITING PERFORMANCE THROUGH FEEDBACK LITERACY TRAINING: A QUASI- EXPERIMENTAL STUDY IN A TURKISH EFL PREPARATORY PROGRAM

This study examines how a feedback literacy intervention affects EFL students' writing abilities at the preparatory level at a Turkish institution. Even though it is often acknowledged that feedback is an essential component of teaching writing in second languages, many students lack the abilities, attitudes, and strategies necessary to interact with teacher feedback in an effective manner (Carless & Boud, 2018; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). The aim of this research is to explore whether explicitly teaching feedback literacy can enhance students' academic writing outcomes. The study was conducted using a quasi-experimental design. Two intact classes from the same level (A2-B1) were assigned as control (n=22) and experimental group (n=21). Over the course of six weeks, the experimental group received structured instruction on feedback literacy alongside their regular writing tasks. This instruction included training on interpreting, valuing, and applying teacher feedback in revision processes. Meanwhile, the control group followed the standard writing curriculum and regular teacher feedback without any additional training. To measure changes in students' feedback literacy levels, the Feedback Literacy Scale (Yıldız et al., 2022), consisting of four dimensions—Appreciation, Positive Attitude, Awareness towards Effective Feedback, and Openness to Use Feedback—was administered as a pre- and post-test to both groups. In addition, both groups completed pre- and post-writing tasks, which were assessed based on organization, coherence, content relevance, grammar, vocabulary use and punctuation following a grading rubric implemented by the institution. Findings revealed that the experiment group had a higher improvement compared to the control group. The students who received feedback literacy instruction demonstrated greater clarity of ideas, more coherent structure, and improved language accuracy in their post-intervention texts. These findings imply that improving students' feedback literacy is essential to enhancing their writing skills and encouraging a more autonomous and thoughtful approach to feedback.

Keywords: feedback literacy, EFL writing, writing performance, academic writing instruction, Turkish preparatory students

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to the completion of this thesis.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Suzan Kavanoz, for her invaluable guidance, academic insight, and continuous support throughout every stage of this research. Her expertise, constructive feedback, and thoughtful criticism played a crucial role in shaping both the direction and the quality of this study. Her encouragement and commitment to academic excellence were a constant source of motivation and inspiration.

I am also grateful to the members of my thesis committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Burcu Ünal and Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülay Kıray, for their insightful comments, thoughtful questions, and valuable suggestions, all of which contributed significantly to the improvement of this work.

I would like to extend my thanks to the management of the Istinye University Foreign Languages Department for providing a supportive academic environment and the necessary resources to carry out this research. The institutional support and professional atmosphere greatly facilitated my academic development during this process.

Special thanks are extended to my colleagues for their cooperation, meaningful discussions, and encouragement. Their academic support made this journey both productive and enjoyable.

My sincere appreciation goes to my family and friends for their unconditional love, patience, and unwavering support throughout my academic journey. Their belief in me provided the strength, confidence, and motivation needed to overcome challenges and remain focused on my goals.

A very special note of gratitude is reserved for my best friend; Gizem Özdamar, whose presence, understanding, and constant encouragement meant more to me than words can express. During moments of doubt, stress, and exhaustion, her belief in me, emotional support, and constant reassurance helped me stay grounded and motivated. Her friendship brought balance, comfort, and joy to this demanding journey, and I am profoundly grateful for her patience, kindness, and unwavering companionship.

Finally, I would like to thank all of these people whose endless contributions helped me survive through this journey!

EMİNE TANRISEVEN

January, 2026; Istanbul

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET iii
ABSTRACT iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v
TABLE OF CONTENTS vi
LIST OF TABLES viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ix

1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. Statement of the Problem 2
1.2. Significance of Study 3
1.3. Purpose of the Study 3
1.4. Research Questions 4
1.5. Essential Terms 4
1.5.1. Feedback Literacy 4
1.5.2. Positive Feedback 4
1.5.3. Constructive Feedback 5
1.5.4. Suggestive Feedback 5
1.5.5. Corrective Feedback (CF) 5
1.5.6. Academic Writing Performance 6

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 7
2.1. Theoretical Background 7
2.2. Feedback in Language Education 9
2.3. Reconceptualizing Feedback 12
2.4. Components of Effective Feedback 14
2.5. Types of Feedback and Their Pedagogical Roles 17
2.5.1. Positive Feedback 18
2.5.2. Constructive Feedback 18
2.5.3. Suggestive Feedback 19
2.5.4. Corrective Feedback 20
2.5.5. Synthesizing the Pedagogical Roles of Feedback Types 21
2.6. Feedback Literacy: Definitions and Dimensions 22
2.7. Teaching Feedback Literacy in Writing Instruction 26
2.7.1. Pedagogical Foundations: Theoretical Models of Feedback Literacy in Writing 26
2.7.2. Designing Writing Curricula that Build Feedback Literacy 27
2.7.3. Instructional Strategies: Scaffolding Feedback as a Learning Process 28
2.7.4. Reflective and Metacognitive Practices 29
2.8. Feedback Literacy and Writing Performance 31
2.8.1. Empirical Evidence Linking Feedback Literacy and Writing Gains 31
2.8.2. Affective Engagement and Motivation in Writing 32
2.8.3. Feedback Literacy and Revision Depth 34
2.8.4. Conclusion: From Literacy to Performance 35

2.9. Feedback Literacy Studies in EFL Contexts 36

3. METHODOLOGY 39
3.1. Research Design 39
3.2. Research Context 40
3.3. Participants 41
3.4. Instrumentation 41
3.4.1. Feedback Literacy Scale 42
3.4.2. Weekly Writing Tasks and Rubric 43
3.4.3. Feedback Literacy Intervention Activities 45
3.4.4. Semi-Structured Interview 47
3.5. Procedure 47
3.5.1. Pre-Intervention Phase 48
3.5.2. Intervention Phase (6 Weeks) 49
3.5.3. Post-Intervention Phase 53
3.6. Data Collection 54
3.7. Data Analysis 55
3.8. Ethical Considerations 56

4. RESULTS 58
4.1. Quantitative Results 58
4.1.1. Weekly Writing Results 59
4.1.2. Feedback Literacy Scale Results 61
4.2. Qualitative Results 68
4.2.1. Appreciating Feedback 68
4.2.2. Making Judgements 69
4.2.3. Managing Affect 70
4.2.4. Taking Action 71

5. DISCUSSION 72
5.1. Discussion on the Findings for RQ1 72
5.2. Discussion on the Findings for RQ2 74
5.3. Discussion on the Finding for RQ3 75
5.4. Integrated Interpretation of Findings 76

6. CONCLUSION 77
6.1. Limitations of the Study 79

REFERENCES 81
APPENDICES 88

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Weekly Writing Tasks 43

Table 2. Weekly Feedback Literacy Intervention Activities 46

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Pre-test and Post-test Scores 59

Table 4. Paired-Samples T-Test 60

Table 5. Independent t-Test (Experiment vs Control Group) 60

Table 6. Experimental Group Reliability Analysis Results 61

Table 7. Control Group Descriptive Statistics 62

Table 8. Experimental Group Descriptive Statistics 62

Table 9. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test to Compare the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Control Group 63

Table 10. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test to Compare the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group 64

Table 11. Mean Ranks and Sum of Ranks for Control and Experimental Groups (Pre-test) 65

Table 12. Mean Ranks and Sum of Ranks for Control and Experimental Groups (Post-test) 66

Table 13. Mann-Whitney U Test to Compare the Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups 66

Table 14. Mann-Whitney U Test to Compare the Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups 67

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
CF	: Corrective Feedback
EAT	: Engage-Apply-Transfer
WCF	: Written Corrective Feedback
OCF	: Oral Corrective Feedback
ESL	: English as a Second Language
LMS	: Learning Management System
ZPD	: Zone of Proximal Development
CMF	: Culturally Mediated Feedback
SRL	: Self-Regulated Learning
DEFT	: Developing Engagement with Feedback Tools
ISTEP	: Istinye University Test of English Proficiency
LAT	: Level Achievement Test
EFA	: Exploratory Factor Analysis
CFA	: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's educational landscape, feedback is not simply seen as an evaluative mechanism but an essential component of the learning process, particularly in writing-centered academic settings. Feedback is a crucial part of learning for university students enrolled in English preparation programs to build academic writing proficiency which will be useful in their future studies. However, because of a lack of student comprehension and involvement, feedback may not achieve the intended effect, in spite of its importance (Carless & Boud, 2018; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006).

The reason why this problem is particularly pressing in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is because feedback can be misunderstood or ignored because of a lack of training in how to process and apply it, cultural differences in educational expectations, or limitations in language proficiency (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Winstone & Nash, 2016). For feedback to be effective, students must acquire the necessary skills such as the ability to interpret, assimilate, and apply feedback in their studies which can also be reflected as feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018; Sutton, 2012).

Feedback-literate students both understand the goal of feedback and have the necessary skills to manage emotional responses, ask for clarification when needed, and actively use feedback to revise and improve their work (Winstone et al., 2017). Developing these skills is not automatically required for structured pedagogical assistance. Brookhart (2017) emphasizes that students must learn how to uncover feedback messages, specifically when they include diverse types such as positive (affirmative), constructive (corrective), and suggestive (developmental) feedback.

For EFL learners, academic writing frequently poses additional difficulties due to its cognitive demands and cultural context. If students are not provided with instructions on how to use feedback, they could misinterpret teacher revisions or remarks (Lee, 2008; Yu et al., 2019). Consequently, there is an increasing demand to reshape feedback as a continuous process that incorporates active learner participation rather

than as a onetime input. According to research, feedback works best when students are taught how to evaluate and apply feedback critically and reflectively (Jonsson, 2013; Dawson et al., 2019).

Feedback procedures in the EFL setting of Turkish universities are still primarily teacher centered, and students frequently receive ambiguous or excessively critical remarks without any recommendations on how to get better. It is necessary to reconsider the design and delivery of feedback considering the transition from product oriented to process oriented writing pedagogy (Kıvrak, 2023). By presenting feedback literacy as a teachable competency rather than merely an assumed learner trait, this study expands on recent research (Carless & Chan, 2017; Molloy & Boud, 2013).

1.1. Statement of the Problem

While the impact of feedback on academic writing has been widely acknowledged, its actual effectiveness depends on students' ability and willingness to engage with it. Despite teachers' best efforts, feedback is often underutilized or misapplied by students, especially in second language writing contexts. This issue is intensified in English preparatory programs, where writing assignments are frequent, but the metacognitive skills necessary for processing feedback are rarely taught (Evans, 2013; Han & Hyland, 2015).

In Turkish EFL preparatory programs, feedback is commonly perceived by students as criticism rather than support. Students may feel confused, discouraged, or overwhelmed by written comments which may lead to poor engagement with revision (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Moreover, many teachers do not explicitly distinguish between different types of feedback such as positive encouragement, constructive critique, and suggestive guidance resulting in discrepancies in how feedback is interpreted and applied by learners (Brookhart, 2017; Wiggins, 2012).

Although the concept of feedback literacy has gained attention internationally, few empirical studies have tested its practical implications in Turkish EFL contexts. Even fewer studies have been done using interventions in which students are exposed to the trainings to identify, understand, and apply different types of feedback. This gap in the literature leaves unanswered questions about whether feedback literacy can be

improved through explicit structured instruction and whether such improvement results in better writing performance.

1.2. Significance of Study

This study is significant both theoretically and pedagogically. From a theoretical perspective, it contributes to the emerging literature on feedback literacy by operationalizing it in the context of university level academic writing in an EFL setting. This study applies and adapts feedback literacy models in a Turkish preparatory school setting, expanding the universal understanding of how feedback literacy can work in a variety of contexts, even though most of these models have their roots in Anglophone higher education systems (Carless & Boud, 2018; Winstone et al., 2017).

In terms of pedagogy, the study examines how students might be enforced to take more responsibility for their own writing development through explicit feedback literacy training that incorporates various kinds of feedback such as constructive, suggestive, and positive feedback. It addresses current requests to reframe feedback as a reciprocal process involving both the giver and the recipient (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Dawson et al., 2019). By designing a six-week intervention focused on improving students' metacognitive and affective feedback skills, the study also offers a replicable model for other EFL programs targeting to bridge the gap between teacher feedback and student action.

Furthermore, this study can inform teacher education programs by emphasizing the importance of teaching feedback strategies and cultivating classroom conditions that support feedback engagement. Curriculum designers may also benefit from seeing how feedback literacy can be embedded into academic writing syllabi rather than treated as a peripheral concern.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of a structured feedback literacy intervention on university English preparatory students' academic writing performance. It investigates whether explicit feedback literacy training that assists students to identify and react to positive, constructive, and suggestive feedback can

improve their writing ability to revise their work efficiently. The study also aims to explore how students' feedback literacy level changes prior to and following the intervention.

1.4. Research Questions

The following research questions serve as the basis for this study:

1. To what extent does explicit feedback literacy training improve the academic writing performance of university English preparatory students?
2. To what extent does students' feedback literacy level change as a result of explicit feedback literacy training?
3. How do students perceive different types of feedback (positive, constructive, suggestive) before and after the intervention?

1.5. Essential Terms

1.5.1. Feedback Literacy

Feedback literacy refers to a learner's capacity to meaningfully engage with feedback in ways that promote learning. This involves having the necessary skills to understand, analyze, and use feedback to improve academic performance. According to Carless and Boud (2018), feedback literacy consists of three components: behavioral (acting on feedback), affective (controlling emotional reactions), and cognitive (understanding the substance and purpose of feedback). It creates a culture of sustained feedback and empowers students to be the agents in their learning. Feedback literacy, according to Sutton (2012), also includes students' understanding of feedback mechanisms and their part in making sense of feedback rather than just receiving it passively.

1.5.2. Positive Feedback

Positive feedback involves commendations highlighting students' strengths at their work. Its main purpose is to increase student involvement, motivation, and confidence, especially when they are having difficulties or are unsure of their progress (Brookhart, 2017). According to Wiggins (2012), effective positive feedback should be aimed at

reinforcing intended academic qualities and strategies and that should be consistent with learning objectives rather than general praise.

1.5.3. Constructive Feedback

Constructive feedback identifies areas for improvement in a student's work while aiming to guide their learning process rather than simply pointing out mistakes. This type of feedback helps students comprehend their mistakes and create plans to perform better in their future studies by offering clear explanations and justifications. (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), constructive feedback may be categorized under three levels: task, process, and self-regulation related. As long as these three levels assisted well, they promote deeper understanding and learning.

1.5.4. Suggestive Feedback

Suggestive feedback does not directly correct students' mistakes. Instead, it offers possible alternatives, suggestions, or tactics to improve their work. It encourages learners to be the agent of their work by reflecting, making decisions and taking the responsibility of their revision process. This kind of feedback respects learner autonomy and fosters critical thinking and self-regulated learning. According to Jonsson (2013), suggestive feedback is particularly useful when integrated with peer and self-evaluation for it enables students to interact dialogically with feedback and cultivate metacognitive abilities.

1.5.5. Corrective Feedback (CF)

Corrective feedback (CF) is typically used in language learning contexts and focuses on addressing specific linguistic errors, such as grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation. CF can be direct by providing the correct form or indirect in a way highlighting the error without correction, and both types have varying impacts on learner uptake and long-term improvement (Ferris, 2003). Bitchener and Ferris (2012) emphasize that the effectiveness of CF not only depends on timing, consistency, and clarity, but the learner's feedback literacy and willingness to revise.

1.5.6. Academic Writing Performance

Academic writing performance refers to a student's ability to produce coherent, well-structured, and linguistically accurate written texts in an academic context. Some of the qualities which are commonly used to evaluate the writing performance are the organization, reasoning, coherence, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary range, and mechanics such as spelling and punctuation. (Nation, 2009). According to Hyland (2016), academic tone, evidence-based argumentation, and the decent use of discourse markers are all considered as the components of excellent academic writing. Students' writing performance can be greatly affected by the kind and quality of feedback they receive during their learning process.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the current literature related to the study, emphasizing the idea of feedback and its developing significance in language education, especially regarding English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. It begins by detailing the theoretical underpinnings of feedback and examines its educational roles, highlighting the transition from conventional corrective methods to more interactive and student-focused approaches. The chapter subsequently explores various forms of feedback and their contributions to enhancing writing skills, then provides a thorough analysis of feedback literacy, including its definitions, aspects, and significance for student involvement and self-directed learning. Ultimately, it examines methods for teaching feedback literacy in writing education and emphasizes important outcomes from earlier studies, offering the theoretical foundation and empirical context for current research.

2.1. Theoretical Background

Feedback as a pedagogical tool has long been a key component of academic achievement, learner autonomy, and metacognition in a variety of educational environments (Sadler, 1989; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Feedback, which has its origins in behaviorist learning theories that emphasize reinforcement and correction, has developed into a multifaceted concept by incorporating constructivist and socio-cultural frameworks that see learning as an active, socially situated process (Vygotsky, 1978; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Feedback, according to Ramaprasad (1983), is "information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way." Instead of only assessing performance, this approach emphasizes the formative role of feedback in fostering learning. The groundbreaking meta-analysis by Black and Wiliam (1998) further showed the significant influence of formative feedback on student progress, setting the stage for further research into efficient feedback techniques.

The roles that learners play in feedback processes have received more attention since the theoretical concept of feedback literacy emerged. According to Carless and Boud (2018), feedback literacy is the set of abilities, attitudes, and knowledge needed to analyze data and use it to improve work or learning processes. This is consistent with learner-centered education's tenets, which prioritize accountability, agency, and reflection (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Sutton,

2012). Thus, feedback literacy encompasses interpretation and action in addition to reception.

Sociocultural theories, especially those based on Vygotsky (1978), emphasize the importance of mediation in learning and imply that feedback can be used as a tool to foster higher order thinking abilities if it is properly scaffolded. According to this perspective, feedback is generative rather than merely corrective, assisting students in creating meaning together and creating strategic learning strategies (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Lee, 2017).

This is further developed in recent work by Jonsson (2013) and Winstone et al. (2017), who suggest that feedback procedures need to take student agency, motivation, and emotional response into consideration. A theoretical shift that represents the growing complexity and personalization of teaching and learning settings is the move from feedback *given* to feedback *used* (Evans, 2013; Han & Hyland, 2015; Boud & Dawson, 2021). To enhance performance, learners must not only hear feedback but also analyze, assess, and apply it.

Furthermore, frameworks like the Feedback Literacy Behavior Scale (e.g., Han & Xu, 2021; Molloy et al., 2013) and the EAT (Engage-Apply-Transfer) model (Dawson et al., 2019) provide theoretical scaffolds for evaluating and encouraging students' involvement with feedback. These models emphasize that feedback is an iterative, socially situated learning process rather than a one-time transmission. They are in line with the growing recognition that learners' emotional responses, past experiences, and long-term academic growth all influence feedback engagement (Nicol et al., 2014; Ajjawi et al., 2020; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Theoretical approaches in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) must take into consideration the distinct pedagogical, cultural, and linguistic elements that influence feedback practices and students' interactions with them. Due in large part to

sociocultural expectations, differing educational norms, and proficiency limitations, written corrective feedback (WCF) in L2 contexts elicits responses that differ significantly from native (L1) environments, according to seminal studies by Ferris (2003) and Hyland & Hyland (2006). These findings are supported by more recent study by Han and Hyland (2015), which demonstrates that EFL learners may misunderstand the purpose of feedback, especially if it is worded ambiguously or is interpreted as being unduly critical. This emphasizes the necessity of feedback methods that are dialogic, transparent, and learner informed. Furthermore, Lee (2017) and Bitchener & Ferris (2012) stress that learners frequently do not respond to written feedback effectively in the absence of formal feedback literacy instruction, which lessens the feedback's potential influence on writing growth.

In conclusion, constructivist, sociocultural, and metacognitive traditions are all incorporated into the theoretical framework supporting this research. Feedback is viewed as an iterative, situational, and transforming part of the learning process rather than as a final goal. This study adds to developing conversations about how to best give students the resources they need to interact meaningfully with feedback and improve their academic writing performance by defining feedback literacy as a teachable and assessable competency (Carless & Boud, 2018; Winstone & Carless, 2019).

2.2. Feedback in Language Education

Feedback serves as a formative, interactive, and strategic method for language development in addition to being an evaluative tool, making it a crucial component of language education. Feedback has several pedagogical uses in second language (L2) contexts, including shaping identity, fostering linguistic accuracy, encouraging learner autonomy, and scaffolding communicative competence. A more sophisticated approach is required for language education to address lexical, grammatical, and pragmatic development, in contrast to general education, where feedback frequently concentrates on conceptual understanding (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Ferris, 2003). Effective L2 teaching relies heavily on feedback because of its dual focus on form and meaning, which places it at the nexus of communication and instruction.

Behaviorist traditions have historically influenced language classroom feedback, especially in the grammar-translation and audio-lingual stages of language instruction.

Feedback in these methods was unidirectional and corrective, with a focus on mechanical drilling, mimicry, and error avoidance (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2007). These teaching methods were in line with the Skinnerian principles of reinforcement, which state that correct responses should be reinforced while erroneous ones should be eliminated. These frameworks provided limited possibilities for learner agency or meaningful engagement with language production, despite being successful in controlling classroom conduct and reinforcing distinct forms.

The role of feedback in L2 classrooms underwent a significant paradigm shift in the 1970s and 1980s with the move toward Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). According to CLT, feedback techniques have developed to promote meaning negotiation, fluency, and learner autonomy because language is seen as a means for genuine communication (Richards &

Rodgers, 2001; Hedge, 2000). Dialogic and formative feedback emerged as a result of this shift, shifting the emphasis from correction to supporting students' understanding, production, and application of strategies. Student-teacher conferences, revision cycles, and peer reviews have become more popular as cooperative and introspective feedback methods.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) is perhaps the most researched area within feedback in language education. WCF, which is defined as written comments by teachers intended to fix grammatical problems in student writing, has been closely examined for efficacy and educational value. While later research examined the long-term effects of both, Ferris (2003) was one of the first to distinguish between direct feedback which provides the proper form and indirect feedback which indicates the error without remedy. Both forms of WCF can aid in language development, according to meta-analyses, especially when it comes to rule-governed grammatical errors (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Li, 2010).

The advantages of correcting grammar in writing, however, are not universally acknowledged by academics. In his well-known critique of the technique, Truscott (1996) claimed that grammar correction was ineffectual and might even be harmful to language learning. A nuanced understanding that learner characteristics including skill, motivation, and feedback literacy modify the effectiveness of feedback emerged as a consequence of his claims, which sparked rigorous empirical investigation.

According to Ellis et al. (2008), feedback that is appropriate for a learner's interlanguage level is the most effective, demonstrating the importance of developmental readiness.

Additionally, oral corrective feedback (OCF) has been a major area of study for L2. Recasts, metalinguistic signals, clarification requests, elicitation, and explicit correction are all included in the well-known taxonomy of Lyster and Ranta (1997). The categories vary in terms of their degree of explicitness and instructional affordances. They discovered that explicit prompts, like elicitation, led to higher levels of uptake than implicit feedback, like recasts, in their study conducted in French immersion schools. These results were later supported by Ammar and Spada (2006), who demonstrated that learners with lower competence levels responded better to prompts.

Learner identity, power dynamics, and emotional reactions to feedback have received more attention as a result of the sociocultural approach in language instruction. Students might be less likely to challenge criticism or participate in dialogic negotiation in settings that prioritize teacher authority (Han & Hyland, 2015; Kıvrak, 2023). Classroom hierarchy, face-saving techniques, and cultural norms all influence how feedback is interpreted and incorporated. This implies that in order to promote students' self-assurance and autonomy, feedback needs to be emotionally encouraging and culturally sensitive.

Feedback distribution and interaction have been further revolutionized by technology-enhanced feedback. Feedback may be instantaneous, dialogic, and multimodal with tools like Turnitin, Moodle, and Google Docs. For instance, screencast feedback enables teachers to provide video explanations, which can promote learner comprehension and lessen ambiguity (Ene & Upton, 2018). Grammarly and other automated writing assessment programs give students immediate, rule-based feedback so they may make revisions in real time. Researchers warn that these tools should be used in addition to pedagogically based feedback mechanisms rather than in instead of them (Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Brick & Holmes, 2008).

The concept of feedback literacy has surfaced in recent years to emphasize the learner's responsibility for analyzing and responding to criticism. Carless and Boud (2018) define feedback literacy as the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that allow students to

use feedback in a productive way. This theoretical change is especially pertinent to language instruction, where linguistic and cultural mediation can cause learners' interpretations to diverge greatly from teachers' intentions. Research conducted in EFL contexts has demonstrated that, particularly in high stakes writing projects, students frequently misinterpret criticism that is overly oblique or emotionally blunt (Winstone et al., 2017; Sutton, 2012).

In sum, the landscape of feedback in language education is shaped by a convergence of pedagogical theories, cultural variables, instructional technologies, and learner engagement frameworks. While early paradigms emphasized correction and control, contemporary models advocate for a more collaborative, reflective, and learner-centered approach. As research continues to evolve, especially within diverse EFL contexts, the integration of feedback literacy development into writing instruction appears increasingly essential to maximize the impact of formative assessment practices.

2.3. Reconceptualizing Feedback

The transfer of correcting information from a knowledgeable source (often the instructor) to a passive recipient (the student) was the main conceptualization of feedback in its early forms. Using feedback as an external tool to guide learner behavior, this behaviorist-based model placed a strong emphasis on error correction and reinforcement (Sadler, 1989). These one-way methods have been criticized, nevertheless, for not encouraging active participation, self-control, or deeper learning. Because students frequently viewed feedback as judgmental, ambiguous, or unrelated to future development, the model's shortcomings were especially noticeable in higher education.

Due to these constraints, socio-constructivist feedback models which see students as active participants in the feedback process have become more popular in recent years. Effective feedback helps students bridge the gap between their present and desired performance through active engagement and internalization of criteria, which promotes self-regulated learning (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). By changing perspective, feedback is no longer seen as solely corrective but rather as a process that helps students build evaluative judgment, or the ability to judge the quality of both their own and other people's work.

As a result of this rethinking, feedback has been defined more broadly to incorporate relational and dialogic components. Students and teachers are increasingly viewing feedback as a communication tool that entails interpretation, negotiation, and joint meaning-making (Ajjawi & Boud, 2015). According to Winstone et al. (2017), feedback must be analyzed in terms of both delivery and "recipience," or how it is received, digested, and used. Instead, assuming that the instructor bears complete responsibility, the concept of dialogic feedback advocates shared accountability and ongoing interaction.

An additional significant change is acknowledging the emotional aspects of feedback. According to Rowe (2017), students' emotional reactions can range from motivation to defensiveness or anxiety can greatly influence how they interact with feedback. It is necessary to understand how tone, timing, and relational trust affect uptake to provide emotionally intelligent feedback. This has led to increased focus on feedback environments and interpersonal relationships that help students feel secure and encouraged throughout their educational journey.

The idea of feedback literacy, the ability of students to understand, react to, and utilize feedback to enhance their work, is also introduced by the rethinking of feedback. Four components make up feedback literacy, according to Carless and Boud (2018): valuing input, forming opinions, controlling emotions, and acting. Fostering feedback literacy entails preparing students to actively seek, assess, and apply feedback in addition to receiving it. This aligns with learnercentered pedagogies and centers the feedback process around the learner's agency.

Several theoretical frameworks have been developed to direct this rethink. For instance, Ajjawi et al. (2020) describe feedback as a series of encounters that facilitate the gradual development of evaluative judgment in their Feedback for Learning paradigm. In a similar vein, Carless and Boud (2018) stress how critical it is to cultivate feedback literacy to support students in responding to and engaging with criticism. These models emphasize that feedback is a dialogic, iterative process that promotes agency, application, and long-term learning outcomes rather than a one-time occurrence.

According to Nicol (2021), the idea of interior feedback is a last step in the reconceptualization of feedback. The term "inner feedback" describes the internal

assessments and comparisons that students make while completing tasks, such as contrasting their present output with earlier work, models, or expectations. By supporting their capacity to independently assess and modify their performance, which is a fundamental component of self-regulated learning, encouraging students to develop inner feedback fosters independence and deep learning (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2011).

2.4. Components of Effective Feedback

In EFL writing instruction, effective feedback is more than just corrective; it consists of several interrelated elements that work together to promote student learning, agency, and self-control. According to researchers in language education and assessment, feedback needs to be timely, precise, intelligible, actionable, and regarded as reliable by students to be effective (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). These core features are especially important in EFL contexts, where students are simultaneously grappling with linguistic accuracy, genre conventions, and intercultural communication expectations. In university English preparatory programs, where students' academic writing skills are still developing, the alignment between feedback and learning goals becomes central to enabling improvement.

Clarity and specificity are essential elements of good feedback. Students frequently ignore criticism because they find it ambiguous, inconsistent, or too general not because they don't want to be corrected (Ferris, 2003; Hyland, 2003). Students sometimes misunderstand abstract or coded comments like "unclear" or "develop this idea." This problem is especially severe when it comes to written feedback on academic writing. Ferris (2003) highlights the value of offering specific feedback along with examples or questions that encourage students to make meaningful revisions to their work in her empirical work with university ESL students. Hyland (2003) offers a similar argument, saying that targeted feedback should help students grasp academic discourse standards and focus on manageable difficulties.

Another well-established aspect of feedback quality is timing. Given that it occurs when the student's learning is still occurring in their memory, timely feedback has a higher chance of being successful (Black & Wiliam, 1998). Students are less likely to act upon or incorporate feedback into future work when it is given later than expected, such as weeks after submission or after marks are given (Wiliam, 2011). In EFL

academic writing, where iterative drafts and process-oriented learning are crucial, timely intervention supports students' ability to revise and understand the rationale behind corrections. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that electronic feedback modalities (such as screencast feedback and LMS comments) improve response speed and accessibility without sacrificing depth (Elola & Oskoz, 2016).

The attitude and tone used in feedback messages are equally important. According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), students frequently interpret instructor comments not only for their content but also for inferred assessments of the writer's skill or effort. Students are more likely to believe that feedback is intended to guide rather than punish when it is delivered in a positive, encouraging manner. Rowe (2017) conducted a study on the emotional responses of ESL students to feedback and discovered that retreat and demotivation were caused by remarks interpreted as critical or impersonal. This emphasizes how crucial it is to use dialogic cues, soften language, and hedge (for example, “Could you elaborate more on this?” instead of “This is unclear.”). Positive framing can enhance risk-taking with more sophisticated forms of expression and lessen language anxiety in EFL writing environments.

The feed-forward dimension is another crucial element; that is, feedback should help students perform better in the future in addition to addressing the current assignment (Sadler, 2010). This is especially crucial when it comes to improving academic writing over the course of a semester or academic year. Lee (2019) emphasizes in her longitudinal research that rather than just pointing out mistakes, students gain the most from comments that are strategy-oriented and forward-looking. By encouraging students to consider performance trends, feed-forward also promotes metacognitive awareness.

Scaffolding is a very important feature of successful feedback in EFL academic writing environments. According to Wood et al. (1976), scaffolding involves gradually adjusting feedback support to the learner's present level of competency and reducing it as the learner becomes more independent. To help students identify discrepancies between their drafts and target performance, feedback procedures may use guided questions, sample texts, or marginal comments. Scaffolding guarantees that learners are guided through little improvements rather than being overwhelmed by feedback for EFL beginners or intermediates, particularly those enrolled in preparatory programs. This strategy is in line with Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal

development (ZPD), which postulates that learning happens best when help is provided just above the learner's present level of independence.

Student uptake of feedback, which is the degree to which students comprehend, analyze, and act upon the feedback they receive, is closely related to scaffolding. Delivering feedback is not enough to make it effective; the learner must also process and use it (Carless & Boud, 2018). Winstone et al. (2017) present a taxonomy of recipience processes in their study on feedback engagement, highlighting the fact that student perception, delivery, and framing of feedback all affect uptake. For example, when feedback is too technical, poorly timed, or emotionally charged, uptake is compromised. Limited language ability increases this risk in EFL writing because it can make it more difficult to accurately grasp the feedback message. As a result, scholars emphasize the value of dialogic feedback, which raises the likelihood of significant uptake and change by offering possibilities for clarification, questioning, and discussion (Ajjawi & Boud, 2015).

A less tangible but equally significant factor in feedback effectiveness is trust. Students are more likely to engage with and apply feedback when they trust the teacher's intentions, expertise, and consistency (Price et al., 2010). Trust is particularly relevant in EFL writing classes where learners may feel vulnerable due to their language limitations and prior experiences with negative correction. Studies by Rowe (2017) and Carless (2006) highlight that relational trust supports risk-taking and deeper engagement with feedback, while mistrust—especially when feedback is perceived as punitive or disconnected from students' goals—results in disengagement. Moreover, cultural expectations surrounding teacher authority and student deference can complicate the dynamics of trust and receptiveness, especially in contexts like Turkey, where hierarchical norms in education are still prevalent (Yıldız, 2022).

The cultural and contextual factors influencing feedback effectiveness are especially pronounced in EFL settings. Research has shown that learners' interpretations of feedback are shaped by their educational backgrounds, cultural communication styles, and experiences with power dynamics in classrooms (Nelson & Carson, 1998). For instance, Turkish students may interpret direct criticism as a personal attack rather than constructive guidance, due to the indirect feedback norms embedded in the culture. This underscores the importance of context-sensitive feedback strategies, such as culturally mediated feedback (CMF), that align with students' expectations while still

pushing for growth (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Furthermore, as Hamp-Lyons (2006) argues, effective feedback should be situated within the broader sociolinguistic and academic norms that the learner is navigating not treated as a onesize-fits-all approach.

A final but often underemphasized component of effective feedback is its alignment with learner autonomy and self-regulated learning strategies. Rather than positioning feedback as a tool for teacher correction alone, contemporary perspectives advocate for feedback practices that build learners' ability to monitor, evaluate, and direct their own learning (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). This requires fostering metacognitive awareness through reflective prompts, self-assessment rubrics, and opportunities for students to generate internal feedback. In EFL writing classrooms, supporting autonomy is particularly important, as learners must transfer feedback informed improvements across writing genres and academic contexts. When feedback is delivered in ways that promote ownership such as allowing student-led revisions or self-commentaries on drafts it cultivates long-term writing development rather than one-off corrections.

In sum, effective feedback in EFL academic writing is multifaceted, involving clarity, timeliness, tone, feed-forward potential, scaffolding, emotional safety, contextual sensitivity, and alignment with learner autonomy. These elements are mutually reinforced rather than distinct. When implemented holistically, they enable feedback to act not only as a corrective mechanism, but as a core element of pedagogical dialogue and identity formation. As discussed in the literature, feedback tends to be more effective when it is viewed as a relational and developmental process rather than a purely corrective one. This perspective highlights the role of feedback in supporting learners' reflection and growing independence as academic writers in English.

2.5. Types of Feedback and Their Pedagogical Roles

Recognizing the educational functions of various types of feedback is essential for creating successful writing instruction, particularly in situations where students are still building their academic literacy. In this research, four categories of feedback (positive, constructive, suggestive, and corrective) were selected due to their unique cognitive and emotional roles and their significance in feedback literacy training. These types illustrate a range from supportive to directive replies while also capturing

different levels of directness and emotional resonance. When applied deliberately, they promote a vibrant feedback ecosystem that improves student involvement, metacognitive understanding, and writing effectiveness (Carless & Boud, 2018). The next part delves into each type thoroughly, examining their theoretical foundations, practical consequences, and functions in developing feedback literacy.

2.5.1. Positive Feedback

Positive feedback is crucial for the development of academic writing, yet it is frequently undervalued. Its primary purpose is to support good writing decisions including organization, tone, and clarity. According to Bandura (1997), positive feedback is a type of social reinforcement that boosts learners' motivation, self-esteem, and emotional involvement. Affirmational answers can lessen the emotional strain of writing and foster a positive learning environment, particularly for inexperienced or low-skilled writers. Because it links praise to writing techniques, research indicates that detailed and precise praise such as "Your transition between paragraphs is smooth and strengthens the argument" is more successful than general affirmation, like "Good job" (Lipnevich & Smith, 2009).

Positive feedback can serve as an example of successful writing in feedback literacy training, which helps students create their own internal standards, or "inner criteria" (Sadler, 1989). Students start internalizing the definition of quality when they receive explicit instruction on how to identify positive aspects of their own or their classmates' writing. In EFL environments, where students might not be familiar with academic genre rules, this method is especially helpful.

Additionally, it has been demonstrated that giving students balanced feedback that acknowledges their strengths makes them more open to receiving more critical criticism (Wiliam, 2011), which improves feedback uptake overall.

2.5.2. Constructive Feedback

Constructive feedback is defined as answers that point out areas that need work while providing doable recommendations for changes. It focuses on progress rather than insufficiency, which creates a balance between affirmational and remedial techniques. Constructive feedback is theoretically consistent with dialogic and socio-constructivist learning models, which prioritize learner agency and scaffolding (Vygotsky, 1978;

Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). In practical terms, this feedback might highlight a weakness in organization or clarity and provide a way forward, such as reordering points or clarifying terminology.

One of the main pedagogical roles of constructive feedback is its ability of constructive criticism to promote introspection and planning. Constructive feedback functions at the level of content development, coherence, and rhetorical effectiveness, in contrast to corrective feedback, which frequently focuses on superficial problems (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). It promotes what Carless and Boud (2018) refer to as the "making sense" part of feedback literacy, when students interact cognitively with the input and start solving problems. Additionally, constructive feedback plays a motivational role by communicating teacher investment in the learner's progress. It signals that errors are part of growth, not final judgments, and thus supports a growth-oriented classroom culture.

Empirical research demonstrates that students exhibit better revision quality and increased transfer to subsequent tasks when they are taught how to evaluate and respond upon constructive criticism (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Importantly, the tone of constructive criticism affects its quality: excessively critical language can demotivate pupils, whereas polite and cooperative language (e.g., "You might consider…") encourages participation and taking risks.

2.5.3. Suggestive Feedback

Suggestive feedback, sometimes referred to as advising or facilitative feedback, encourages students to think about other options without offering answers. It frequently appears as prompts, speculative recommendations, or peripheral inquiries (e.g., "Could you expand on this idea?" or "Is there a clearer way to express this?"). From an educational perspective, suggestive feedback encourages students to make decisions and cultivate rhetorical awareness by playing a role in cognitive apprenticeship (Hyland, 2003). It places students as decision-makers in their rewriting process and assumes that they are capable of self-regulation.

Suggestive feedback plays an important role in the development of feedback literacy. It improves pupils' capacity to assess alternatives, balance trade-offs, and make deliberate changes. Nicol (2010) asserts that this kind of feedback develops self-evaluative judgment, a skill that is useful outside of the classroom. Research indicates

that pupils who get constructive criticism make more in-depth edits than those who only receive directive input (Ferris, 2003). Additionally, learners are more likely to view suggestive feedback favorably due to its non-authoritative tone, particularly in situations where instructor authority is traditionally dominant.

2.5.4. Corrective Feedback

Feedback that points out and fixes mistakes in students' written work—usually in the areas of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, or syntax—is known as corrective feedback (CF). It might be indirect, pointing out the mistake and encouraging self-correction, or direct, giving the right form

(Ellis, 2009). In EFL writing, CF is essential for developing accuracy and stabilizing interlanguage, particularly for learners at lower proficiency levels who are still learning the fundamentals of academic English (Ferris, 2006). Corrective feedback is the most researched sort of feedback, especially when it comes to written corrective feedback (WCF). It has sparked a lot of discussion about its effectiveness, long-term effects, and proper use.

Corrective feedback has instructional relevance because it can promote linguistic precision, which is a prerequisite for academic communication. Focused CF, which targets certain linguistic elements like articles or verb tenses, has been shown to be more successful than unfocused CF, particularly over the long term (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). However, learners' feedback literacy specifically, their comprehension, processing, and application of corrections is crucial to efficacy. Students who get insufficient instruction in interpreting CF may choose to dismiss it or make superficial corrections without internalizing the underlying principles (Ashwell, 2000).

Corrective feedback mainly supports the action dimension from the perspective of feedback literacy, assisting students in putting modifications into practice and enhancing textual accuracy. However, CF needs to be administered carefully. Extensive, harsh corrections can overwhelm students and divert their focus from more important issues like content and structure (Lee, 2008). Students can therefore better understand errors in the context of their larger writing objectives by combining CF with other forms of feedback, especially constructive and suggestive input. Additionally, revision checklists and teacher-student conferences can help close the gap between identification and uptake and facilitate the internalization of CF.

2.5.5. Synthesizing the Pedagogical Roles of Feedback Types

Even though each form of feedback serves a different goal, when used in combination, they provide a more comprehensive pedagogical framework that supports authors' developmental requirements. Positive feedback serves as a basis for receptivity by fostering affective involvement and confidence. While suggestive feedback encourages independence and rhetorical freedom, constructive feedback expands on this by directing changes at the content and structure levels. Lastly, corrective feedback improves linguistic accuracy by addressing form-level problems. When combined, they offer a thorough framework that helps pupils on both an emotional and cognitive level (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Wiliam, 2011).

Learner attributes like confidence, feedback history, and competence level should also guide the use of various feedback forms. For instance, advanced learners might use suggestive and indirect CF more than low-confidence learners, who might benefit more from a positive-constructive combination. Moreover, learners' ability to understand and respond to feedback determines how effective each type is, which is why pedagogically crucial explicit feedback literacy training is (Carless & Boud, 2018). Students' capacity to use feedback purposefully is improved when they are encouraged to differentiate between different forms of feedback, discuss their objectives, and practice using them.

Teachers also need to be aware of the emotional burden that feedback carries. Although giving constructive and corrective criticism is crucial for development, it must be balanced by positive statements and presented as a step in the process of improvement. Several studies confirm that feedback is fair, courteous, and placed in a supportive environment, they are more likely to implement it (Jonsson & Panadero, 2018). Therefore, it is not only a question of methodology but also of ethics and equality in pedagogy to balance these four feedback forms within a coherent plan.

In summary, the four core feedback types explored in this study (positive, constructive, suggestive, and corrective) offer complementary pedagogical functions that extend beyond surface correction to support holistic writing development. When used purposefully and accompanied by feedback literacy training, they equip learners not only to revise specific drafts but to become self-regulated writers who understand, evaluate, and use feedback autonomously. In this way, feedback ceases to be a

unidirectional transmission of teacher authority and becomes a dynamic, co-constructed process. The success of such an approach depends on both teacher expertise and student feedback literacy, reinforcing the need for explicit instruction in how to interpret, evaluate, and act upon feedback in university-level writing courses.

2.6. Feedback Literacy: Definitions and Dimensions

The idea of feedback literacy has been more and more popular in the last ten years as researchers and professionals have worked to rethink feedback as a learned student skill rather than just an educational tool. Feedback was traditionally presented as teacher-generated material intended to correct student mistakes (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), frequently delivered following task completion. Modern models, however, place more emphasis on the learner's responsibility for understanding, interacting with, and applying feedback as a cognitive and social tool. Therefore, feedback literacy is a change from feedback as transmission to feedback as development and interaction (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Feedback literacy is a fundamental skill that supports independent learning, effective revision, and long-term writing development in the context of academic writing, particularly for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners.

Sutton (2012), who first used the phrase "feedback literacy," maintained that understanding feedback involves not just cognitive processing but also feelings and identity-related factors. Three components were included in this early definition of feedback literacy: knowing (knowing what feedback is), being (having the attitude to interact with feedback), and acting (successfully implementing it). Sutton's methodology challenged technocratic perspectives that restrict feedback to a delivery mechanism by emphasizing its comprehensive, humanistic aspects. This triadic perspective paved the way for later, more sophisticated frameworks, especially when it came to writing assessment and higher education.

Carless and Boud's (2018) operational model is the most influential to date. They define feedback literacy as the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to interpret information and apply it to improve work or learning techniques. This framework involves: (1) appreciating feedback, (2) making judgments, (3) managing affect, and (4) taking action. Theoretical and empirical work frequently references these elements, which offer a framework for comprehending the development, assessment, and

instruction of feedback literacy. The contextual, cultural, and linguistic factors that influence feedback engagement in multilingual or EFL contexts may not be adequately addressed by Carless and Boud's (2018) model, even though it has a solid theoretical base (Han & Xu, 2021; Molloy, Boud, & Henderson, 2020; To & Carless, 2016).

Each one of the four dimensions provides information about a distinct area of student development. Recognizing that criticism is a chance for improvement rather than a form of punishment is known as appreciating it. Appreciating feedback is to acknowledge that it is a chance for personal development rather than a form of punishment. This factor is consistent with the research on feedback receptivity, which emphasizes students' views about learning and emotional preparedness (Naomi et al., 2017). Learners frequently react defensively or anxiously to feedback in many EFL circumstances, especially when language problems are misconstrued as intellectual inadequacies (Han & Gao, 2021). Encouraging students to reframe feedback as a collaborative learning opportunity is therefore essential for literacy development.

The second dimension, making judgments, addresses the growth of students' evaluative abilities, or their capacity to assess the quality of their work by comparing it to models or criteria. This skill is thought to be crucial for long-term academic progress and is strongly related to peer and self-evaluation procedures (Tai et al., 2018). Rubric analysis, collaborative revision exercises, and exemplars are frequently used in writing teaching to assist students in developing their judgment. These techniques help students from diverse educational backgrounds understand academic writing genres that they might not be familiar with, while also fostering feedback literacy in EFL contexts (To & Carless, 2016; Akbarzadeh, Saeidi & Chehreh, 2014).

The third element, managing affect, deals with how pupils feel about feedback, including both critical and positive comments. Whether input is embraced, disregarded, or resisted depends on affective reactions (Ryan & Henderson, 2018). Cultural traditions surrounding teacher authority and face-saving make instructor feedback even more stressful for many EFL students. The affective dimension is especially important in high-power-distance or collectivist cultures, like Turkey, because of this dynamic. Researchers stress the value of establishing trust and making intentions clear to prevent comments from being misconstrued as personal criticism instead as expert advice (To & Carless, 2016).

Taking action, the last aspect of feedback literacy, describes how students react to and apply criticism to enhance their performance in the future. It encompasses both short-term revision behavior and long-term strategy building, such as self-monitoring, goal setting, and regulation. Due to linguistic difficulties and a lack of metacognitive awareness, this feature is frequently underdeveloped even though it is a crucial sign of successful feedback literacy, particularly among EFL learners (Zheng, Yu, & Liu, 2020). Studies have indicated that even when students comprehend instructor comments conceptually, they might not know how to apply them successfully until they are provided with structured opportunities to do so (Chong, 2022). This gap between comprehension and application is especially noticeable when students lack confidence in their language skills or when feedback is vague. In these situations, scaffolding tools such as annotated checklists, feedback-action planning sheets, revision logs, and peerdialogue protocols can encourage more deliberate use of feedback and improve the transparency and manageability of the application process (Winstone et al., 2017; Jonsson & Panadero, 2018). In addition to promoting student autonomy, these resources foster a feedback-friendly atmosphere where acting is seen as a natural next step in academic practice rather than a taxing duty. It has been demonstrated that incorporating these techniques into regular classroom activities improves long-term writing outcomes, revision quality, and uptake for EFL students (Chong, 2022; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Expanding Beyond the Core Model: Responsive and Contextual Feedback Literacy

Although the four-dimension framework developed by Carless and Boud (2018) is still widely used, a few academics have argued for a more dynamic and context-sensitive description of feedback literacy. For example, Molloy, Boud, and Henderson (2020) propose a responsive model that sees feedback literacy as a relational and developing skill that is co-constructed through interactions with peers, teachers, and institutional structures rather than as a fixed set of traits. With this paradigm, the focus is shifted from individual competency to feedback as an emergent practice that is influenced by power relations, emotional trust, and assessment design.

This relational perspective is particularly crucial in multilingual classrooms because feedback frequently reflects on linguistic and cultural differences.

The focus on self-regulated learning (SRL) by Nicol and Macfarlane Dick (2006) offers yet another improvement. They suggest that feedback plays an important role in supporting students' metacognitive processes, including observing, assessing, and revising their own work. This view enhances the "taking action" factor by incorporating feedback into planning and goal-setting techniques. Students are encouraged to understand feedback concepts and use them on their own overtime through SRL-based feedback literacy. Research conducted in L2 writing contexts has demonstrated that students who are taught to evaluate themselves using rubrics and exemplars exhibit increased independence when it comes to peer criticism and writing revision (Panadero, Jonsson, & Botella, 2017).

Research highlights that feedback literacy is teachable from an educational perspective.

Winstone, Nash, Rowntree, and Parker (2017) created the DEFT (Developing Engagement with Feedback Toolkit), which consists of useful exercises including interpreting feedback, coordinating with rubrics, and predicting teacher remarks. These techniques help students transition from being passive recipients of feedback to active processors of it, a process they refer to as "recipience processes." Such scaffolding is especially helpful in EFL environments, where students frequently have trouble understanding the language and purpose of feedback. Research by Carless and Winstone (2016) shows that even among first-year undergraduates, structured feedback literacy workshops that include peer discussion, guided reflection, and exemplars can greatly improve students' confidence, engagement, and revision performance.

Students' language skills, fear of making mistakes, and respect for teacher authority are often the main barriers to feedback literacy in EFL writing classes. Research from a variety of settings, such as the Gulf (Mahfoodh, 2017), China (Han & Gao, 2021), and Turkey (To & Carless, 2016), shows that students frequently find it difficult to understand feedback because of imprecise wording, strange academic jargon, or a misinterpretation of the teacher's intentions. Feedback literacy training has been used in several intervention studies to address this issue. This training helps students decode feedback, ask clarifying questions, and practice revisions using structured reflection journals, sentence-level revising templates, and exemplars (Winstone et al., 2017; Han & Gao, 2021). These interventions regularly increase students' confidence in handling

feedback, leading to better revisions and stronger engagement with instructor remarks. This is especially true when implemented throughout several writing cycles.

Taken together, the literature suggests that feedback literacy is a multi-dimensional, teachable, and measurable construct. While early models focused on understanding and acting upon feedback, newer frameworks emphasize emotional regulation, contextual awareness, and the sociocultural dynamics of feedback engagement. These insights are especially pertinent in EFL academic writing settings, where feedback is both a linguistic and pedagogical challenge. To foster feedback literacy, educators must go beyond providing comments. They must explicitly teach students how to interpret, respond to, and benefit from feedback across writing cycles. This shift from feedback delivery to feedback learning transforms the role of the teacher from evaluator to facilitator, and the student from passive recipient to active agent in their own development.

2.7. Teaching Feedback Literacy in Writing Instruction

Despite being a well-established part of teaching writing, feedback alone does not guarantee that students will make progress. According to recent pedagogical changes, students' ability to utilize feedback effectively is just as important as the quality of the feedback provided (Carless & Boud, 2018). In the writing classroom, this shift from feedback delivery to feedback literacy highlights the necessity of incorporating instructional strategies that enhance students' ability to comprehend, analyze, and use feedback. In this context, feedback literacy refers to students' capacity to regulate their emotions, take constructive action, evaluate their work critically, and value criticism (Molloy et al., 2020). Writing instruction thus becomes a powerful site for teaching feedback literacy as an essential component of academic competence.

2.7.1. Pedagogical Foundations: Theoretical Models of Feedback Literacy in Writing

The foundation of feedback literacy lies in socio-constructivist perspectives on education, which hold that knowledge is co-constructed by discussion, reflection, and engagement (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Carless and Boud (2018) offer a four-dimensional paradigm that encompasses appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. These characteristics align well with writing

pedagogy, which frequently involves interpretive, emotive, and iterative feedback. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) offer yet another well-known theory that connects self-regulated learning and feedback. They argue that since goal setting, monitoring, and strategy adaptation are all essential to the growth of writing, good feedback should encourage these metacognitive processes.

When it comes to writing education, these models all agree that feedback should be used as a pedagogical instrument to foster academic identity, autonomy, and self-awareness rather than just as a means of correction. Embedding feedback as an interactive, formative, and developmental process is necessary to incorporate feedback literacy into writing education.

2.7.2. Designing Writing Curricula that Build Feedback Literacy

A process-based paradigm that stresses writing as an iterative, dialogic, and progressive practice is necessary for curriculum designers to move above conventional product-oriented approaches and include feedback literacy into writing teaching in a meaningful way (Hyland, 2003; Boud & Molloy, 2013). Several drafting chances, organized revision phases, and feedback loops are prioritized in such a curriculum in order to enhance students' writing abilities as well as their metacognitive awareness of feedback as a teaching tool.

Decoding feedback language, differentiating between superficial corrections and content-focused remarks, and connecting feedback to rubric criteria should all be part of early education at the fundamental level. Research has indicated that students' comprehension and application of feedback significantly improve when they receive clear guidance on how to evaluate rubrics (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). Additionally, students can better contextualize their own writing within academic norms and internalize quality standards by being shown annotated exemplars and encouraged to engage in comparison analysis (Handley & Williams, 2011; Carless & Chan, 2017).

As students improve, the design of the curriculum should gradually move toward student agency by include exercises like self-evaluation, peer review, and rationalizing revision decisions. These methods are in line with the formative assessment paradigm developed by Nicol and MacfarlaneDick (2006), which presents feedback as a framework for self-regulated learning. This type of staged scaffolding improves students' writing and feedback skills by assisting them in moving from depending on

instructor input to independent feedback engagement (Jonsson, 2013; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Incorporating feedback literacy explicitly into learning outcomes and course objectives is another essential design component. Students are more likely to consider feedback as a learning tool rather than as a means of passing judgment when they are informed that critical engagement, responsiveness, and feedback interpretation are assessable competencies (Henderson et al., 2019). Feedback literacy is positioned as a primary component of academic writing training rather than an auxiliary skill thanks to this deliberate structuring.

Additionally, the writing program can be made consistent and progressive by using curriculum mapping, which methodically outlines where and how feedback literacy is taught and reinforced throughout courses (Nash & Winstone, 2017). For example, while upper-level courses stress creating and implementing feedback through group writing assignments, first-year writing courses may concentrate on comprehending feedback. This long-term strategy encourages the growth of sustainable feedback practices, which are defined by Boud and Molloy (2013) as methods that enable students to handle and absorb feedback on their own outside of the classroom.

In sum, designing a writing curriculum that builds feedback literacy involves a multi-layered strategy: embedding explicit instruction, aligning tasks with cognitive development, integrating peer/self-review mechanisms, and reflecting feedback goals in assessment and course outcomes. These curricular elements work in tandem to develop students' abilities not only to improve their writing but to engage with feedback as reflective, proactive learners.

2.7.3. Instructional Strategies: Scaffolding Feedback as a Learning Process

Students' perceptions and interactions with feedback are greatly influenced by the design of the assessment. Feedback frequently becomes an afterthought, something that is received too late to be taken into consideration, when assessments are presented only as summative judgments. A feedback-rich assessment approach, on the other hand, allows students to interact with feedback prior to the final evaluation, emphasizing learning and progress. In the context of writing teaching, this entails designing tasks to include several drafts, focused feedback sessions, and chances for modification before grading (Carless & Boud, 2018).

The alignment of work objectives, feedback methods, and assessment criteria is one important principle. Research has indicated that students develop stronger evaluative judgment and clearer expectations when they are clearly taught how to apply grading rubrics and compare their work against exemplars (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013; Jonsson & Panadero, 2018). This alignment fosters a sense of justice and encourages them to participate by assisting them in understanding comments within an open framework.

Furthermore, integrating feedback uptake into grading is another way that assessment design can actively promote feedback literacy. Feedback utilization is integrated into the learning process through techniques including "feedback-informed resubmissions," annotated revisions, and feedback response diaries (Boud & Molloy, 2013). Students are encouraged by these designs to consider feedback, defend their edits, and exercise agency in their responses. These methods turn feedback into a collaborative learning process rather than a teacher-driven correction.

Another important dimension is emotional safety. According to Winstone and Boud (2020), students are more inclined to interact with comments when they believe that evaluation procedures are constructive rather than punitive. Particularly early in the course, low-stakes formative assignments let students experiment with changes and writing techniques without worrying about failing. This lessens defensiveness and increases resilience in handling criticism, which is a crucial aspect of feedback literacy.

In sum, well-designed assessments serve not only to evaluate student work but also to scaffold their capacity to interpret, apply, and benefit from feedback over time. For writing instructors aiming to foster feedback literacy, assessment must be seen not as an endpoint, but as a vehicle for continuous engagement.

2.7.4. Reflective and Metacognitive Practices

Fostering students' reflective and metacognitive skills is closely linked to developing feedback literacy in writing teaching. Feedback is more than just a final output; it's a mental and emotional process that calls on students to analyze, assess, and use data to make their work better. Reflective practices allow students to internalize feedback and use it as a tool for long-term development rather than as a means of isolated correction by providing a link between instructor comments and student action (Boud & Soler, 2016). Reflection helps students understand their development, detect patterns in their

mistakes, and express their changing objectives as writers— skills essential to academic maturity and self-directed learning.

A commonly used method for encouraging reflective participation is the usage of revision notebooks or feedback response logs. With the assistance of these tools, students must reply to instructor comments by summarizing their understanding, outlining their plans of action, and considering why particular adjustments are necessary. The "taking action" component of feedback literacy is strengthened by this metacognitive process, which challenges students to consider the significance and intent of feedback before acting upon it (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Additionally, by giving teachers insight into how pupils understand remarks, these tactics enable more individualized follow-up and assistance.

Another effective metacognitive strategy is guided self-assessment. Teachers foster the development of evaluative judgment and autonomy by teaching students to compare their own drafts to exemplars or rubrics (Panadero et al., 2017). Students become less reliant on teacher input as they get better at predicting the kinds of feedback they might get. This proactive approach is consistent with what Winstone et al. (2017) refer to as "feedback recipience," which is the active role that learners play in analyzing and using feedback. Regular self-assessment practices help students feel more in charge of their education, which is crucial for developing a growth-oriented academic identity.

Emotionally grounded reflection is equally important in fostering feedback literacy. Receiving critical feedback can cause learners to feel discouraged, embarrassed, or resistant, especially when it involves writing and personal expression. Encouragement of students to write letters to themselves in the future or to talk about their feelings in response to criticism normalizes these experiences and creates opportunities for emotional development (Henderson et al., 2019).

Teachers can also serve as role models for reflective skills by expressing the emotional work that goes into editing one's own work and by describing how they provide feedback. These exercises foster a culture of positive feedback, sensitivity, and self-awareness.

Teachers should create reflection exercises with explicit goals and support to guarantee that reflection results in greater learning. Open-ended questions like "What did you

find most helpful in the feedback?" or "How will your next draft be impacted by this comment?" focus attention on metacognitive objectives. Students take these prompts more seriously when they are linked to participation or grades, and reflection stops being an optional extra and starts to become a regular component of the writing process. Integrating these reflective tools into the curriculum lets students know that responding to criticism is just as important as writing (Carless & Boud, 2018).

This section emphasized that teaching feedback literacy in writing instruction requires intentional curriculum design, formative assessment practices, and reflective scaffolding. Rather than treating feedback as a unidirectional comment, it must be embedded into the pedagogical architecture of writing development. By foregrounding feedback as a learnable process— supported through exemplars, peer review, metacognition, and emotionally supportive assessment—educators can help learners become autonomous and strategic writers. This foundation sets the stage for examining how such instructional efforts influence measurable improvements in writing performance.

2.8. Feedback Literacy and Writing Performance

The growing interest in feedback literacy has marked a shift from perceiving feedback merely as an instructional tool to understanding it as a central component of learning performance, especially in writing. Writing is not just a product-based activity but a process-oriented skill where students must understand, evaluate, and integrate feedback effectively across multiple drafting stages. Feedback literacy, encompassing the ability to appreciate, interpret, and act on feedback, has been increasingly recognized as a predictor of meaningful revision, improved text quality, and greater academic success. As higher education institutions place more emphasis on formative assessment and learner autonomy, exploring how feedback literacy enhances writing performance becomes critical for designing effective pedagogies and curricula.

2.8.1. Empirical Evidence Linking Feedback Literacy and Writing Gains

Research continuously shows that improving students' feedback literacy results in measurable improvements in academic writing. Feedback-literate students analyze, consider, and respond to criticism in ways that improve their writing rather than viewing it as unchanging facts. According to Winstone, Nash, Rowntree, and Parker

(2017), students who received feedback interpretation training improved their ability to self-evaluate as well as their ability to make more effective adjustments.

This connection between feedback literacy and writing improvements is further supported by scaffolded treatments. Students given reflective assignments, like peer discussions, self-evaluations, and feedback journals, were better able to incorporate criticism into their later versions (Carless & Boud, 2018). These students took charge of revising techniques rather than seeing feedback as a must, which resulted in texts that were more cohesive and persuasive.

This body of research was strengthened by Molloy, Boud, and Henderson (2020), who showed that students who are feedback-literate make more thorough and prolonged edits over several drafts. These students addressed higher-order writing issues, like rhetorical tone, audience awareness, and logical flow, through peer discussion and structured reflection, which is indicative of better writing performance. Importantly, their improvements continued beyond particular tasks, demonstrating the cumulative effect of feedback literacy on writing growth.

Carless and Winstone (2020) have also highlighted the importance that teacher feedback literacy plays in promoting these objectives. Their conceptual framework identifies critical teacher competences that are necessary to support students' feedback literacy and performance, including creating learning settings that are conducive to feedback, encouraging dialogic feedback practices, and putting formative teaching tactics into practice. These skills are essential for facilitating feedback that is useful, significant, and focused on the development of the learner.

Overall, the empirical record is clear: feedback literacy is a critical mechanism through which feedback transforms student writing. By fostering learners' ability to understand, evaluate, and apply feedback, educators can cultivate deeper revision strategies, improved argumentation, better text coherence, and more confident writer identities. Embedding feedback literacy—not just feedback delivery—into writing instruction is therefore essential for achieving meaningful and sustainable academic writing development.

2.8.2. Affective Engagement and Motivation in Writing

Although cognitive and behavioral skills have historically been the focus of feedback literacy, affective involvement is just as important in influencing how students receive

and use feedback in their writing. If criticism is interpreted as being too personal or critical, emotional reactions like defensiveness, annoyance, or fear can serve as obstacles to learning. On the other hand, pupils who view criticism as encouraging and helpful are more likely to persist, make significant revisions, and improve. Nash and Winstone (2017) stress that students are more likely to approach feedback with a sense of partnership rather than judgment when teachers and students take responsibility for it.

Motivation also possesses a significant role in students' engagement with feedback. Self-determination theory makes a distinction between extrinsic motivation, which is primarily focused on grades or instructor acceptance, and intrinsic motivation, which is motivated by a desire to learn and improve. Ryan and Deci (2020) claim that while extrinsically motivated students might just make surface-level adjustments, intrinsically motivated students are more likely to use feedback to improve their writing abilities holistically. Incorporating feedback literacy education into a growth-oriented classroom atmosphere helps students move toward intrinsic goals, which increases the possibility of meaningful and in-depth changes.

The idea of self-efficacy, or students' confidence in their capacity to successfully act upon feedback, is closely related to motivation. While students with low self-efficacy may engage in avoidance or demotivation behaviors, those with high self-efficacy are more likely to see critical comments as constructive and manageable (Bandura, 1997). It has been demonstrated that instructional strategies that emphasize effort over result, model the use of feedback, and promote incremental development increase self-efficacy, resulting in a positive feedback loop and an improvement in writing performance.

Finally, learner agency—the capacity to make independent, calculated decisions based on feedback—is closely linked to affective engagement. Feedback-literate students exercise agency by choosing what they want to change, how they want to change it, and when they want clarification. Fostering agency can transform feedback from a one-sided transmission of teacher authority into a dialogic and empowering process, according to Carless and Boud (2018). Agency enables students to reinterpret feedback as a tool for personal development and academic ownership.

2.8.3. Feedback Literacy and Revision Depth

One of the most powerful indicators of feedback literacy is the depth and quality of student revisions. Students may miss more significant chances for growth if they only fix minor mistakes like spelling, grammar, or punctuation. Students who are feedback-literate, on the other hand, make more thorough revisions that involve reorganizing arguments, improving clarity, and bolstering coherence. Liu and Carless (2006) emphasized that peer feedback encourages students to critically evaluate both their own and their peers' writing when it is provided in a supportive and encouraging setting. These relational elements of feedback create an environment where students are encouraged to focus on content-level, more significant adjustments rather than just aesthetic ones.

Before revision starts, feedback literacy also promotes organized planning and metacognitive awareness. Students with a strong understanding of how to analyze and use feedback frequently strategically manage the feedback process by using planning tools, revision checklists, and personal learning objectives. These students demonstrate intentional engagement, according to Nicol (2020), by choosing revision priorities depending on the significance of the feedback, such as strengthening thesis statements, boosting paragraph transitions, or improving the argument flow. This reflective approach transforms revision from a reactive task to a guided and intentional process.

Technological tools can further support revision depth when combined with feedback literacy instruction. Students can see how their work has changed over drafts thanks to version-control platforms and feedback mapping tools. Such technologies enable students to tag comments from peers or teachers, associate them with particular alterations, and consider the results of their modifications (Winstone & Carless,2019). This iterative and transparent revision environment fosters self-regulated learning and provides tangible evidence of writing development over time.

Research indicates that students with a high level of feedback literacy regularly generate more thorough and comprehensive changes. Instead of passively reacting to criticism, students assess it critically in light of the assignment's objectives, create a revision action plan, and provide thoughtful commentary to support their choices. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) argue that these kinds of exercises foster a more

profound understanding of genre, a more robust sense of author identity, and enhanced capacity for self-regulated learning, all of which support the long term growth of academic writing.

2.8.4. Conclusion: From Literacy to Performance

The correlation between writing performance and feedback literacy demonstrates the transforming power of feedback in academic improvement. When students are able to understand, consider, and act upon feedback, they start to view it as a tool for academic improvement and personal development rather than as criticism. Carless and Winstone (2020) claim that improved learning outcomes and increased engagement are facilitated by the growth of feedback literacy in both teachers and students. Students take the initiative to revise their texts, show growth in structure, coherence, and logic, and gain confidence when replying to criticism. In this sense, feedback literacy acts as a foundation for lifelong learning and reflective writing practices.

Significantly, studies demonstrate that students' active participation in the feedback process is inextricably linked to their ability to write well. Winstone et al. (2017) stress that students need to be taught how to seek, analyze, and utilize criticism in real-world writing situations; just giving them comments is not enough. This means making feedback literacy a primary educational objective rather than a supplementary skill in curriculum design. By teaching students how to analyze model texts, understand rubrics, and participate in peer and self-evaluation, instructors who use this method help students develop mental habits that promote long-term writing progress.

Additionally, students' autonomy and academic agencies are improved when feedback literacy development is included in teaching practices. Students are taught to see themselves as active participants in the feedback discussion rather than as passive recipients of teacher advice.

Feedback needs to be rethought as a dialogic and developmental process, according to Boud and Molloy (2013), where students respond critically and creatively to remarks, evaluate their own development, and map out their own learning paths. This reinterpretation places feedback as a continuing, iterative component of the writing process rather than just a response to a particular assignment.

In sum, feedback literacy serves as an essential link between measurable writing improvements and instructional feedback. It includes behavioral, cognitive, and

emotive components that complement one another to promote significant revision and writer development. Teachers enable students to become self-regulated writers who can apply their talents in a variety of contexts and disciplines by cultivating these competences in their pupils. Structured, continuous feedback literacy training must be emphasized in future writing curricula that strive for long term proficiency as a fundamental part of writing education.

2.9. Feedback Literacy Studies in EFL Contexts

The construct of feedback literacy has recently gained systematic attention in EFL research, particularly within Turkish higher education. While a large portion of the previous research on feedback in EFL contexts concentrated on student perceptions of feedback, teacher practices, and types of corrective feedback, the idea of feedback literacy moves the focus to students' capacity to comprehend, interpret, and act upon feedback in ways that improve learning. (Carless & Boud, 2018) This is especially important in EFL contexts like Turkiye, where students mostly rely on the organized, teacher-led feedback they receive in official educational settings and have little exposure to English outside of the classroom. This section summarizes four recent studies that provide insight into how feedback literacy appears in EFL higher education settings and why targeted interventions are necessary. These studies include two large-scale validation studies of adapted feedback literacy scales, a cross-cultural scale validation that included Turkiye, and a qualitative investigation into enhancing and impeding factors.

Özdemir-Yılmazer and Kabadayı (2024) represents systematic efforts to adapt an established feedback literacy measurement tool to the Turkish higher education context in their study. The authors ensured cultural and language appropriateness by localizing the Student Feedback Literacy Scale through rigorous translation, back-translation, and expert review procedures. A wide sample of university students from various faculties, including those enrolled in English medium programs, participated in the survey. The validation method confirmed a multifaceted factor structure that closely resembles Carless and Boud's (2018) theoretical model of feedback literacy. These elements include the ability to form judgments, manage affect, take action, and appreciate feedback. Crucially, the authors discovered that although most students acknowledged the need for feedback, they performed noticeably worse on the "taking

action" dimension. This implies that Turkish EFL students could value criticism conceptually but find it difficult to apply it to specific revision techniques, especially when writing assignments requiring the interaction of linguistic proficiency and self-control. These results closely relate to the topic of the current study since they emphasize the necessity of educational strategies that actively foster students' agentic involvement with feedback in addition to increasing awareness.

Similarly, Yıldız, Bozpolat, and Hazar (2022) worked to validate a feedback literacy assessment tool for the Turkish higher education population. Despite being multifaceted as well, their version focused on four elements: appreciation, positive attitude, awareness of effective feedback, and openness to using feedback. The sample included students from education faculties, many of whom were enrolled in foreign language education programs. Results indicated that students' affective dispositions toward feedback, particularly openness, were highly predictive of their likelihood of responding to the remarks in a meaningful way. However, awareness of what constitutes “effective feedback” was less developed, particularly among those in earlier years of study. This suggests a lack of metacognitive training, as pupils may emotionally react favorably to criticism but lack the critical thinking abilities to distinguish between information that is actionable and that is not. For EFL writing instruction, this gap can result in superficial revisions that fail to address higher-order concerns such as argumentation, cohesion, and audience awareness. By identifying this pattern, the study reinforces the need for feedback literacy instruction to integrate explicit modeling of effective feedback characteristics alongside strategy training.

Kara (2021)'s qualitative research provides a richer, context-rich knowledge of what helps or inhibits Turkish university students' development of feedback literacy, whereas the previous two studies used quantitative survey methodologies. Kara discovered a number of enhancing elements, including timely and dialogic feedback, opportunities for peer review, and teacher facilitation of reflective practices, based on semi-structured interviews with participants from a variety of fields, including English language instruction. On the other hand, obstacles included comments that were too critical or ambiguous, little possibilities for follow-up, and unclear input regarding its intended use. Significantly, participants stated that linguistic criticism was frequently given precedence over content and organization in EFL writing environments, which hindered their development as independent writers. Kara’s findings underscore that

feedback literacy is shaped not only by the presence of feedback but also by the surrounding pedagogical culture. This aligns with the rationale for the present study, which seeks to intervene in this culture by systematically developing students' abilities to interpret and act upon feedback in a constructive, self-regulated manner.

Even though Woitt et al. (2025) studied a number of countries, Turkiye was one of the participating contexts, which makes it relevant to comprehending feedback literacy from a comparative standpoint. A feedback literacy scale was created and validated in this study to assess students' attitudes and actions in various cultural contexts. The Turkish subsample gave valuable information about how local pupils follow or deviate from global trends. Findings indicated that Turkish students scored comparably high on appreciation and affective engagement dimensions but relatively lower on proactive behaviors such as feedback-seeking and iterative revision. According to the authors, this can be the result of exam-focused educational culture and hierarchical classroom norms, where pupils are used to passively taking comments rather than bringing it up for discussion. From an EFL writing standpoint, this passivity can limit opportunities for students to clarify misunderstandings, negotiate meaning, and refine drafts through multiple cycles of feedback application. The cross-cultural lens of this study supports the argument that developing feedback literacy in Turkiye requires not only skill building but also shifts in classroom interaction norms.

The rationale for the present study, therefore, is grounded in both the empirical gaps and pedagogical needs identified in this body of research. While recent scholarship has advanced our understanding of how Turkish students perceive and respond to feedback, there is a lack of intervention studies that explicitly aim to enhance feedback literacy within the EFL writing classroom. By designing and implementing a targeted training program that addresses all dimensions of feedback literacy the present study seeks to bridge this gap.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, context, participants, instruments, procedures, data collection, and analysis methods employed in this study. It explains the rationale for adopting a mixed-method, quasi-experimental approach to investigate what kinds of effects that explicit feedback literacy training has on university EFL students' writing performance. The intervention process, the instruments used to measure changes in feedback literacy level and writing ability, and the procedures to collect both quantitative and qualitative data are detailed in this chapter. Finally, it outlines the analytical techniques applied to interpret the data, ensuring methodological rigor and alignment with the study's research questions.

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design with a pre-test/post-test structure. It integrated both quantitative and qualitative approaches to explore the development of students' feedback literacy in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. The rationale behind preferring this design is its capacity to capture not only measurable changes in students' feedback literacy levels but the depth of their lived experiences in engaging with feedback as well (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018; Dörnyei, 2007).

The statistical evidence yielded statistical evidence of changes in feedback literacy levels. These quantitative components are consisted of weekly writing tasks graded out of 100 and the Feedback Literacy Scale adapted from Yıldız et al. (2022). The improvements or decreases in the four aspects of feedback literacy: appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action were notable because of implementing the scale (Carless & Boud, 2018).

The qualitative component gathered through semi-structured interviews provided with deep knowledge of how learners perceived, internalized, and acted upon feedback over

time. The integration of both methods enabled methodological triangulation as well as enhancing the validity of findings (Fetters et al., 2013).

The intervention combined academic writing instruction with explicit feedback literacy training over a six-week period. In addition to completing weekly writing tasks in various genres, students were also engaged in structured activities particularly tailored to develop their skills in interpreting and applying feedback effectively. This approach follows the principles of Carless and Boud's (2018) feedback literacy framework, in which feedback is not seen as a one-way delivery of comments but as an active, dialogic process embracing both the teacher and learner.

3.2. Research Context

The study was conducted in the Department of Foreign Languages at Istinye University, a higher education institution where English is taught as a foreign language to students from diverse academic disciplines. The EFL program is compulsory for all first-year students who could not pass the ISTEP held at the beginning of the semester (which is a test of English proficiency including tree respective parts: listening, reading, and writing) and focuses on developing the four core language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Writing is taught as a separate course with a strong emphasis on academic genres and argumentation, preparing students for the types of written work required in their future university studies.

Classes meet 5 days a week for a total of 15 hours, with sessions-sessions last 60 minutes- held in traditional classrooms. The class in which this study took place followed the institution's standardized writing curriculum, which prescribes the genres to be taught, the pacing of instruction, and the rubric to be used for assessment.

Importantly, the institution maintains an internally developed writing assessment rubric. This rubric served as the primary grading tool for the weekly writing tasks in the present study. The rubric evaluates a variety of writing skills, such as organization, vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and topic development. Its consistent use within the program supports inter-rater reliability and aligns with the institution's learning outcomes for academic writing.

3.3. Participants

The participants in total were 43 undergraduate Turkish students enrolled in the prep school during the summer term at Istinye University. The group included 26 female and 17 male students, with ages ranging from 18 to 21 years.

A convenience sampling strategy was employed, as the participants were drawn from a class taught by the researcher. This sampling method, while not random, was appropriate for the classroom intervention context and allowed for direct observation and interaction during the study (Mackey & Gass, 2016).

Participants had similar levels of prior exposure to academic writing in English, as all students at the institution are required to take a level achievement test (held under the name of LAT at the institution) at the end of each semester. Based on the results of this test students are classified under 4 levels which are described as Basic, Mid, High, and Prof. All the students participating in this study were at a high level which corresponds to A2-B1. This guarantees that students in the same cohort have similar levels of proficiency. All participants, however, were expected to produce structured, coherent essays in multiple genres by the end of the semester, as per institutional requirements.

To be included in the study, students were required to:

1. Attend at least 80% of the writing classes during the intervention period.

2. Complete all eight assigned writing tasks.

3. Participate in all six feedback literacy training activities.

4. Complete the pre-test and post-test versions of the Feedback Literacy Scale.

Students who did not meet these criteria were excluded from the final analysis.

3.4. Instrumentation

The study employed a combination of quantitative instruments for measuring changes in feedback literacy and qualitative instruments for capturing students' perceptions and experiences. These tools were complemented by a series of instructional materials designed to support the intervention.

3.4.1. Feedback Literacy Scale

The primary quantitative instrument was the Feedback Literacy Scale originally developed by Yıldız et al. (2022) to assess students' capabilities in engaging productively with feedback. The Feedback Literacy Scale was developed and validated using data yielded from a total of 735 undergraduate students enrolled in a faculty of education. The sample was divided into two independent groups. 337 participants were used for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to describe the underpinning factor model. The other group consisted of 398 participants used for Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to identify the proposed model. The scale operationalizes the four key dimensions of feedback literacy identified by Carless and Boud (2018):

1. Appreciating Feedback – understanding the purpose and value of feedback for learning.

2. Making Judgments – critically evaluating the quality of work against standards.

3. Managing Affect – regulating emotional responses to feedback, whether positive or critical.

4. Taking Action – applying feedback to make improvements in learning outcomes.

The scale consists of 24 items with factor loadings ranging between .520 and .812.; each rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

Regarding reliability, the internal consistency of the scale was found to be high. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .94 for the overall scale. The reliability for the subdimensions were also strong. These items are distributed across four dimensions:

Appreciation of Feedback (Items 1–8) with alpha value of .88, .88 for Positive Attitude (Items 9–14), Awareness toward Effective Feedback (Items 15–18) with alpha value of .84, and .83 for Openness to Use Feedback (Items 19–24). The unequal number of items per dimension reflects the varying conceptual weight given to each construct in the original model. This structure enables the scale to capture both the cognitive and affective components of feedback literacy, as well as students' behavioral intentions toward engaging with feedback. Responses from each dimension can be analyzed separately to identify strengths and weaknesses in specific aspects of feedback literacy,

while the aggregated score offers a holistic measure of a learner's overall capacity to interpret and act on feedback effectively.

The scale was administered twice for both control and experiment group: once at the start of the intervention to establish a baseline, and once at the conclusion to measure changes in experiment group's feedback literacy levels.

3.4.2. Weekly Writing Tasks and Rubric

Eight writing tasks were already developed and embedded into the institution's genre-based academic writing curriculum, which organizes instruction around distinct essay types such as problem solution, cause–effect, compare–contrast, and argumentative writing. While the genres and writing tasks were determined by the syllabus, this study integrated feedback literacy training into each weekly task. In this way, students not only practiced the rhetorical and structural conventions of each genre but also engaged in explicit activities to enhance their ability to interpret, evaluate, and act upon feedback. Table 1 demonstrates weekly writing tasks.

Table 1. Weekly Writing Tasks

Week	Essay Types	Essay Topics
Week 1(Pre-Task)	Argumentative Essay (see Appendix)	Some people claim that immigrants should adopt the local culture when immigrating to a new country. To what extent do you agree with this view?
Week 2	Argumentative Essay (see Appendix)	Some people argue that it is important to care about personal interactions and values rather than technology. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?
Week 3	Cause Essay	

	(see Appendix)	Write a well-organized essay where you discuss the causes of a short attention span.
Week 4	Cause & Effect Essay (see Appendix)	Write well-organized essay where you discuss the causes and effects of dropping out of university.
Week 5	Advantage & Disadvantage Essay (see Appendix)	Write a well-organized essay about the advantages and disadvantages of learning a foreign language.
Week 6	Compare & Contrast Essay (see Appendix)	Write a well-organized essay where you compare how art and science are valued in society.
Week 7	Effect essay (see Appendix)	Write a well-organized essay of on the effects of learning a foreign language.
Week 8 (Post-Task)	Problem-solution Essay (see Appendix)	Write a well-organized essay on possible ways of combating and preventing eating disorders.

All essay prompts were designed to align with students' academic proficiency level and the genre-specific writing skills targeted in each week. Each task required students to produce approximately 250 words in an academic style, including an introduction, body paragraphs, and a conclusion, with cohesive devices and appropriate vocabulary.

To ensure students had clear guidance, each task was accompanied by a full prompt rather than just the topic title. Prompts included: (a) a brief contextual description of the situation or issue, (b) explicit task instructions, and (c) suggested guiding points for content development.

All writing tasks were evaluated using the institution's Writing Task Rubric (see Appendix 10), which allocates a maximum of 52 points for Content and Organization (covering paragraphing, introduction, thesis statement, topic sentences, supporting ideas, conclusion, and coherence) and 48 points for Use of Language (including grammatical range and accuracy, lexical range and accuracy, and punctuation and spelling). Each essay was independently graded by two instructors, and discrepancies were resolved through discussion to ensure scoring reliability.

3.4.3. Feedback Literacy Intervention Activities

The design of the weekly intervention activities were created in line with the feedback literacy framework proposed by Carless and Boud (2018) focusing on four interrelated subdimensions: appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. To support the development of students' feedback literacy, each activity was designed to address one or more of these dimensions. These activities were implemented alongside the weekly writing tasks, enabling students to immediately apply their feedback literacy skills to their own work.

The initial activities helped students appreciate the purpose, value, and function of the feedback in academic writing. For instance, at the very beginning of the intervention students were taught various feedback abbreviations and feedback types which in return helped students interpret teacher comments more meaningfully and raise their awareness of feedback as a learning tool rather than identifying it as an evaluative tool.

Following activities were designed in a way to strengthen students' ability to make judgments. Tasks such as identifying feedback categories, analyzing sample feedback comments, and providing feedback on a model essay encouraged students to critically evaluate writing quality, recognize strengths and weaknesses, and apply assessment criteria. These activities promoted evaluative judgment by requiring students to compare written work against expected standards.

The elements of managing affect were embedded through reflection worksheets, peer collaboration, and group discussions. They helped students to process emotional

responses to feedback, be more durable against critical comments, and develop constructive attitudes towards teacher comments. The tasks supported students to be more motivated and resilient.

The final sections of the intervention focused on taking action. Activities such as revising a paragraph and formulate strategies collaboratively for future tasks enabled students to be agents of their own work and be prepared to upcoming studies.

All intervention activities were designed to build upon each other, gradually expanding students' ability to interpret, organize, apply, and seek feedback independently. The tasks encouraged active engagement with teacher feedback, fostering skills transferable to future academic writing contexts.

Table 2 summarizes the objectives and activities for each week.

Table 2. Weekly Feedback Literacy Intervention Activities

Week	Objective	Main Activities
1 – Understanding Feedback Abbreviations	Familiarize students with common feedback abbreviations to improve comprehension	(1) Marking an unmarked sample essay by identifying errors and applying the correct feedback codes.
2 – Recognizing Feedback Types	Develop the ability to identify types of feedback and understand the organization of written feedback	(1) Students were introduced to three main feedback types (positive, constructive/suggestive, corrective) and matched example feedback comments to the correct type.
3 – Interpreting and Reflecting on Feedback	Help students interpret different types of feedback and determine actions to take	(1) Explaining the intent behind positive, corrective, and suggestive feedback; (2) Completing a Feedback Reflection Worksheet
4 – Paragraph Organization	Guide students in revising work based on feedback received	(1) Rewriting a paragraph using received feedback; (2) Peer review of revised drafts

5 – Applying Feedback Principles to a Sample Essay	Encourage students to actively engage with and apply feedback principles to written work	(1) Students were given a sample essay along with its prompt and asked to provide written feedback based on what they had learned in the previous weeks
6 – Feedback Strategy Development	Promote reflection on the feedback process and creation of strategies for future use	(1) Group discussions on feedback experiences; (2) Creating a collective feedback strategy

3.4.4. Semi-Structured Interview

A semi-structured written interview was conducted with seven participants who willingly accepted to take part in after the completion of the training program. The interview consisted of four thematic categories. These were respectively listed as Feedback Perception, Training Process and Awareness, Emotional Responses, and Application and Future Approach. Each category contained open-ended questions designed to elicit reflective and detailed responses. The questions were predetermined to ensure consistency. Open-ended questions allowed students to elaborate on their personal experiences and perspectives.

Participants provided their answers in handwritten form on printed copies of the interview sheet, which were distributed and collected by the researcher. Some of the participants preferred to send their responses via e-mail, which was also acceptable to make students' participation as smooth as possible. This format removed the need for audio recording or transcription while preserving the authenticity and richness of qualitative data. Expressing their perspective in a written way allowed them to reflect before committing their responses, potentially enhancing depth and accuracy.

3.5. Procedure

This study employed a mixed-methods design integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to investigate the impact of targeted feedback literacy training on university-level EFL students' writing performance and feedback engagement. Data collection and instructional activities were conducted over an eight-week period during summer term of 2024-2025 academic year. The procedure followed a sequential

structure, beginning with pre-intervention measures, progressing through a six-week intervention phase, and concluding with post-intervention data collection.

The quantitative phase included the administration of the Feedback Literacy Scale (Yıldız et al., 2022) at two points, one prior to and the other following the intervention in addition to the evaluation of students' performance on an initial baseline writing task and a final post-test writing task. These measures provided comparable pre- and post-intervention data on both feedback literacy levels and writing achievement.

The qualitative phase consisted of a semi-structured, written-response interview administered at the end of the study. Students' perceptions, experiences, and challenges regarding feedback during the intervention were noticeable thanks to these written responses. By combining quantitative and qualitative data, the study sought to capture both measurable changes in feedback literacy and the contextual factors influencing these changes.

3.5.1. Pre-Intervention Phase

a. Administration of Feedback Literacy Scale

The Feedback Literacy Scale (Yıldız et al., 2022) was administered to all participants to determine their baseline feedback literacy levels (see Appendix 1) before the implementation of the feedback literacy training. The scale was distributed in paper format during a regular class session, and students completed it individually without time pressure. Establishing a baseline allowed to determine participants' initial strengths and weaknesses in feedback literacy and to evaluate the potential effects of the intervention.

b. Baseline Writing Task (Pre-test)

Following the administration of the scale, students completed the baseline writing task, which served as the pre-test for assessing their initial writing performance (see Appendix 2). This task asked students to produce an argumentative essay based on the given prompt and several guiding points to help them structure their essays. After 5 minutes of brainstorming with the teacher and whole class, students were given 40 minutes to complete their essays during regular class time. This writing task provided a starting point for measuring improvement in writing skills over the course of the study. All essays were assessed and graded using the institution's standardized analytic

writing rubric. Content development, organization, language use, and mechanics were the primary components of assessment. To ensure scoring reliability, each essay was independently graded by two experienced writing instructors, and any discrepancies in scores were resolved through discussion.

3.5.2. Intervention Phase (6 Weeks)

Week 1 – Understanding Feedback Abbreviations

This week began with an explicit introduction to the feedback coding system that would be used throughout the training (e.g., G = grammar, V = vocabulary, C = coherence, etc.) (see Appendix 11) in addition to regular instruction on argumentative essay structure. The instructor demonstrated each code using authentic examples from anonymized student work and explained how each symbol corresponded to a specific type of writing issue. A handout was also distributed to students so that they could study the abbreviations and codes (see Appendix 12). In addition to the handout, a soft copy of this file was uploaded on Blackboard - the online learning module used by the institution both for online assignments and as an announcement tool. Thus, students had access to display the material outside of the class. After studying the codes students participated in a guided practice activity where they examined a sample essay, identified errors according to the given codes, and suggested corrections. Students, initially, completed the exercise individually then checked their corrections with a peer. All the revisions were consequently checked with the teacher alongside a class discussion. Class discussion focused on the purpose of using a code-based system and how it can make feedback more precise and actionable. At the end of the week, students wrote an argumentative essay within the same format and time constraints as the baseline essay (see Appendix 2). This time, students received feedback for their first drafts and after examining the feedback they wrote a second draft. These second draft essays were evaluated using the writing rubric by two instructors.

In the same week, the control group received regular instruction on argumentative essay writing, including essay structure, thesis statements, and supporting arguments. After completing their argumentative essays, students received written teacher feedback following the instructor's usual practices. However, no explicit explanation was provided regarding feedback abbreviations or how feedback should be interpreted, and students were expected to revise their work based on teacher comments and write

a second draft. The second draft was later evaluated and graded by two instructors using the writing rubric.

Week 2 – Recognizing Feedback Types

Alongside instruction on cause essay writing, the second week focused on helping students recognize and differentiate between three major feedback types: positive, suggestive, and corrective. To begin, the instructor introduced sample teacher comments taken from a past essay (see Appendix 13) and explained the distinguishing features of each category. Positive feedback was highlighted as a way of reinforcing strengths and boosting confidence. Suggestive feedback was reflected in guidance that offers alternative expressions or strategies. On the other hand, corrective feedback was emphasized as a means of directly signaling and correcting errors. Students then received an additional handout containing a set of teacher comments (see Appendix 14). Each student worked individually to categorize these comments according to the three feedback types. After completing the task, the class went through the comments one by one, with collective discussion ensuring shared understanding and reinforcing the pedagogical value of each type in the writing process. At the end of the week, students produced a cause essay (see Appendix 4). Assessment and grading criteria were the same as the first week of the intervention.

During Week 2, the control group received standard instruction on cause essay writing as outlined in the syllabus. The lesson focused on developing cause relationships, paragraph structure, and language use. Students completed the essay task and received written teacher feedback afterward. No instructional time was allocated to discussing feedback types or the purposes of different comments. The second drafts were graded just like previous week.

Week 3 – Interpreting and Reflecting on Feedback

While students were taught how to structure cause-and-effect essays, the third week emphasized developing students' ability to interpret and reflect on teacher feedback. The instructor provided a sample essay annotated with teacher comments, highlighting strengths in organization, vocabulary use, and argument structure, as well as pointing out areas requiring improvement (see Appendix 15). Each student then completed a structured reflection worksheet. This reflection worksheet guided them to identify the main points of feedback, summarize strengths, note areas for development, and

propose concrete steps for revision (see Appendix 16). This activity encouraged students to engage more critically with feedback rather than passively receiving it, which in return promotes their metacognitive awareness of the writing and revision process. After completing and discussing the reflection exercise as a class, students proceeded to compose a cause-and-effect essay, as outlined in the institutional syllabus (see Appendix 5).

The control group, meanwhile, followed the regular instructional sequence for cause-and-effect essay writing. Lessons addressed organization, logical connectors, and coherence. After submitting their essays, students received written teacher feedback, wrote a second draft but were not asked to complete reflection activities or engage in structured discussion about how the feedback could inform revision.

Week 4 – Paragraph Organization

The fourth week addressed the affective dimension of feedback reception by helping students transform emotional responses into constructive action. The session began with a discussion of common reactions to teacher feedback, such as frustration or discouragement, and strategies for reframing these emotions as growth opportunities. To make this process concrete, students were given a short paragraph annotated with teacher comments (see Appendix 17). Students worked individually to revise the paragraph based on the feedback provided. They focused on applying corrections while reflecting on how the changes improved clarity, coherence, or accuracy. Each student compared their revised paragraph with a peer to examine whether they did similar corrections or paid attention to the same details pointed in the feedback. Paragraph revision was particularly chosen to allow students to concentrate on the revision process without being overwhelmed by the length or complexity of an entire essay. After completing revisions, the class compared different approaches, highlighting how feedback could be used as a practical tool for improvement rather than as criticism. The week concluded with students composing an advantage-disadvantage essay, in line with the course syllabus sticking to the same assessment and grading criteria (see Appendix 6).

During this week, the control group received regular instruction on advantage–disadvantage essay structure. Students practiced developing topic sentences and supporting ideas before completing the assigned essay. Written teacher feedback was

provided afterward as it was in previous weeks, but no paragraph organization took place.

Week 5 – Applying Feedback Principles to a Sample Essay

The fifth week shifted the focus toward consolidating students' understanding of feedback principles by practicing their application on a complete essay. All students were given the same model essay (see Appendix 18) accompanied by the institution's scoring rubric (see Appendix 10). Drawing on what they had learned in previous weeks such as identifying types of feedback, interpreting teacher comments, and revising based on guidance students provided feedback directly on this shared essay. Each student first revised the text individually, highlighting areas of strength and weakness, before discussing their feedback collectively This group discussion, by highlighting indicators and assessments that shine within the feedback categories, helped everyone see how their individual assessments could converge toward shared assessment practices. The activity reinforced that effective feedback is not only about identifying errors but also about supporting clarity, organization, and argumentation. At the end of the week, students completed a compare-contrast essay, as outlined in the syllabus (see Appendix 7).

At the same time, the control group received standard instruction on compare–contrast essays, focusing on organizational patterns and appropriate language use. After completing their essays, students received written feedback from the instructor. Unlike the experimental group, they did not engage in activities involving rubric analysis or collective discussion of feedback practices.

Week 6 – Feedback Strategy Development

The final week of the intervention urged students to develop concrete strategies for improvement. Students were asked to revisit teacher comments from their earlier essays and identify repetitive mistakes, such as issues with organization, argument support, or grammar. To scaffold this process, the instructor distributed a set of questions (see Appendix 19) that prompted students to reflect on how feedback could be translated into practical steps for revision. Working in groups of three, students created action plans that outlined strategies for addressing these weaknesses in future writing tasks. The instructor also modeled this process to demonstrate how vague or general feedback can be reformulated into specific, achievable goals. This activity not

only promoted a sense of agency in handling feedback but also reinforced the long-term value of feedback literacy in independent writing. The week concluded with the writing of an effect essay, as specified in the course syllabus (see Appendix 8).

During Week 6, the control group followed regular instruction on effect essay writing as required by the syllabus. Lessons addressed essay structure and language accuracy, after which students completed the writing task and received written teacher feedback. No explicit instruction was provided on developing feedback strategies or identifying recurring patterns across drafts.

3.5.3. Post-Intervention Phase

a. Post-writing Task (Post-test)

At the end of the intervention, students completed a final writing, a problem solution essay, (see Appendix 9). This task functioned as the post-test to measure changes in students' writing performance after the intervention lasted for six weeks. Two independent instructors evaluate the essays to ensure scoring reliability and comparability with the pre-test essays using the institutions' standardized syllabus This comparison provided insights into whether feedback literacy training had a measurable effect on writing quality.

b. Administration of the Feedback Literacy Scale

The Feedback Literacy Scale was readministered to all participants at the end of the intervention (see Appendix 1). Same students who completed all the writing tasks and the training (for experimental group) took the scale. Implementing the scale again aimed to measure any development in students' feedback literacy compared to their baseline results. Conducting the scale both before and after the training allowed for identifying potential changes in their awareness, attitudes, and ability to engage productively with feedback.

c. Semi-Structured Interview

As a final step of the post-intervention phase, a semi-structured interview was conducted with students who accepted to participate. The interview provided insights into students' perceptions of feedback literacy training. Out of all participants, seven students voluntarily agreed to participate in this stage. The interview questions (see Appendix 20) were designed to explore students' reflections on their experiences,

perceived benefits, and challenges faced during the intervention. Instead of oral recordings, students provided their responses in written form on paper both because of time constraints and students' being reluctant to record their voices, which were later collected and analyzed thematically. This approach allowed for richer understanding of students' attitudes toward feedback, complementing the quantitative findings from the scale and writing tasks.

3.6. Data Collection

To address the research questions, data were collected from multiple sources before, during, and after the intervention. This multi-stage collection process ensured that both quantitative and qualitative evidence was available for analysis, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation of students' feedback literacy development and writing performance.

At the outset, the Feedback Literacy Scale was administered to establish students' baseline levels of feedback literacy. This provided an initial quantitative measure of awareness, attitudes, and practices regarding feedback. In addition, a baseline writing task was conducted. Students were asked to produce an argumentative essay, which was subsequently evaluated by two independent raters using the institution's standard rubric. This stage ensured comparability of results and served as the foundation for later progress measurement.

Throughout the six-week intervention, weekly essays were collected in line with the course syllabus. These essays not only functioned as part of the training activities but also provided ongoing evidence of students' writing performance under the influence of feedback literacy training. Alongside essays, students engaged with various reflection-based handouts and tasks (e.g., recognizing feedback types, analyzing teacher comments, revising based on feedback).

At the end of the training, students completed a post-test essay, which was again rated independently by two instructors using the institutional rubric. To complement this, the Feedback Literacy Scale was re-administered to measure changes in students' perceptions and practices compared to the pre-intervention stage. Finally, a semi-structured interview was conducted with students who consented to participate (n = 7). Unlike oral interviews, responses were collected in written form, allowing participants

to reflect carefully on the questions before submission. This provided qualitative insights into how students perceived their feedback literacy development and the impact of the intervention on their writing practices.

Collecting data from diverse sources at multiple points allowed for triangulation between scale results, essay scores, and student reflections. This mixed-methods approach ensured that both the measurable outcomes of writing performance and the subjective experiences of learners were considered in the evaluation of the intervention.

3.7. Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed through both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Quantitative data consisted of students' pre-, and post-test writing scores and their responses Student Feedback Literacy Scale and were analyzed using SPSS. Before conducting statistical analysis, the normality of the data was assessed. All values fell within the acceptable range of ±1.5, indicating that the data were normally distributed. Therefore, parametric tests were deemed appropriate for further analysis.

The pre- and post-test writing scores were analyzed using paired-samples t-tests to examine within-group differences and independent-samples t-tests to evaluate between-group differences. This was done to determine whether the feedback literacy training intervention led to significant improvement in writing performance, particularly in the experimental group compared to the control group.

In addition to writing scores, participants completed the scale, which consists of 24 items designed to measure different aspects of students' feedback literacy. The scale is divided into four categories: Appreciation (Items 1–8), Positive Attitude (Items 9 and 14), Awareness toward Effective Feedback (Items 15–18), and Openness to use Feedback (Items 19–24). The mean score of each category was calculated by averaging the responses across all participants. Descriptive statistics were computed, and a normality test was performed for each subdimension to evaluate changes over time and between groups. The findings showed that the data did not fit the normal distribution assumptions. Therefore, non-parametric tests were employed for analysis. In particular, the Mann–Whitney U Test was used to assess between-group differences

at each time point, and the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test to investigate within-group variations between pre- and post-test results. This method made it possible to assess the intervention's effects on several aspects of feedback literacy when the distribution was not normally distributed.

Qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured written interviews conducted with seven participants from the experimental group following the intervention. The interviews were analyzed through thematic analysis based on the four-stage model proposed by Yıldırım and Şimşek (2013): coding, theming, organizing, and interpreting. Interview responses were segmented into meaningful units and coded based on recurring patterns and expressions. These codes were then grouped into themes corresponding to the four dimensions of feedback literacy: appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. Throughout this process, the researcher avoided inserting personal interpretation and ensured that the findings were grounded in the participants' own statements. The themes generated from this analysis provided insight into how learners perceived and applied feedback, and how their emotional responses to feedback evolved over the course of the training.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles for educational research, ensuring that the rights, dignity, and confidentiality of all participants were protected throughout the process. Prior to data collection, approval was obtained from Yıldız Technical University Ethics Committee. Consent was taken to use The Feedback Literacy Scale (see Appendix 24) before implementing the intervention. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, the nature of their involvement, and their right to withdraw at any stage without penalty. Consent was obtained orally from all participants before their participation commenced.

To safeguard anonymity, students' names and identifying information were removed from all datasets. Codes (such as participant 1) were assigned to participants to ensure confidentiality when reporting results. Only the researcher and the supervisor had access to the raw data. All materials, including essays, scale, and interview responses, were solely used for research purposes and were not shared outside the study.

Students were assured that their decision to participate or not would have no impact on their course grades or their relationship with the institution. For the interview stage, only volunteers who explicitly agreed to take part were included.

Finally, given the classroom-based nature of the intervention, attention was paid to minimize any disruption to normal teaching and learning activities. All instructional materials used during the intervention were designed to complement the existing curriculum while serving the research purposes of the study. Feedback sessions were framed as educationally beneficial, ensuring that students derived value regardless of their role in the research.

4. RESULTS

This chapter presents the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study investigating the impact of explicit feedback literacy training on English preparatory students' academic writing performance and their perceptions of feedback. The findings are presented based on the following research questions:

RQ1. To what extent does explicit feedback literacy training improve the academic writing performance of university English preparatory students?

RQ2. To what extent does students' feedback literacy level change as a result of explicit feedback literacy training?

RQ3. How do students perceive different types of feedback (positive, constructive, suggestive) before and after the intervention?

A mixed-methods approach was utilized to address these questions. Quantitative data were gathered through academic writing pre-, and post-tests and a Feedback Literacy Scale administered to both experimental and control groups at the beginning and end of the study. Qualitative data were collected through semi structured interviews with seven students who willingly accepted to participate.

The quantitative results, which refer to RQ1 and RQ2, are presented in section 4.1.1 reporting the results of weekly writing tasks and 4.1.2detailing the findings of the feedback literacy scale. The qualitative results addressing RQ3 are examined in section 4.2 according to thematic analysis of interview data.

4.1. Quantitative Results

This section presents the quantitative results of the study, which aimed to determine how explicit feedback literacy training affected Turkish EFL students' academic writing ability and their growth in several feedback literacy aspects. Specifically, the study intended to measure whether integrating a structured six-week feedback literacy intervention along with regular teacher feedback results in a significant improvement compared to the teacher feedback alone. The analysis also includes a validated

feedback literacy scale examining students' understanding, attitudes, and engagement with feedback over time.

Normality of the Feedback Literacy Scale scores was examined using the Shapiro–Wilk test. The results showed that several sub-dimensions did not meet the assumption of normality, with multiple factors yielding p-values below .05. For example, in the experimental group, the posttest Awareness towards Effective Feedback scores demonstrated a significant deviation from normality ($W = 0.872$, $p = .010$), and in the control group, the post-test Appreciation scores were also non-normally distributed ($W = 0.882$, $p = .016$). Similar patterns were observed in additional factors across both groups, where Shapiro–Wilk p-values were lower than .05, indicating nonnormality of the feedback literacy data. Because these distributions violated normality assumptions, the feedback literacy results were analyzed using non-parametric statistical tests: the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to compare pre- and post-test scores within each group, while the Mann–Whitney U Test was applied to compare the experimental and control groups at both measurement points. All analysis was conducted using SPSS.

4.1.1. Weekly Writing Results

SPSS program was used to analyze descriptive statistics, means, and standard deviations of both control and experimental groups. The findings revealed that there has been a growth in writing performance of both groups but with a greater improvement in experimental group which received a 6-week- feedback literacy intervention compared to the control group.

To begin with, paired sample t-test was administered to compare pre- and post- task performance within both control and experimental groups. Followingly, independent sample t-test was employed to analyze the significance of writing performance between control groups receiving traditional teacher written feedback and the experimental group which was instructed with a six-week feedback literacy intervention schedule along with the regular teacher written feedback. **Tables 3** presents the pre- and post-test descriptive statistics for each group.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Group	Test	M	SD	N
Experimental	Pre-test	59.19	15.16	21

Experimental	Post-test	78.76	8.39	21
Control	Pre-test	55.41	11.98	22
Control	Post-test	63.82	13.93	22

The experimental group's mean score increased from M = 59.19 (SD = 15.16) on the pre-test to M = 78.76 (SD = 8.39) on the post-test. The control group also showed improvement, with scores increasing from M = 55.41 (SD = 11.98) to M = 63.82 (SD = 13.93). These descriptive results suggest improvement in both groups, with a greater gain observed in the experimental group. This can also be interpreted as the feedback literacy had a huge impact on students' writing performance.

Table 4 and **Table 5** present within-group and between-group comparisons.

Table 4. Paired-Samples T-Test

Group	**t**	**df**	**p**	**Mean Difference**
Experimental	-8.84	20	< .001	19.57
Control	-2.64	21	.015	8.41

A paired-samples t-test showed a statistically significant increase in scores in the experimental group, t(20) = -8.84, p < .001, with a mean difference of 19.57 points. The control group also improved significantly, t(21) = -2.64, p = .015, with a mean difference of 8.41 points. These results suggest that while both groups benefited over time, the experimental group experienced a larger improvement. While both groups received written teacher feedback, the greater mean difference in experimental group is an indication that the feedback literacy training served the purpose of the study.

Table 5. Independent t-Test (Experiment vs Control Group)

Test	**t**	**df**	**p**	**Mean Difference**	**95% CI (LL, UL)**
Pre-test	0.91	41	.368	3.78	[-4.61, 12.18]
Post-test	4.28	34.72	< .001	14.94	[7.86, 22.03]

An independent samples t-test revealed no significant difference between the groups at pre-test, $t(41) = 0.91$, $p = .368$. However, a significant difference was found at post-test, $t(34.72) = 4.28$, $p < .001$, with the experimental group scoring higher than the control group. This indicates that the intervention had a significant effect on student performance.

4.1.2. Feedback Literacy Scale Results

The Feedback Literacy Scale was employed both for the control and experimental groups before and after the intervention. Students' feedback literacy level was aimed at being measured across four key dimensions. Every factor consisted of several items evaluated on a Likert scale, and the average scores were utilized to evaluate participants' growth in each domain.

A series of statistical methods was utilized to examine the data. Initially, Cronbach's alpha values were computed to assess the internal consistency of the scale factors. Next, descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and score ranges) were calculated to analyze changes in students' perceptions prior to and following the intervention. Because the data did not meet the assumptions of normality, non-parametric tests were utilized: the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test compared pre- and post-test outcomes within each group, while the Mann–Whitney U Test was applied for comparisons between groups at the pre- and post-test stage.

Table 6 demonstrate Cronbach's alpha values for each factor in the experimental group.

Table 6. Experimental Group Reliability Analysis Results

Factors	Pre-test α	Post-test α
Factor 1 (Appreciation)	.820	.847
Factor 2 (Positive attitude)	.806	.871
Factor 3 (Awareness towards effective feedback)	.525	.725
Factor 4 (Openness to use feedback)	.572	.801

This table shows the internal consistency analysis for the experimental group. At pre-test, Cronbach's alphas were moderate to high across all factors, ranging from .525 to .820. At posttest, all factors showed improvement, with alpha values exceeding .70. This indicates that there is a strong internal consistency at post-intervention phase.

These results reveal that intervention had a stabilizing and strengthening effect on the consistency of participants' responses across feedback literacy subcategories.

Table 7 and **Table 8** show the descriptive statistics for control and experimental groups across each dimension of feedback literacy scale.

Table 7. Control Group Descriptive Statistics

Factor	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Pre-test Min–Max	Post-test Min–Max	N
Factor 1	1.88 (0.33)	2.04 (0.25)	1.38–2.63	1.50–2.75	22
Factor 2	1.78 (0.53)	1.96 (0.52)	1.00–3.17	1.00–2.83	22
Factor 3	2.16 (0.47)	2.34 (0.43)	1.50–3.00	1.50–3.25	22
Factor 4	1.98 (0.38)	2.17 (0.43)	1.50–3.17	1.67–3.33	22
Total Score	1.92 (0.32)	2.10 (0.27)	1.50–2.92	1.79–2.75	22

Although there is a slight rise in all factors, these improvements are limited and probably not considered statistically significant. The minimal change indicates that the typical classroom experience itself, without an explicit feedback literacy training, was not adequate to significantly improve students' perceptions or practices regarding feedback.

Table 8. Experimental Group Descriptive Statistics

Factor	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Pre-test Min–Max	Post-test Min–Max	N
Factor 1	2.54 (0.52)	4.01 (0.64)	1.38–3.38	3.00–5.00	21
Factor 2	1.82 (0.56)	3.43 (0.90)	1.00–3.00	1.33–5.00	21
Factor 3	2.64 (0.49)	4.31 (0.71)	1.75–3.75	2.75–5.00	21
Factor 4	2.48 (0.42)	3.99 (0.63)	1.83–3.50	3.00–5.00	21
Total Score	2.36 (0.41)	3.91 (0.60)	1.63–3.25	2.96–4.96	21

The experimental group demonstrated substantial and consistent increases in all factors of feedback literacy. Improvements over 1.4–1.6 points across all factors indicate the positive impact of the instructional intervention. These findings imply that the intervention was successful in raising learners' emotional orientation toward feedback as well as their awareness, receptiveness, and engagement with it.

A Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was administered to compare pre- and post-results within each group. **Table 9** and **Table 10** show the results of this test.

Table 9. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test to Compare the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Control Group

Group	Factor	Z	p-value
Control	Appreciation	-2.29	.022
Control	Positive Attitude	-2.10	.035
Control	Awareness towards effective feedback	-1.78	.075
Control	Openness to use feedback	-1.91	.056
Total Scale		-2.61	.009

As illustrated in Table 9 students in the control group demonstrated statistically significant improvements in two dimensions of feedback literacy. Notably, the *Appreciation* factor showed a significant increase from pre- to post-test (Z = -2.29, p = .022), indicating that students became more appreciative of feedback over time, possibly due to consistent exposure to traditional teacher feedback. Similarly, a significant improvement was observed in the *Positive Attitude* factor (Z = -2.10, p = .035), suggesting that students cultivated a more positive inclination toward receiving feedback. Nonetheless, no statistically significant differences were found in

Awareness towards Effective Feedback (Z = -1.78, p = .075) or Openness to use Feedback (Z = 1.91, p = .056), imply that these action-oriented or cognitive aspects may necessitate clearer guidance. However, the total scale's score was significantly higher at post-test (Z = -2.61, p = .009), indicating a general improvement in feedback literacy despite the lack of specific intervention.

Table 10. Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test to Compare the Pre-test and the Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group

Group	Factor	Z	p-value
Experimental	Appreciation	-4.03	< .001
Experimental	Positive Attitude	-4.02	<.001
Experimental	Awareness towards effective feedback	-4.02	<.001
Experimental	Openness to use feedback	-4.03	<.001
Total Scale		-4.02	<.001

As demonstrated in Table 10 experiment group which underwent explicit feedback literacy training indicated statistically significant gains across all four feedback literacy factors. Notable enhancements were seen in Appreciation ($Z = -4.03$, $p < .001$), Positive Attitude ($Z = -4.02$, $p < .001$), Awareness towards Effective Feedback ($Z = -4.02$, $p < .001$), and Openness to use Feedback ($Z = -4.03$, $p < .001$). These ongoing enhancements demonstrate the efficacy of the intervention in boosting both the emotional and cognitive-behavioral components of feedback literacy. Additionally, the overall scale demonstrated a statistically significant enhancement ($Z = -4.02$, $p < .001$), verifying that the organized training aided in the comprehensive growth of students' feedback literacy abilities.

The Mann–Whitney U test was used to determine if there were notable differences in feedback literacy levels between the experimental and control groups before and after the intervention. The analysis focused on four aspects of feedback literacy: Appreciation, Positive Attitude, Awareness Towards Effective Feedback, and Openness to Use Feedback. The tables below display the mean ranks and sum of ranks for each group during the pre- and post-test phases, followed by the Mann–Whitney U test results. These findings offer insights into the comparative effectiveness of feedback literacy intervention.

Table 11. Mean Ranks and Sum of Ranks for Control and Experimental Groups (Pre-test)

Factor	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Appreciation	Control	22	14.48	318.5
	Experimental	21	29.88	627.5
Positive Attitude	Control	22	21.93	482.5
	Experimental	21	22.07	463.5
Awareness towards Effective Feedback	Control	22	16.8	369.5
	Experimental	21	27.45	576.5
Openness to Use Feedback	Control	22	15.09	332.0
	Experimental	21	29.24	614.0
Total Scale	Control	22	15.23	335.0
	Experimental	21	29.1	611.0

This table compares the pre-intervention feedback literacy levels between the control and experimental groups across four categories: *Appreciation*, *Positive Attitude*, *Awareness Towards Effective Feedback*, *Openness to Use Feedback* finalizing it with the total scale. The experimental group had consistently higher mean ranks than the control group in all factors except **Positive Attitude**. The two groups showed nearly identical mean ranks (22.07 vs. 21.93), suggesting a similar baseline attitude toward feedback.

Notably, large rank differences were noted in **Appreciation** (29.88 vs. 14.48), **Openness to Use Feedback** (29.24 vs. 15.09) which indicate that students in the experimental group had stronger engagement with feedback before the intervention commenced. These initial differences imply a possible pre-existing advantage in the experimental group, which should be taken into consideration when interpreting post-test results.

Table 12. Mean Ranks and Sum of Ranks for Control and Experimental Groups (Post-test)

Factor	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Appreciation	Control	22	11.5	253.0
	Experimental	21	33.0	693.0
Positive Attitude	Control	22	12.91	284.0
	Experimental	21	31.52	662.0
Awareness towards Effective Feedback	Control	22	11.7	257.5
	Experimental	21	32.79	688.5
Openness to Use Feedback	Control	22	11.68	257.0
	Experimental	21	32.81	689.0
Total Scale	Control	22	11.5	253.0
	Experimental	21	33.0	693.0

As demonstrated in this table, the experimental group achieved significantly higher mean ranks across all categories than the control group. For example, in **Appreciation**, the experimental group had a mean rank of 33.00, compared to just 11.50 for the control group. Similar gaps were observed for **Awareness Towards Effective Feedback** (32.45 vs. 12.15), **Openness to Use Feedback** (32.40 vs. 12.20).

These results indicate that after feedback literacy training, the experimental group not only preserved but also increased its advantage in feedback literacy. The consistent high rank across all dimensions reflects the broad and effective impact of the intervention, affecting both students' attitudes and behaviors related to feedback.

Table 13. Mann-Whitney U Test to Compare the Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

Factor	Test	U	Z	p
Appreciation	Mann–Whitney U	65.5	-4.04	< .001
Positive Attitude	Mann–Whitney U	229.5	-0.037	.971

Awareness towards Effective Feedback	Mann–Whitney U	116.5	-2.824	.005
Openness to Use Feedback	Mann–Whitney U	79.0	-3.718	< .001
Total Scale	Mann–Whitney U	82.0	-3.628	< .001

The Mann–Whitney U test results for pre-test scores show that three out of four factors differed significantly between the groups even before the intervention. Specifically, the experimental group had significantly higher scores in: **Appreciation** ($U = 65.5$, $p < .001$), **Awareness** Towards Effective Feedback ($U = 116.5$, $p = .005$), and **Openness to use Feedback** ($U = 79.0$, $p < .001$). Only **Positive Attitude** did not differ significantly ($U = 229.5$, $p = .971$), suggesting a similar mindset between groups at baseline before the intervention started.

These results suggest that earlier classroom practices, teacher attention, or other contextual factors may have contributed to the experimental group's higher fundamental levels of feedback literacy at the beginning of the study in several areas. Understanding the baseline advantage is crucial for accurately evaluating the gains after the intervention.

Table 14. Mann-Whitney U Test to Compare the Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

Factor	**Test**	**U**	**Z**	**p**
Appreciation	Mann–Whitney U	0.0	-5.637	< .001
Positive Attitude	Mann–Whitney U	31.0	-4.87	< .001
Awareness towards Effective Feedback	Mann–Whitney U	4.5	-5.531	< .001
Openness to Use Feedback	Mann–Whitney U	4.0	-5.527	< .001
Total Scale	Mann–Whitney U	0.0	-5.617	< .001

Following the feedback literacy training, the Mann–Whitney U test indicated highly significant differences in all four factors between the experimental and control groups, with p-values below

.001 for each. The U values were particularly low (e.g., $U = 0.0$ for Appreciation and Total Scale), and the Z-scores ranged from -4.87 to -5.637, highlighting strong effect sizes.

This pattern shows that the intervention had a clear and measurable effect on students' feedback literacy development. All four dimensions showed improvements: students exhibited greater willingness to implement input, developed more positive attitudes, improved awareness of what makes effective feedback, and grew more appreciative of feedback. The high post-test performance supports the conclusion that explicit feedback literacy training can significantly enhance students' engagement with and use of feedback in academic writing contexts.

4.2. Qualitative Results

Qualitative data were obtained from semi-structured written interviews with seven students from the experimental group following the intervention. Thematic analysis was conducted following Yıldırım and Şimşek's (2013) four-stage model: coding, theming, organizing, and interpreting.

Codes were organized around the four dimensions of feedback literacy proposed by Carless and Boud (2018): appreciating feedback, making judgments, managing affect, and taking action. The themes and representative student statements are presented below.

4.2.1. Appreciating Feedback

One of the outstanding issues was the shift in students' perception of feedback. Feedback was first characterized by the majority of participants as correction-focused or even demotivating. However, following the intervention, they started to see feedback as constructive, enhancing, and necessary. For example, interviewee 2 answered the first question, "What did feedback mean to you before?'' as follows:

''The feedback was only correction for me. I thought it showed my mistake. I didn't really think of feedback as helpful.'

The same participant changed his/her mind on that and answered the second question which is 'Have your thoughts about feedback changed now?' as follows:

''Yes, now I see feedback as help to improve. It is not only about mistake. Now I know feedback also shows me what I do well and gives ideas to make my writing better. It helps me learn, not just correct.'

Similarly, interviewee 6 emphasized how the training helped change their understanding of feedback:

''Before, feedback just meant someone pointing out my mistakes. I didn't think much about why it was given.' (his/her response to the first question)

''Yes, now I see it as a tool for improvement, not just criticism.' (his/her response to the second question)

Students also started to appreciate the informative and supportive role of feedback. They noted that understanding the purpose behind teacher comments made it easier for them to internalize and apply the feedback meaningfully. For instance, interviewee 4 replies to the second question as:

''Now I understand that feedback is not just about structure. It also helps me think differently, consider the reader's point of view, and improve the way I express my thoughts.'

In line with the first aspect of feedback literacy, the training presented feedback as a teaching tool by making it easier to understand.

4.2.2. Making Judgements

Another emerging theme was the development of judgment skills. Students demonstrated a significant improvement in evaluating the quality of their work and understanding feedback.

They reported that they were better able to identify strengths and weaknesses in their writing.

Interviewee 1 summarized this as follows in his/her reply to the fourth question:

''It showed me how to understand comments and improve my writing step by step.'

Interviewee 3 had a very similar view on this matter:

''[…] Now I can understand if the teacher is trying to help, suggest something, or correct something directly.'

''[..]It also showed me how to read the teacher's comments better and how to use them for practice.'

This shows a more critical consciousness of the interpretation of feedback. Students were observed to gain a critical feedback literacy skill that is they were able to decode the feedback messages; filter it using their background knowledge and decide how to respond to it.

4.2.3. Managing Affect

At first, emotional reactions to feedback were characterized as anxiety provoking, especially because of the fear of failing or being misinterpreted. The intervention seemed to improve their emotional resilience and lessen negative emotions towards feedback. The responses to question 7 (How do you feel when you receive feedback?) justified this argument. Interviewee 1 stated:

''Sometimes I feel nervous, but also happy. If it's too critical, I feel a bit sad. But if I also see good comments, I feel motivated to do better.' Interviewee 6 expressed:

''[…] Sometimes it was hard to hear, but later I realized it was given to help, not to judge.'

The interviews showed that even though the anxiety continued to exist, the feelings of pride, motivation, and purpose counterbalanced it. Feedback has evolved from being a discouragement to emotional motivation, according to a number of interviewees.

Interviewee 7 suggested that:

''I used to be very nervous before, but now it makes me feel proud that I was able to achieve my goal. Seeing that I made progress gives me confidence.' Interviewee 5 summarized it as:

''Seeing my mistakes makes me ambitious. We all make mistakes; the important thing is to correct them. I feel motivated to do better.'

These expressions indicated that students were learning to control their emotions while accepting criticism which is essential for self-efficacy and sustainable learning.

4.2.4. Taking Action

Every participant explained how they had engaged with feedback to enhance their writing. They took part in revisions, self-reflection, and outlining strategies for future tasks without directly accepting the feedback. Responses which were given to question 9 (How do you use feedback when improving your writing?) enlightened how students apply feedback actively. Interviewee 1 noted:

''I read the feedback and change my sentences or grammar. Now I also try to understand the problem and fix similar things in my next writing too.' Interviewee 3 echoed this:

''I read it and changed my mistakes. I try to understand the comment first. Then I go back to the sentence and rewrite it in a better way.' Interviewee 4 added:

''I make changes based on feedback and try to apply the same advice in future tasks too. I don't just fix it, I learn.'

Students discussed their plans to use feedback more carefully for their future studies in addition to their current usage. They demonstrated an understanding of the significance of self-monitoring and learning from feedback even before submission. Participants stated their action plans for the future tasks by responding to question 10 in which they were asked how they plan to apply what they have learned from the process so far. Interviewee 5 indicated that:

''I will put into practice what I have learned theoretically, otherwise what I have learned will mean nothing.'

Interviewee 6 explained:

''I plan to review feedback carefully, make adjustments, and keep practicing improving.'

Interviewee 7 concluded:

''I am thinking of using it more carefully. I want to make feedback part of my regular writing process. I'll use it as a checklist before I finish my work.'

This reflects how students become more active, strategic, and self-agent in their writing process following the four dimensions of feedback literacy.

5. DISCUSSION

This chapter offers a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the study's findings by carefully exploring each research question. The results are discussed in relation to the literature previously reviewed, focusing on theoretical perspectives on feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018), formative assessment (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006), and L2 writing feedback (Hyland, 2003; Ferris, 2010). By combining quantitative and qualitative findings, the chapter shows how explicit feedback literacy instruction influenced students' writing development, their understanding of feedback, and their engagement with revision processes. Because feedback knowledge is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct involving affective, cognitive, and behavioral engagement, each research question is interpreted with reference to these interconnected factors.

5.1. Discussion on the Findings for RQ1

The results from the weekly writing tasks show a clear and statistically significant improvement in the writing performance of the experimental group compared to the control group. Although both groups benefited from weekly writing instruction and teacher feedback, the significant progress seen in the experimental group, who received explicit feedback literacy training, suggests that this intervention played a key role in enhancing their writing skills. These findings strongly support the idea that feedback is only effective when learners can understand and use it properly, as highly emphasized in the literature (Carless & Boud, 2018; Boud & Molloy, 2013).

The improvement in the experimental group can be understood by considering how feedback literacy directly supports revision. Earlier studies showed that understanding the intentions behind teacher feedback is difficult for a majority of L2 students, particularly at times when the feedback is not clear enough or put in evaluative terms (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Misinterpretation often leads to superficial revisions or ignored feedback. In the current study, students in the experimental group developed greater clarity about the

intentions behind teacher comments, enabling them to revise more meaningfully. Responses gathered from the interview supported this interpretation, as students reported that the intervention helped them “see what the teacher meant” and “understand the reason behind the comment.” This is consistent with Nicol’s (2010) argument that effective feedback creates internal learning dialogues that allow students to compare their work with standards and exemplars.

The intervention’s structured approach also contributed to improvement of writing skills. The systematic way of the instruction help students understand how to analyze feedback, identify recurring mistakes and follow the comments to revise their works. This procedure is consistent with Ferris's (2010) emphasis on the value of explicit training in helping L2 writers strengthen their revision skills. Learners are better able to revise at deeper levels requiring organization, argumentation, and coherence—areas in which the experimental group demonstrated significant growth when they are provided strategies instead of just corrections.

Affective factors also played a significant role. According to Sutton (2012) and Winstone and Nash (2016), students' emotional reactions to feedback can influence whether they engage with or avoid teacher comments. Prior to the intervention, many students felt discouraged when receiving corrective feedback. However, the explicit teaching of feedback literacy reframed feedback as a supportive and developmental tool rather than a judgment of ability. Students reported feeling more confident, less anxious, and more motivated to make revisions. The "managing affect" component of Carless and Boud's (2018) paradigm is reflected in this emotional shift, which probably helped to improve the writing results by lowering the fear of making mistakes and encouraging a willingness to revise.

Thus, the results are consistent with a large body of research that emphasizes that feedback is a dialogic and interpretive process rather than a one-way information flow. When students learn the abilities and dispositions necessary to interpret and act on instructor feedback, writing performance improves. The present study confirms that explicit instruction is a highly effective way to cultivate such skills in EFL writing classrooms.

5.2. Discussion on the Findings for RQ2

The Feedback Literacy Scale results revealed substantial increases across all four dimensions of feedback literacy for the experimental group, while the control group exhibited minimal or inconsistent improvement. The claim that feedback literacy is a teachable and developable construct rather than something that students acquire implicitly through exposure to teacher comments is well supported by these findings (Carless & Boud, 2018; Dawson et al., 2019).

The most striking gains appeared in the cognitive and behavioral dimensions—Awareness toward Effective Feedback and Openness to Use Feedback. Students had greater conceptual understanding of what constitutes appropriate feedback and how comments relate to the criteria used to assess writing. This is consistent with Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick's (2006) theoretical framework, which identifies self-regulation and evaluative judgment as essential components of feedback engagement. Students in the experimental group were able to construct mental models of high-quality writing by examining sample essays, comparing drafts, and going over rubric descriptors again which assisted them to comprehend the significance and goals of instructor comments.

The behavioral dimension, Openness to Use Feedback, also improved dramatically. Before the intervention, many students admitted that they either ignored feedback or applied it superficially. Following the intervention, students reported checking their revised texts against teacher comments, asking for clarification when necessary, and utilizing feedback as a basis for multistep revision. These behaviors reflect the "taking action" dimension of feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018) and align with Boud and Molloy's (2013) argument that learners must understand feedback as part of a sustained process of improvement rather than as isolated events.

Affective development was also evident. The experimental group's responses showed increasing appreciation of feedback as well as more positive attitudes toward receiving comments. These changes are in line with studies showing that students who become emotionally resilient to criticism are more likely to make extensive revisions and see mistakes as learning opportunities rather than as dangers to their self-worth (Brookhart, 2017; Jonsson, 2013). Affective development requires deliberate, targeted support, as seen by the control group's minimal shift in emotional orientation.

Cronbach's alpha scores may be the best proof of the intervention's efficacy. The experimental group displayed increased internal consistency across all factors, while the control group's reliability scores, particularly in Appreciation and Awareness towards effective Feedback, dropped considerably. Although reliability can be influenced by sample size, the varied patterns between groups imply that the experimental group had more consistent and coherent understandings of feedback concepts, further establishing the efficacy of the instructional program.

Overall, the results support the theoretical assertion that feedback literacy includes behavioral strategies, affective dispositions, and cognitive understanding, all of which can be developed through explicit teaching. This study adds to the growing body of evidence suggesting that developing feedback literacy should be an integral part of writing pedagogy, especially in contexts where learners rely heavily on teacher guidance but lack experience engaging autonomously with feedback.

5.3. Discussion on the Finding for RQ3

Qualitative findings revealed profound changes in students' perceptions of different feedback types. Prior to the intervention, students frequently favored positive feedback because it validated their efforts, while corrective comments caused anxiety or confusion. This aligns with Hyland and Hyland's (2001) observations that L2 writers are particularly sensitive to the emotional weight of feedback, sometimes interpreting constructive criticism as an indication of failure. Several students in the present study also explained that they struggled to understand suggestive or indirect comments, which they found vague and difficult to apply.

Following the intervention, students reported a more sophisticated understanding of feedback types. They observed that positive feedback promoted motivation but did not necessarily offer suggestions for improvement, whereas constructive and suggestive comments offered the knowledge essential to revise effectively. This change mirrors findings of the research by Zhang and Hyland (2018), who observe that teaching students about feedback genres and teacher purpose improves their ability to understand comments and react appropriately. Students in the experimental group also demonstrated increased capacity to distinguish between suggestions that offered choices for revision and corrective comments that signaled necessary changes. This

development indicates growth in evaluative judgment, an essential component of feedback literacy.

As a result, the intervention facilitated the shift from using feedback as emotional comfort to using it as a learning tool. Students' improved perceptions reflect the dialogic, developmental view of feedback stressed by Carless (2019), wherein learners see feedback as part of an ongoing conversation aimed at encouraging growth rather than merely pointing out errors. The conceptual clarity gained from the instructional activities allowed students not only to interpret teacher comments more accurately but also to value different feedback types for their distinct purposes.

5.4. Integrated Interpretation of Findings

When considered together, the quantitative and qualitative findings present a coherent narrative: explicit feedback literacy instruction enhanced students' writing performance primarily by transforming how they understood, valued, and acted upon feedback. Writing improvement was not isolated from feedback literacy development but emerged through the interplay of cognitive clarity, emotional readiness, and behavioral engagement. The triangulation across data sources strengthens the validity of this conclusion and affirms the theoretical perspective that effective feedback requires active involvement from students rather than passive reception (Nicol, 2020).

The study contributes meaningfully to the feedback literature by providing empirical evidence from a Turkish EFL preparatory context, a setting in which feedback literacy research remains limited. The findings demonstrate that even short-term, structured interventions can produce significant changes, supporting Carless and Boud's (2018) argument that feedback literacy is conceptually robust and pedagogically powerful. Moreover, the study underscores the need to move beyond teacher-centered feedback practices toward instructional models that empower learners to interpret and use feedback independently.

6. CONCLUSION

This study explored the impact of explicit feedback literacy training on the academic writing performance of Turkish EFL preparatory students, their development across the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of feedback literacy, and their evolving perceptions of different feedback types. By employing a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design, the study yielded both quantitative and qualitative findings demonstrating that feedback literacy is not just an abstract concept but a pedagogically significant competence that can be cultivated deliberately through structured instructional intervention.

The findings indicated that students in the experimental group, who received a six-week feedback literacy training in addition to the regular writing curriculum, significantly outperformed their peers in the control group in their writing performance. This improvement extended beyond just improving surface-level accuracy; students showed clearer ideas, better coherence, stronger organization, and more intentional revision. The quantitative analyses indicated that explicit feedback literacy instruction significantly contributed to writing improvement, while the qualitative interviews uncovered the underlying factors driving this progress, including a better understanding of teacher feedback, increased motivation, strengthened confidence, and a developing sense of agency in the revision process. These results support the theoretical argument that feedback is most effective when learners have the necessary skills and attitudes to actively engage with it, as described by Carless and Boud's (2018) feedback literacy model.

The study further demonstrated that feedback literacy itself can be significantly enhanced through explicit teaching. The experimental group exhibited greater gains across all four dimensions of the Feedback Literacy Scale—Appreciation, Positive Attitude, Awareness toward Effective Feedback, and Openness to Use Feedback—while the control group showed little to no development in the cognitive and behavioral dimensions. These findings demonstrate that students do not learn feedback literacy simply through passive exposure to teacher comments; instead, they require

structured opportunities to discuss, evaluate, and apply feedback meaningfully. The increases in internal consistency reliability among experimental group responses also suggest that students developed more stable and coherent conceptualizations of feedback literacy following the intervention.

The qualitative data revealed a substantial transformation in students' perceptions of different feedback types. Before the intervention, students tended to overvalue positive feedback for its emotional reassurance and undervalue corrective and suggestive feedback due to confusion or anxiety. After the intervention, however, they demonstrated a fuller understanding of the distinct purposes of different feedback types and expressed greater appreciation for constructive or suggestive comments that guided deeper revision. This shift indicates that the intervention helped students reconceptualize feedback not as a signal of failure but as a dialogic and developmental process aligned with their learning goals.

Together, the findings provide robust support for integrating explicit feedback literacy instruction into preparatory-level EFL writing programs. Such instruction not only enhances students' ability to understand and utilize teacher feedback but also promotes greater autonomy, reduces negative emotional responses, and encourages sustained engagement with revision processes. These outcomes are particularly significant in EFL contexts, where students often approach feedback with limited confidence, limited metacognitive awareness, and a strong reliance on teacher authority. By helping students view feedback as a collaborative tool for learning, feedback literacy instruction contributes to the development of more reflective and self-regulated learners.

The ramifications of this study extend beyond individual classrooms. Institutions seeking to improve writing outcomes may consider embedding feedback literacy within curriculum design, training writing instructors to adopt feedback practices that foster dialogue and learner agency and developing instructional materials that support students in interpreting teacher comments. Because feedback literacy intersects with assessment literacy, metacognitive development, and social-emotional learning, it has the potential to transform not only how students respond to feedback but also how they perceive themselves as writers.

Overall, this study contributes to the growing body of research emphasizing the centrality of feedback literacy in writing instruction. By demonstrating the effectiveness of explicit instruction in improving both writing performance and students' engagement with feedback, it reaffirms the need for pedagogical approaches that position learners as active participants in feedback processes. The findings underscore that feedback is most impactful when understood, valued, and acted upon, and that these abilities can be intentionally cultivated through thoughtful instructional design. In doing so, the study provides pedagogical direction for future writing programs seeking to empower learners with the skills necessary for continued academic and professional writing development.

6.1. Limitations of the Study

While the mixed-methods design adopted in this study provided a comprehensive and nuanced perspective on students' feedback literacy development, several limitations should be acknowledged.

First, the intervention was conducted with a single class of preparatory-year students within one institution. This restricted scope reduces the generalizability of the findings to broader EFL contexts, since institutional culture, teacher practices, and student demographics may differ significantly across settings. Future studies could enhance external validity by including multiple classes across various institutions.

Second, the relatively short duration of the intervention—6 weeks—limits the ability to capture long-term changes in feedback literacy. Feedback literacy is a complex and developmental construct, and students may require extended exposure and practice over multiple semesters or academic years to demonstrate stable and sustained growth. As such, the results of this study primarily reflect short-term gains rather than enduring transformations. Longitudinal studies would be necessary to investigate whether the observed changes persist over time.

Third, the small sample of interviewees may not fully represent the perspectives of the entire class, potentially limiting the breadth of insights captured in the qualitative data. Students who volunteered may have been more positively inclined toward the intervention, which could have influenced their responses.

In addition, although the control group followed the regular writing instruction specified in the curriculum and received written teacher feedback throughout the study, their experiences with feedback were not explored in detail. The research did not involve classroom observations or qualitative data collection aimed at understanding how control group students interpreted or made use of the feedback they received during the intervention period. As a result, comparisons between the experimental and control groups were primarily based on performance outcomes, rather than on a detailed examination of learning processes. Future studies may benefit from including reflective tasks or observational data from both groups in order to gain a more comprehensive picture of how students engage with feedback in different instructional conditions.

Finally, while the intervention was carefully designed to align with curricular goals, it necessarily displaced some instructional time that might otherwise have been devoted to other components of academic writing instruction. This trade-off may have shaped students' engagement and outcomes in ways that are difficult to differentiate from the effects of the intervention itself.

Despite these limitations, the study offers valuable insights into the short-term development of feedback literacy in a preparatory EFL writing context and provides a foundation for future research to build on with larger, longer-term, and more diverse samples.

REFERENCES

Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2015). Researching feedback dialogue: An interactional analysis approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(2), 252–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1102863

Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Tai, J. (2020). *Developing evaluative judgement: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work*. Routledge.

Akbarzadeh, R., Saeidi, M., & Chehreh, M. (2014). The effect of oral interactive feedback on the accuracy and complexity of EFL learners' writing performance. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 5*(2), 109–118.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(4), 543–574. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060268

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 193–214. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5*(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2021). What feedback literate students do: An empirical investigation of the uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(7), 979–990. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). *Feedback in higher and professional education: Understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 38*(6), 698–712. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462

Boud, D., & Soler, R. (2016). Sustainable assessment revisited. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 41*(3), 400–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1018133

Brick, B., & Holmes, J. (2008). Using screen capture software for student feedback.

Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students* (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.

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 & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Carless, D., & Chan, K. K. H. (2017). Managing dialogic use of exemplars. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(6), 930–941. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1211246

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. E. (2016). Designing feedback processes for developing learner agency. In D. Carless, S. Bridges, C. K. Y. Chan, & R. Glofcheski (Eds.), *Scaling up assessment for learning in higher education* (pp. 427–449). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3045-1_22

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. E. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education, 25*(8), 931–945. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372

Chong, S. W. (2022). The role of feedback literacy in written corrective feedback research. *Cogent Education, 9*(1), 2082120. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2082120

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Mahoney, P., Phillips, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). What makes for effective feedback: Staff and student perspectives. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1467877

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

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

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183

Ene, E., & Upton, T. (2018). Synchronous screencast feedback on students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 39*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005

Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(1), 70–120. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge University Press.

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research, 48*(6 Pt 2), 2134–2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2006). Feedback in portfolio-based writing courses. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 130–148). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.010

Han, Y., & Gao, X. (2021). Research on learner engagement with written (corrective) feedback: Insights and issues. In P. Hiver, A. Al-Hoorie, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Student engagement in the language classroom* (pp. 56–74). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923613-007

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30*, 31–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002

Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2021). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: A case study of Chinese undergraduate students. *Teaching in Higher Education, 26*(2), 181–196. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410

Handley, K., & Williams, L. (2011). From copying to learning: Using exemplars to engage students with assessment criteria and feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 36*(1), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903201669

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.

Henderson, M., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2019). Identifying feedback that has impact. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(5), 675–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1549972

Henderson, M., Ryan, T., & Phillips, M. (2019). The challenges of feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(8), 1237–1252. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1599815

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251

Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 14*(1), 63–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125

Jonsson, A., & Panadero, E. (2018). The use and design of rubrics to support formative assessment. *Educational Research Review, 24*, 137–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001

Kara, C. (2021). A qualitative study of feedback literacy in higher education: Uncovering enhancing and impeding factors [Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University]. Middle East Technical University Institutional Repository.

Kıvrak, C. (2023). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language Research (JLR), 7*(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1341654

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.10.001

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer.

Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching, 52*(3), 416–430. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). "I really need feedback to learn:" Students' perspectives on the effectiveness of the differential feedback messages. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21*(4), 347–367. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-009-9082-2

Liu, N. F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education, 11*(3), 279–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315750606

Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2017). "I feel disappointed": EFL university students' emotional responses towards teacher written feedback. *Assessing Writing, 31*, 52–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.07.001

Molloy, E., & Boud, D. (2013). Changing conceptions of feedback. In D. Boud & E. Molloy (Eds.), *Feedback in higher and professional education* (pp. 11–33). Routledge.

Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45*(4), 527–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Nash, R. A., & Winstone, N. E. (2017). Responsibility-sharing in the giving and receiving of assessment feedback. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1519. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01519

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(2), 113–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90010-8

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 501–517. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559

Nicol, D. (2020). The power of internal feedback: Exploiting natural comparison processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 45*(5), 664–677. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1823314

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(1), 102–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518

Nicol, D. J., & 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

Özdemir-Yılmazer, M., & Kabadayı, B. (2024). Adaptation of student feedback literacy scale into Turkish culture: A study of reliability and validity. *System, 122*, 103294. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103294

Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review, 9*, 129–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002

Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Botella, J. (2017). Effects of self-assessment on self-regulated learning and self-efficacy: Four meta-analyses. *Educational Research Review, 22*, 74–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2017.08.004

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(3), 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007

Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science, 28*(1), 4–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830280103

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Rowe, A. (2017). Feelings about feedback: The role of emotions in assessment for learning. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3045-1_11

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61*, 101860. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860

Ryan, T., & Henderson, M. (2018). Feeling feedback: Students' emotional responses to educator feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43*(6), 880–892. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1416456

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science, 18*(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714

Sadler, D. R. (2010). Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 535–550. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541015

Sutton, P. (2012). Conceptualizing feedback literacy: Knowing, being, and acting. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 49*(1), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647781

Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgment: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education, 76*(3), 467–481. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3

To, J., & Carless, D. (2016). Making productive use of exemplars: Peer discussion and teacher guidance for positive transfer of strategies. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 40*(6), 746–764. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2015.1014317

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven keys to effective feedback. *Educational Leadership, 70*(1), 10–16.

Wiliam, D. (2011). *Embedded formative assessment*. Solution Tree Press.

Winstone, N. E., & Boud, D. (2020). The need to disentangle assessment and feedback in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 45*(11), 2291–2303. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1779687

Winstone, N. E., & Carless, D. (2019). *Designing effective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach*. Routledge.

Winstone, N. E., & Nash, R. A. (2016). *The developing engagement with feedback toolkit (DEFT)*. Higher Education Academy. https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/developing-engagement-feedback-toolkit-deft

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. *Educational Psychologist, 52*(1), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). "It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it": Barriers to university students' feedback seeking and receipt. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(11), 2026–2041. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032

Woitt, S., Weidlich, J., Jivet, I., Orhan Göksün, D., Drachsler, H., & Kalz, M. (2025). Students' feedback literacy in higher education: An initial scale validation study. *Teaching in Higher Education, 30*(1), 257–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2263838

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (9. baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yıldız, H., Bozpolat, E., & Hazar, E. (2022). Feedback literacy scale: A study of validation and reliability. *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture, 7*(19), 2214–2249. https://doi.org/10.35826/ijoecc.624

Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2019). Investigating Chinese EFL students' engagement with feedback on writing. *ELT Journal, 73*(2), 178–187. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy045

Zheng, Y., Yu, Z., & Liu, S. (2020). Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback: A case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1806225

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (2011). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theoretical perspectives* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Feedback Literacy Scale

IJOEEC *(International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture)* *Vol: 7, Issue: 19 2022*

Ek 1. Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlık Ölçeği

No	Maddeler	Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Genellikle	Her zaman
Madde 1	Geri bildirim sayesinde ödev/çalışma sürecimi değerlendiririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 2	Geri bildirim sayesinde akademik açıdan gelişirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 3	Geri bildirim sürecinde öğretim üyesiyle/öğretmenle olan iletişimim artar.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 4	Geri bildirim aldığımda ödev/çalışmalarımın yeterliliği hakkında bilgi edinirim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 5	Geri bildirim sayesinde hedefe ulaşıp ulaşmadığımı değerlendiririm.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 6	Verilen geri bildirimi çalışmalarımı iyileştirmek için kullanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 7	Geri bildirim sayesinde farklı bakış açıları kazanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 8	Geri bildirim aldığımda güçlü yönlerimin farkına varırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 9	Geri bildirim aldığımda özgüvenim artar.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 10	Geri bildirim aldığımda motivasyonum artar.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 11	Geri bildirim aldığımda mutlu olurum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 12	Geri bildirim aldığımda önemsendiğimi hissederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 13	Geri bildirim aldığımda yaptığım işin değerli olduğunu hissederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 14	Geri bildirim aldığımda heyecanlanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 15	Geri bildirimin uygun üslupla (yapıcı bir şekilde) verilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 16	Geri bildirimin açıklayıcı olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 17	Geri bildirimin objektif verilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 18	Geri bildirimin zamanında verilmesi gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 19	Geri bildirimdeki eleştirilere açık olduğumu düşünüyorum.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 20	Geri bildirim sayesinde öğrenme ihtiyaçlarımı fark ederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 21	Geri bildirim sayesinde öğrendiklerimi başka alanlarda kullanırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 22	Geri bildirim sayesinde öz eleştiri yaparım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 23	Geri bildirim sayesinde hatalarımdan ders çıkarırım.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madde 24	Verilen geri bildirimler doğrultusunda hareket ederim.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Appendix 2. 1st Week Writing Task (Pre-test)

Argumentative Essay

Immigration is the movement of people from the homeland to another country in order to settle there, especially as permanent residents or future citizens. Some people claim that immigrants should adopt the local culture when immigrating to a new country.

To what extent do you agree with this view?

Present your arguments in around 250 words. You can use the ideas presented below.

Agree

– makes life easier

– more job opportunities

– people will trust you more

Disagree

– preserve traditions and language

– fear of other people

– fosters a strong sense of identity

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 3. 2nd Week Writing Task

Argumentative Essay

In the age of technology, people spend every minute they have on technological devices. Some people argue that it is important to care about personal interactions and values rather than technology. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion?

Agree:

- People do not pay attention to social relations and ties anymore
- Cultural and traditional values are losing their importance because of technology

Disagree:

- People establish connections with friends and family thanks to technology
- Technology helps us work (and play) without difficulty

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 4. 3rd Week Writing Task

Cause Essay

These days, many students have difficulty in paying attention and concentrating in their classes. There are several causes behind short attention spans and not having the ability to focus for long periods of time.

Write a well-organized essay where you discuss the causes of a short attention span. Write around 250 words. You can use your own ideas, or the suggestions listed below.

- Screen dependency
- Biological or mental health conditions
- Extremely busy lifestyle (Too many competing demands)
- Lack of sleep

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 5. 4th Week Writing Task

Cause & Effect Essay

In many modern societies, university education is important to be successful in life. But not everyone finishes what they started, and many university students drop out each year for various reasons.

Write an essay of around 250 words where you discuss the causes and effects of dropping out of university. You may use your own ideas, or the ideas presented below.

Causes

Family problems

Financial factors

Lack of motivation

Effects

Family conflicts

Limited Career options

Withdrawal from society

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 6. 5th Week Writing Task

Advantages-Disadvantages Essay

Learning a new language is essential nowadays as the world becomes globalized and international. While there are certain advantages of learning a new language, there are also some disadvantages that should be considered.

Write a well-organized essay about the advantages and disadvantages of learning a foreign language. Write around 250 words. You can use your own ideas or benefit from the ideas presented below.

Advantages

Increased job opportunities

Enhanced cognitive abilities

Improved communication skills

Disadvantages

Spending a lot of time and effort

High cost

Difficulty, some languages are difficult to learn

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 7. 6th Week Writing Task

Compare And Contrast Essay

Art and science are two essential components of human civilization. They have been valued in society for centuries but in different ways. While both have their unique characteristics, they also share some similarities.

Write a well-organized essay where you compare how art and science are valued in society. Write around 250 words. You can use your own ideas or may make use of the ideas presented below.

Art

Based on creativity and expression

Seen as a luxury

Science

Based on logic and reason

Seen as a necessity

Both

Help to understand the world around us

Require observation and experimentation

Funded by both private organizations and the government

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 8. 7th Week Writing Task

Effect Essay

People learn a new language for various reasons like to work or study in another country, move abroad, or simply for pleasure. It is known that learning a foreign language can affect the way people think and communicate.

Write a well-organized essay of around 250 words on the effects of learning a foreign language. You can use the ideas presented below.

• Better academic performance

• Improved concentration

• Stronger communication skills

• More creativity

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 9. 8th Week Writing Task (Post-Test)

Problem-Solution Essay

Unrealistic beauty standards and unhealthy attitudes toward food and eating can contribute to the development of eating disorders (ED), especially in young people. An eating disorder is a mental disorder defined by abnormal eating behaviors that negatively affect a person's physical or mental health. There are different types of eating disorders like anorexia, bulimia, and Binge Eating Disorder (BED).

Write a well-organized essay on possible ways of combating and preventing eating disorders. Write around 250 words. You can use your own ideas or make use of the ideas presented below.

Solutions

- Getting professional help to develop healthy eating habits
- Raising awareness about social pressures from the media and peers
- Providing early intervention and treatment
- Promoting positive body image and self-esteem

Introducing Topic in Intro Parag. (2 points)	Lexical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Thesis Statement (4 points)	Punctuation and Spelling (4 points)
Topic Sentences (4 points)	Coherence (4 points)
Relevant Supporting Sentences (8 points)	Grammatical Range and Accuracy (10 points)
Brief/Effective Conclusion (2 points)	Paragraphing (2 points)

Appendix 10. Rubric For Writing Tasks

CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION (52 pts)

Paragraphing	4 pts
Introduction of the Topic in the Introduction Paragraph	4 pts
Thesis Statement	8 pts
Topic Sentences (one for each body paragraph)	8 pts
Supporting Ideas with Relevant Examples and Explanations	16 pts
A Brief/Effective Conclusion	4 pts
Coherence	8 pts

USE OF LANGUAGE (48 pts)

Grammatical Range and Accuracy	20 pts
Lexical Range and Accuracy	20 pts
Punctuation and Spelling	8 pts

Appendix 11. 1st Week of Intervention- Understanding Feedback Abbreviations

Structure and Organization		
1. TS	**Topic Sentence**	*Missing, unclear, or unrelated topic sentence*
2. TH	**Thesis Statement**	*Problems with the essay's main argument.*
3. CO	**Coherence**	*Ideas are not logically connected*
4. TR	**Transition**	*Missing or weak transitions between paragraphs*
5. OR	**Organization**	*Issues with the overall structure of the essay*
Content		
1. RE	**Relevance**	*Content is off-topic or irrelevant*
2. EX	**Explanation**	*Insufficient or unclear explanation of ideas*
3. EV	**Evidence**	*Lack of evidence or poorly integrated evidence*
4. DP	**Depth**	*Ideas need more development or analysis*
Language and Grammar		
1. G	**Grammar**	*Grammar errors (e.g., tense, agreement)*
2. SP	**Spelling**	*Spelling mistakes*
3. P	**Punctuation**	*Incorrect or missing punctuation*
4. WCh	**Word Choice**	*Inappropriate or unclear word choice*
5. VT	**Verb Tense**	*Inconsistent or incorrect verb tense*

Appendix 12. 1st Week Handout

THE EFFECTS OF TV ON CHILDREN

A great number of children around the world like to watch television. Also, there are many channel and programme for children in television. Television can has some positive and negative effect on children.

Fristly, one positive impact of television is new informations. For example, when children watch the television, they learn new knowledges as well as words. So, children learn new things very fast and funny thanks to watching television. Moreover, we must pay attent choosing channel and programme for children.

Secondly, one negative impact of television is healthy. Watching too much television contributes to some disease, such as eye disease. Additionally, according to researches, watching television leads to some psychological problems on children. For instance, the children who watch too much television are become more angry because they always want to watch television. If fix the this issue, they may be addicted to television.

In conclusion, television has positive and negative effect on children. Of all these effect, learning new informations and health are two of most signifcant ones.

Appendix 13. 2nd Week of Intervention- Recognizing Feedback Types

Essay Prompt

In order to have a more dynamic country, it is believed that welcoming immigrants can be a good idea both for the country and its citizens. It can help the host country in many different aspects, like education and employment. The US is a good example of this.

What are the main reasons to accept immigrants into a country? (250-300 words)

• The need for skilled workforce

• The need to enrich culture

• The need to increase the younger population of a country

Example Essay

People may want to live in other countries therefore, countries often recieve immigrants from abroad. There are some reasons why countries accept this situation, such as expanding culture and increasing labor.

First of all, host countries can have more different cultures thanks to immigrants. This can be improved host country because cultural diversity is one of the significant factor in the development of countries. As the culture of country expands, it becomes easier to adapting to social life. In this way, the level of welfare increases fastly because as people come together, it becomes easier to live in the country.

The other reason for migration is increasing labor force. As immigrants come to the country, the number of people who have to work somewhere will increase rapidly. In this way, immigrants will have contributed to the country's economy. This is a very important situation, especially for employers.

To sum up, countries accept immigrants to improve some situations. There is a mutual gain between countries and immigrants.

Teacher's Feedback:

Positive Feedback(P)

- Clear Structure: Your essay has a clear introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion. This structure helps in organizing your ideas logically.

- Relevant Ideas: You've identified important reasons for accepting immigrants, such as enriching culture and increasing labor force, which are key points in the discussion.

Suggestions for Improvement(S) (Suggestive Feedback)

- The introduction could be clearer and more specific. For example, instead of saying "welcoming immigrants can be a good idea," you could explicitly mention the positive impacts immigrants have on the country.

- The thesis in your introduction is somewhat vague. Make sure your thesis clearly states the main points you will discuss in the body of the essay.

-Your essay provides good points, but the explanations could be more detailed. For example, when discussing how cultural diversity benefits the country, you could explain how different cultures contribute to innovation, creativity, and international relations.

- Work on smooth transitions between paragraphs and ideas to improve the flow of the essay.

Grammar (G): (Corrective Feedback)

- Verb Tense Consistency:

"As the culture of country expands, it becomes easier to adapting to social life."

Suggested revision: "As the culture of a country expands, it becomes easier for people to adapt to social life."

- The sentence "This improves the host country because cultural diversity is one of the significant factors in the development of nations" is in active voice because the subject ("This") is performing the action of improving the object ("the host country"). In active voice, the subject does the action.

If you want to use passive voice, it will shift the focus from the subject ("This") to the object ("the host country"). Here's how it could look:

"The host country is improved by this because cultural diversity is one of the significant factors in the development of nations."

Appendix 14. 2nd Week Handout

Disorganized Feedback:

1. "Make sure to include a stronger thesis statement in your introduction."
2. "The vocabulary used in your essay is appropriate and varied."
3. "You have a great structure in your essay, but the conclusion could be clearer."
4. "I noticed several instances where subject-verb agreement needs correction."
5. "Good use of evidence and examples to support your claims."
6. "You should work on making your introduction more engaging."
7. "Your spelling is mostly accurate, but ‘accommodate’ is misspelled."
8. "Your arguments are well organized and logically sequenced."
9. "Avoid using run-on sentences in the second paragraph."
10. "The depth of your analysis is impressive."
11. "Try to provide more context for your examples to make them clearer."
12. "Consider varying your sentence structures for better readability."
13. "Check your use of commas, especially after introductory clauses."
14. "Your conclusion summarizes the main point well enough."
15. "You may want to eliminate unnecessary repetition in your writing."

There are some disorganized feedback statements above. Categorize them under the corresponding group.

Positive Feedback	Suggestion for Imrovement	Grammar and Mechanics

Appendix 15. 3rd Week of Intervention- Interpreting and Reflecting on Feedback

Essay Prompt

Incentive prizes offer large rewards upon completion of a specific objective task. Traditionally, they are large cash prizes awarded to individuals or teams who have done an extraordinary job in their positions.

What are the effects of awards and prizes on the performance of an individual or team? (250-300 words)

Effects

• It can create a healthy competitive atmosphere at work.

• Individuals or teams may have much more motivation.

• Individuals and teams may take their job more seriously.

Example Essay

There may be rewards as a result of some specific objective tasks. Incentive rewards are effective on the performance of employees or competitors. These rewards have some effects increasing people‘s motivation and competitive atmosphere at work.

First of all, people like to gain something and they strive for rewards. They can spend their time and effort for the task. The source of this effort is motivation given by the rewards. These rewards are often choosen as monetary rewards because, nowadays, money is perceived as the most valuable for people. The motivation of wanting to earn money makes people successfull.

Secondly, competition is a very useful as long as it is harmless and these incentive prizes can create a useful competitive atmosphere. This is a very necessary situation because competition increases people‘s desire to win, especially of ambitious people.

To sum up, incentive prizes have very significant effects on people. Most of the time, people achieve success thanks to these effects. Especially employees can benefit from this situation.

Teacher’s Feedback

- The essay follows a clear structure with an introduction, body paragraphs, and a conclusion. This helps the reader understand the main points easily.

- You’ve identified the key effects of incentive prizes, such as motivating individuals and creating a competitive atmosphere. These are important points that support the thesis.

- The conclusion briefly summarizes the main points, reiterating that incentive prizes significantly affect individuals' and teams' performance.

- You mention that competition is useful, but you can expand this idea. How does competition lead to increased performance or innovation? For example, does it encourage teamwork or innovation? Providing specific details would strengthen your argument.

- Try using a broader range of vocabulary to make the essay more engaging. For example, "money" can be replaced with "financial rewards" or "monetary incentives."

- The sentence "These rewards are often choosen as monetary rewards because, nowadays, money is perceived as the most valuable for people" contains an issue with verb tense ("choosen" should be "chosen").

- In the sentence "The motivation of wanting to earn money makes people successfull," the word "successful" should be used, and the structure can be improved for clarity.

- In your last sentence, "Especially employees can benefit from this situation" feels a bit disconnected. It would be clearer to restate it in a way that ties back to the previous ideas.

Suggested revision: "In particular, employees can benefit from the motivation and competitive atmosphere created by these incentive prizes."

Appendix 16. 3rd Week Handout

Feedback Reflection Worksheet

1. What are the main points of feedback given?

_____

_____

_____.

2. What did the teacher highlight as strengths in the sample essay?

_____

_____

_____.

3. What areas need to be improved based on the feedback?

_____

_____

_____.

4. Aree there any comments that are not understandable or need more clarification on?

_____

_____

_____.

5. What specific steps should the writer take to improve his/her work based on this feedback?

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix 17. 4th Week of Intervention- Paragraph Organization

Paragraph Question

Sleep is an essential part of our daily routine, and it is crucial for our physical and mental well-being. However, sleeping too much can have adverse effects on our health and lifestyle.

Write a paragraph around 150 words in which you discuss the effects of sleeping too much. You can use your own ideas or the ideas below.

Effects:

1. Reduced productivity

2. Health problems: obesity, diabetes, and heart disease

Sample Paragraph

Sleeping can have negative effects of our health and lifestyle. One of the effect is obesity. Obesity, which is crosing the line of calories and normal line. If people sleep too much, they feel tired and they cannot do physical activities. This is effect the obesity. Another negative effect is heart disease. This problem mostly cause of sleep less. Because their daily routines are pose a risk. They cannot catch the life. Their cells and mental health have effect of this problem.

Teacher's Feedback

Clear Identification of Effects: You've identified important effects of sleeping too much, such as obesity and heart disease, which directly relate to the prompt.

Structure: The paragraph has a clear structure, starting with the topic and followed by examples of the negative effects.

Clarity: Some explanations are unclear. For example, "Obesity, which is crossing the line of calories and normal line" should specify how sleeping too much reduces physical activity and contributes to obesity.

● **Suggested revision:** "Obesity occurs when people consume more calories than they burn, and excessive sleep can contribute to this."

Transitions: Improve the flow between ideas. The transition from obesity to heart disease is a bit abrupt.

● **Suggested revision:** "In addition to obesity, excessive sleep can also lead to heart disease."

Grammar:

● "One of the effect is obesity" → "One of the effects is obesity."

● "This is effect the obesity" → "This affects obesity."

Phrasing:

● "Obesity, which is crossing the line of calories and normal line" → "Obesity occurs when calorie intake exceeds expenditure."

● "This problem mostly cause of sleep less" → "This is often caused by lack of sleep, but excessive sleep can also contribute."

Revised Version:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix 18. 5th Week of Intervention- Applying Feedback Principles to a Sample Essay

Essay Prompt

There are more than 7.000 languages around the world, but English has become a lingua franca making communication possible among people from different linguistic backgrounds. Having a global language like English has undeniable benefits for humankind, however, it also brings several drawbacks.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of having a global language?

Write a well-organized essay with at least 300 words.

Sample Essay

In today's world, high percentage of people use English. There are countries more than 10 which has spoken as a main language. In addition, there are lots of sources which has been written in English .This situation creates an advantage for education. Many countries speak English. Therefore, their educational sources were written with english. Badly, there is one disadvantage of this situation. The country which speaks english. Such as, india. The natives want to preserve their culture, traditions and language.

First of all, English may create an advantage for education. Most of sources were written with English at before. When many people knows English, One's understand what the source want to tell. With this way, English would be a key for educational life and next generation would take advantage of this sources which books has written in English. If the world would continue to use English, these books would contribute to other people.

Secondly, there is negative impact on the preservation of local cultures and tradition. Native person may want to preserve their culture and traditions. English can be obstacle for them because when people use the different language, people may lose their traditional culture. Unfortunatelly ,their next generation can be affected from the situation. Such as, kids do not want to listen their local stories. Kids may want to listen stories which has been written in English.

To conclusion, ıf people can speak English, they can utilize from many sources and they can understand what is happening in the world but native people ,they would not to use English because their culture and tradition would have damage with this way.

Student’s Feedback:

Appendix 19. 6th Week of Intervention- Feedback Strategy Development

GROUP WORK

1. What steps can you take to approach feedback with a positive mindset and use it effectively for improvement?

_____

_____

_____.

2. When receiving multiple pieces of feedback, how will you decide which to focus on first?

_____

_____

_____.

3. What steps can you take to apply feedback effectively and make tangible improvements in your work?

_____

_____

_____.

4. What will you do if you don't understand a piece of feedback or feel confused about how to act on it?

_____

_____

_____.

5. If you face difficulties applying feedback, what strategies can you use to overcome them (e.g., breaking tasks into smaller steps, seeking clarification)?

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix 20. Semi-structured Interview Questions

A. Feedback Perception

1. What did feedback mean to you before?

2. Have your thoughts about feedback changed now?

3. Which type of feedback do you find most useful? Why?

B. Training Process and Awareness

4. What did feedback literacy training add to your knowledge?

5. After this training, do you think you understand the feedback given by your teacher more easily?

6. How did this process affect the way you review your writing?

C. Emotional Responses

7. How do you feel when you receive feedback?

8. Did you feel demoralized when receiving critical feedback? How did you cope with it?

D. Application and Future Approach

9. How do you use feedback when improving your writing?

10. How do you plan to apply what you've learned from this process to your future writing tasks?

Appendix 21. Ethics Committee Approval

YILDIZ TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu

Toplantı Tarihi: 26.05.2025 **Toplantı No: 2025.05**

SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ARAŞTIRMALARI ETİK KURULU TOPLANTI KARARI

Yürütücülüğünü Üniversitemiz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü öğretim üyelerinden Prof. Dr. Suzan Kavanoz danışmanlığında lisansüstü öğrencisi EMİNE TANRISEVEN tarafından yapılacak olan "Geribildirim Okuryazarlığının Üniversite Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi The Effect Of Feedback Literacy On College Prep Students' Essay Writing" adlı çalışma ve bu çalışmada kullanılacak veri toplama araçları ve yöntemlerine ilişkin bilgilerde etiğe aykırı herhangi bir bulguya rastlanmamıştır.

Etik Kurul Üyeleri

DocuSigned by: Murat Donduran 07F20CD75AD8430...
Prof. Dr. Murat DONDURAN
Başkan

DocuSigned by: [redacted] 9D5616D3F2674C8...
Prof. Dr. Fatih GÜLGEN
Üye

DocuSigned by: [redacted] D8CAA832588D413...
Prof. Dr. Yiğit EVREN
Üye

DocuSigned by: [redacted] 95126DCBD722430...
Doç. Dr. Begüm SATICI
Üye

DocuSigned by: [redacted] 11BD89611D0B462...
Doç. Dr. Nur CEMELELİOĞLU
Üye

DocuSigned by: [redacted] AEDFCC489DA74F0...
Doç. Dr. Gülbin ÖZKAN
Üye

DocuSigned by: [redacted] 7FF802A54D7049F...
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi H. Ağan KARADUMAN
Üye

Taş Bina A-2013 Oda Davutpaşa Kampüsü Esenler/İstanbul Tel: (0212) 383 31 18
E-posta: sbemdr@yildiz.edu.tr - Web: sbe.yildiz.edu.tr
Rapor Doğrulama Adresi: "etik.yildiz.edu.tr/dogrula" Rapor No: 20250505459 Doğrulama Kodu: e1a3c

Appendix 22. Informed Consent Form 1

DENEKLERİN GÖNÜLLLÜLÜĞÜ

VE

AYDINLATILMIŞ ONAM FORMU

Sayın Gönüllü,

Bu formun amacı katılmanız rica edilen araştırma ile ilgili olarak sizi bilgilendirmek ve katılımınız ile ilgili izninizi almaktır.

Bu kapsamda Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Eğitim fakültesi yüksek lisans öğrencisi Emine TANRISEVEN ve tez danışmanı Prof. Dr. Suzan KAvanoz tarafından yürütülen "Geribildirim Okuryazarlığının Üniversite Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi/The Effect Of Feedback Literacy On College Prep Students' Essay Writing" başlıklı yüksek lisans tez çalışmasına davet edilmektesiniz. Bu araştırmaya katılıp katılmama kararını vermeden önce, araştırmanın neden ve nasıl yapılacağını bilmeniz gerekmektedir. Eğer anlamadığınız veya sizin için açık olmayan bir durum varsa, ya da daha fazla bilgi isterseniz bizimle iletişime geçmekten çekinmeyiniz.

Bu çalışma, üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin geribildirim okuryazarlığını geliştirmenin, yazma becerileri üzerindeki etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Araştırmada, deney ve kontrol grubu olmak üzere iki grup öğrenci yer alacaktır. Deney grubuna haftalık yazılı geribildirimlere ek olarak kısa süreli geribildirim okuryazarlığı eğitimi verilecektir. Bu eğitimler, geribildirimi anlama, uygulama, geri bildirim talep etme ve geribirim üzerine düşünme becerilerini geliştirmeye yönelik olacaktır. Araştırma kapsamında öğrencilerden ön test ve son test olarak kısa denemeler yazmaları istenecektir. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin geribildirimle ilgili algılarını ölçmek amacıyla deney sonucunda anket ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler gerçekleştirilecektir. Bu sayede, geribildirim okuryazarlığı eğitiminin yazma performansına, geribildirimi uygulama becerilerine ve öğrenci algılarına olan etkisi nicel ve nitel olarak değerlendirilecektir. Çalışma 01.06.2025-31.07.2025 tarihleri arasında gerçekleştirilecektir. Yanıtlarınızdan toplanan bilgiler yalnızca bu araştırmanın amaçları doğrultusunda kullanılacaktır.

Bu çalışmaya katılımınız gönüllülük esasına dayalıdır, dilediğiniz zaman herhangi bir sebep göstermeksizin ayrılabilirsiniz. Araştırmadan çekilmeniz ya da araştırmacı tarafından araştırmadan çıkarılmanız durumunda sizle ilgili veriler kullanılmayacaktır. Sizden elde edilen tüm bilgiler gizli tutulacaktır, araştırma yayınlandığında kimlik bilgilerinizin gizliliği

korunacaktır. Kimlik bilgileriniz, herhangi bir kişisel tanımlayıcı bilgi yerine bir kod numarası atanacaktır.

Bu formu onayladığınız takdirde araştırmaya katılım için onam verdiğiniz düşünülecektir.

Yukarıda yer alan araştırmaya başlamadan önce gönüllülere verilmesi gereken bilgileri içeren metni okudum (ya da sözlü dinledim). Eksik kaldığını düşündüğüm konularda sorularımı araştırmacılara sordum ve doyurucu yanıtlar aldım. Yazılı ve sözlü olarak tarafıma sunulan tüm açıklamaları ayrıntılarıyla anladığım kanısındayım. Çalışmaya katılmayı isteyip istemediğim konusunda karar vermem için yeterince zaman tanındı. Bu koşullar altında, araştırma kapsamında elde edilen şahsıma ait bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılmasını, gizlilik kurallarına uyulmak kaydıyla sunulmasını ve yayınlanmasını, hiçbir baskı ve zorlama altında kalmaksızın, kendi özgür irademle kabul ettiğimi beyan ederim.

Katılımcının Adı-Soyadı:

İmzası:

Appendix 23. Informed Consent Form 2

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ OLUR FORMU

1. Aşağıda imzası olan ben " Geribildirim Okuryazarlığının Üniversite Hazırlık Öğrencilerinin Yazma Becerilerine Etkisi/The Effect Of Feedback Literacy On College Prep Students' Essay Writing " başlıklı çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

2. Bu çalışmayı yürüten Emine TANRISEVEN çalışmanın yapısı, amacı ve muhtemel süresi, hakkında ayrıntılı sözlü ve yazılı bilgi verdi.

3. Araştırmacı Emine TANRISEVEN'e çalışmasıyla ilgili her soruyu sorma fırsatını buldum. Cevapları ve bana verilen bilgiyi anladım.

4. Araştırmacı Emine TANRISEVEN 'e bilgilerin ayrıntılarını açıklamama ve benimle ilgili sırları koruması şartıyla benimle bu çalışmayı yapmasına izin veriyorum.

5. Çalışma boyunca tüm kurallara uyacağıma, araştırmacı Emine TANRISEVEN ile tam bir uyum içinde çalışacağıma ve konuyla ilgili herhangi bir sorun çıktığında hemen onu arayacağımı kabul ediyorum.

6. Bu çalışma sonuçlarının kullanılmasını kısıtlamayacağımı ve yayın, rapor ve benzeri bilimsel dokümanlarda kullanabileceğini kabul ediyorum.

7. Bu çalışmadan istediğim zaman çıkabileceğimi anladım.

OKUDUM VE ONAYLADIM.

Katılımcının Adı ve Soyadı, Adresi: Tarih, İmza:

Araştırmacının Adı ve Soyadı, Adresi: Tarih, İmza:

Appendix 24. Permission to Use the Feedback Literacy Scale



Feedback literacy scale Gelen Kutusu

Emine Tanrıseven 23 Haz
Alıcılar. [redacted]

Hocam merhabalar,
Ben Emine Tanrıseven. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi'nde İngiliz dili eğitimi alanında yüksek lisans yapıyorum ve tezimde feedback literacy konusu üzerinde çalışıyorum. Tezim için gerekli olan scale'i sizin makalenizde inceledim ve çalışmam için çok uygun olduğunu gördüm. Sizin de izniniz olursa kullanmak istiyorum.
Şimdiden teşekkür ederim.
İyi çalışmalar dilerim.

E
Ebru Bozpolat 23 Haz
Alıcılar: ben

Merhaba Emine,
Tabii ki kullanabilirsin. Çalışmalarında başarılar diliyorum.

Prof. Dr. Ebru BOZPOLAT
Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi
Eğitim Fakültesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
58140 SİVAS