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Abstract

The aim of present research, to analyze deal of requirements that middle and high school students’ fulfillments towards the teachers’ feedback comparatively. Research was carried out two groups randomly determined one from middle and other from high school. These groups were asked to produce a short essay in text type. After these texts were collected and evaluated by researchers. Feedback was projected by making explanations on the paper. In the research carried out by Ülper (2012), It is indicated that teachers give feedback according to content formation, coherence, word usage, language use, mechanical properties, paper order, holistic quality and text type category. This framework was based on feedback upon students’ texts. In the middle stage, the texts were given back to the students and they were asked to rewrite the texts by making adjustments based on that feedbacks. In the last stage, all texts were collected and it was identified that the students’ overwrites relating to which feedback categories. According to the result of our study, it has been evidently revealed that students require assistance when correcting. Besides, the students performed a higher rate of acceptable corrections for topic requiring less cognitive effort such as paper layout, mechanic properties.

1. Introduction

Written text production is formed as a result of an iterative process of three phases with the inclusion of planning, writing out and reviewing (Flower& Hayes, 1981). The criteria of whether or not someone generating a text, who has conducted content planning, fit for the purpose of writing and translated his or her thoughts into writing according to this plan, has generated a text with communication value, depends on the extent to which she has addressed the textuality criteria (coherency, consistency, purposefulness etc.) of the text she has generated. In this respect, it is a necessity for the text generated by each text generator (as a draft) to be reviewed carefully in terms of textuality criteria and corrected. In this process, students require assistance in order and able to perform the reviewing procedure in a sound manner and create more quality texts (Hamzadayı & Çetinkaya, 2011). Goldstein (2004) states that students are able to generate more quality texts by receiving feedback. In this context, teachers can present students oral and written feedback in the classroom setting. Raimes (1983) perceives this case to be one of...
the primary responsibilities of the teacher. Due to classrooms being crowded, sometimes teachers collect students, texts, evaluate them, provide students collectively feedback through markings and explanations on the paper. In this stage, it is expected that students take the marking and explanations on the students, papers into consideration and perform the required corrections. However, similar studies in the literature (see Straub, 1997; Ferris, 1995) indicate that students sometimes fail to fulfill the requirements of this feedback. There are no studies conducted in Turkey on this subject. In this respect, the purpose of the study is examine the extent that students in the middle of school and high school fulfill the requirements of teacher feedback.

2. Methodology

2.1. Set of participants

The study was conducted on two randomly determined groups, one of them is a middle school and the other one from a high school. The number of students from the middle school is 52. Among these students, 23 are girls and 29 are boys. The age range of students is 13-14. The number of students from the high school is 59. Among these students 29 are girls and 30 are boys. The age range of these students is 17-18.

2.2. Process steps

These groups were requested to generate short essays and subsequently these essays were collected and evaluated by the researchers and feedback was provided with explanations on the papers. In the study conducted by Ülper (2012) it is stated that teachers provide feedback according to the categories of content formation, consistency, word use, linguistic performance, mechanical property, paper layout, and text type. Accordingly, in the context of content formation feedback was provided regarding title, introduction, main idea, redundant information (repetition, omitting), imperfect information (addition), creativity, developing, enhancing the topic (exemplifying, detailing), and forming the conclusion. In the context of consistency, feedback was provided with regards to organization of the text (planning logical order), connections between sections of the text, connections within sections of the text, topic unity continuity, and status of coherency. In the context of word use, feedback was presented with regards to relevant word phrase selection, the use of Turkish words, and vocabulary use. In the context of mechanical properties, feedback was provided on ambiguity and formal properties. In the context of paper layout, feedback was provided in terms of spelling, punctuation, and dividing into paragraphs. In the context of paper layout, feedback shall be provided with regards to handwriting and correct use of the paper. This framework was taken as a basis in feedback to be presented in student texts. In the subsequent phase, the texts was redistributed to the students and they were requested to rewrite the texts on a new piece of paper with corrections in line with this feedback.

2.3. Data analysis

2.4. In the final stage, all papers were collected from the students and the feedback categories, which they made corrections accordingly, were determined and analyzed according to percentage and frequency distribution.

3. Findings

Examples of feedback provided to texts generated by middle school and high school. Students are present in Table (2). All of the feedback has been presented in the form of explanations in writing. Some of the feedback provided are follows: Add a title that clarifies and sets the boundaries topic of the text, develop the introduction section by clearly introducing the topic, develop the development section by providing examples and paraphrasing, rewrite the conclusion section by briefly summarizing the topic, there is ambiguity in the underlined sentences, replace the circled word with a suitable word, the second paragraph has been separated from an incorrect point, correct the punctuation in the marked section, take care regarding paper layout and handwriting.
A total of 242 feedbacks were presented to high school students included in the study and students took 92% of this feedback into consideration and attempted corrections. While students took all feedback concerning paper layout into consideration, they only took 67% of feedback concerning consistency into consideration. Together with this, while they were able to make acceptable corrections to only 24% of feedback concerning content, they were able to make 90% acceptable corrections concerning mechanical properties. In total they were able to perform approximately 68% acceptable corrections.

Table 2. Middle school students’ textual actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Category</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Use of Language</th>
<th>Mechanic Properties</th>
<th>Paper Layout</th>
<th>Text Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback number</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of corrective attempts</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective attempt percentage</td>
<td>%69</td>
<td>%57</td>
<td>%78</td>
<td>%88</td>
<td>%82</td>
<td>%100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>%79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of inadequate corrections</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of inadequate corrections</td>
<td>%89</td>
<td>%77</td>
<td>%35</td>
<td>%49</td>
<td>%51</td>
<td>%31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>%52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of acceptable corrections</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of acceptable corrections</td>
<td>%11</td>
<td>%23</td>
<td>%65</td>
<td>%51</td>
<td>%49</td>
<td>%69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>%48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 557 feedbacks were presented to the middle school students included in the study and students took 79% of this feedback into consideration and attempted corrections. While students took all feedback concerning paper layout into consideration, they only took 57% of feedback concerning consistency into consideration. Together with this, while they were able to make acceptable corrections to only 11% of feedback concerning content, they were able to make 90% acceptable corrections concerning mechanical properties. In total they were able to perform approximately 48% acceptable corrections.

4. Conclusion

One of the striking results revealed as a result of the study is concerning the number of presented feedback. While a total of 242 feedbacks were provided concerning texts generated by high school students, a total of 557 feedbacks were provided concerning texts generated by middle schools students. The low rate of feedback provided for texts generated by high school students, in one respect indicates that texts generated by high school students have better quality. Furthermore, with a correction attempt rate of 92%, high school students have made more correction attempts compared to middle school students, who have a correction attempt rate of 79%. This indicates that high school students are more willing to generate quality texts compared to middle school students. Another striking rate is the rate of acceptable corrections. While this rate was 68% for high school students, it was 48% for middle school students. Accordingly, high school students appear to be more adequate with regards to the correction of the mistakes in the texts they have generated. In one aspect, this case explains why the texts generated by high school students are more quality than the ones generated by middle school students. So much so that, the students reviewing and correcting the texts they have generated in the writing process are of utmost significance. In order to perform this correction procedure, students are expected to have competency at certain level. In case students are unable to notice the defective aspects of the texts they have generated on their own, teachers are expected to assist students. By drawing attention to the defective aspects of student texts, teachers expect students to perform corrections; however, it would appear that students demonstrate deficiencies with regards to correcting. According to the results of the study conducted by Straub (1997) and Ferris (1995), the existence of a similar circumstance is striking. According to the results of these studies, students do not perform the corrections on paper required by feedback of their teachers and in this respect it appears that teacher feedback has small impact on students. This arouses a question in mind concerning another aspect of the problem. This is whether or not students are really competent enough to perform this correction procedure.

According to the result of our study, it has been evidently revealed that particularly middle school students require assistance when correcting. The fact that students perform higher rate of acceptable corrections for topic requiring less cognitive effort such as paper layout, mechanic properties and perform acceptable corrections at a lower rate for topics requiring more cognitive effort and textualization knowledge such as consistency and content, provides clues with regards to the source of this problem. Students have need to form adequate background information concerning textualization, consistency and convert this background information to skill. It is evident that plenty of exercises need to be performed in a planned manner in order to achieve this.
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