

EFL Thesis Writing: Revealing the Supervisor's and Supervisee's Attitudes toward the Written Feedback

by Mister G Maru

Submission date: 20-Nov-2022 07:35PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1959135704

File name: EFL_THESIS_WRITING.pdf (3.2M)

Word count: 8771

Character count: 48955



EFL Thesis Writing: Revealing the Supervisor's and Supervisee's Attitudes toward the Written Feedback

Lailatul Musyarofah¹, Slamet Setiawan^{2*}, Mister Gideon Maru³

¹ Universitas Negeri Surabaya & Universitas PGRI Delta, Sidoarjo, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Universitas Negeri Manado, Manado, Indonesia

*Corresponding author's email: slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id

Bio-profiles:

Lailatul Musyarofah is a senior lecturer at Universitas PGRI Delta Sidoarjo. She is interested in English language teaching studies as her major research. Besides teaching, she is also active in a women empowerment organization in East Java and standing as a Vice-Chairperson of *Perempuan PGRI Provinsi Jawa Timur*. She can be reached at ibulaila7810@gmail.com

⁴ **Slamet Setiawan** is an Associate Professor in the English Department of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. He obtained his B.A. in English Language Teaching at Universitas Negeri Surabaya. He completed his MA at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, and his Ph.D. at the University of Western Australia (both in Linguistics). His educational background leads him to be interested in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics (English Language Teaching). He can be reached at slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id. ORCID: 0000-0003-4143-8757

² **Mister Gideon Maru** is a senior lecturer and currently the head of English Education Department in Universitas Negeri Manado (UNIMA). He completed *Sarjana Sastra* in English Literature at Universitas Gadjah Mada in 1998. He is awarded with Cum Laude

for both his Master of Humanities in American Studies (2006) majoring in Literature and for Doctorate (2013) of the same field at the same University. He is currently an editor and reviewer for several national journals. His interest is in literature teaching, cultural studies, text analysis, and essay writings related to character building. He can be reached at mrgidionmaru@unima.ac.id. ORCHID: 0000-0001-7549-1922

Abstract

This paper aims at exploring supervisor and supervisee attitudes concerning written feedback in thesis writing. This is a content analysis using documentation and interview to collect the data. There were four sets of thesis drafts, four thesis supervisors, and ten supervisees as the sources of the data. Attitudes concerning written feedback are seen from the manner, timing, form, function, and area. The manner in this study is defined in three channels: manual, electronic, and combination. Most supervisors provided written feedback manually even though most of them are IT-literate and young aged. Regarding the timing of providing written feedback, most supervisors preferred on the spot written feedback. That is why all supervisor-supervisees have a certain schedule for thesis supervision and thesis writing conference. The form of written feedback is the next aspect this study is concerned. It is found that comments and marks are dominantly used by the lecturers to provide written feedback. The function of written feedback was dominated by correction followed by criticism, praise, and suggestion. The area which the lecturers were concerned about most was the content followed by the form. Supervisors have positive attitudes in providing written feedback, otherwise, some disheartening written feedback is still provided. Regarding supervisee attitudes, it is found that supervisees accepted all kinds of supervisors' attitudes and treatment to them as far as they were supervised. In an inferior position, students were passive even some critical opinions should be considered for the next thesis supervision process.

Keywords: *thesis writing, written feedback, supervisor and supervisee, attitudes*

Introduction

L2 students probably need further assistance with thesis writing; otherwise, they should have more competence in English grammar and usage than native speakers (Murray, 2006). Hence, the language, cultural, and educational backgrounds these students convey to the writing task and the problems that they experience in thesis writing merit watchful consideration (Dong, 1998; Hassan et al., 2020). That is why, unlike L1 students who are fairly independent requesting for help when it is needed, in Indonesia, students regularly and intensively meet the supervisor to receive support and sufficient direction to enable them to succeed in his/her studies from the beginning until the end of the thesis writing process. In the institution where the study was conducted, for example, each student is supervised by two supervisors and the frequency of supervision in the completion of the thesis writing is also determined: eight meetings to complete the proposal and ten times to complete the research report (Widodo et al., 2017). L2 students may require more supervision than others, perhaps for more than just the language differences, since there are other layers of cultural differences that create specific challenges (Murray, 2006; Budiharso & Arbain, 2019). Thus, they need continuous feedback from the supervisor hence feedback is an important aspect of the functions as praise, criticism, and suggestions in the process of writing a thesis (Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Setyawan et al., 2020).

Generally, feedback played a formative role in students' broader socialization and contributed to the co-construction of academic identities and (in) access to preferred discourse practices in their departments and disciplines (Anderson, 2020). In thesis writing completion, feedback is considered as one of the indicators of whether supervision is good (Ferris, 1997:314). More specifically, as one particular kind of assessment method commonly used in language classrooms (Chong, 2018; Sujito et al., 2019), written feedback is considered as one of the media of communication between supervisor and student, particularly, in writing (Hyland, 2009). That is why written feedback is valued as an important aspect of the students' writing process (Kumar & Stracke, 2007). In other words, feedback from supervisors not only guards and guides the progress of researching and writing up a thesis, but it also helps the student to become an

independent academic researcher so they can affiliate their research writing on national or international journals to engage with writers' community.

Sutanto (2015) stated that different types of feedback and the way of the feedback that is provided determine the quality of students' responses to the feedback. The responses of the students to the quality of the contents enhance the progress of the students' thesis writing, which is displayed in the revised drafts of students' thesis. The deeper feedback on the contents and organization indicates the better responses of students in revising the content quality of the thesis. Besides, the supervisors have different abilities in the feedback strategies and that contributes to the development of students' thesis. Sutanto (2015: 131) recommended investigating the perception of supervisors to provide feedback for future research. This recommendation is important to be followed up because supervisors' perception means an awareness of their written feedback and how written feedback is used. This awareness, hopefully, will affect supervisors' passion for providing meaningful and motivating written feedback. Furthermore, to achieve a deeper and balance finding, students' perception is also investigated in this study.

Some studies dealing with the perception of written feedback resulted in different findings (Ferguson 2011; Poulos & Mahoney 2008, Carless 2006; Deveci, 2019). These diverse findings of previous studies have revealed that students' views should not be treated alone, isolated from their context, especially their teachers' beliefs, and practices. Hedcock and Lefkowitz (1996) put forward those students' response patterns could reflect their instructors' practices in the writing classes. Written feedback reinforces the points made through explicit teaching and any research of written teacher feedback should consider the connections and interactions between teachers, students, texts, and writing purposes (Goldstein, 2001: 86; Hyland & Hyland, 2006: 213).

Leaph (2011) examines the perceptions about the effectiveness of oral (OF) and written (WF) feedback on the writing of thirty-seven Cambodian English-major students at the National University of Management (NUM). Results indicate that both groups equally delivered higher performance on the holistic assessment of writing, although the OF group felt more oriented towards oral feedback than the WF group felt towards written feedback. Whereas the OF group improved in both the micro-aspects (i.e. grammar,

vocabulary, and mechanics & spelling) and the macro-aspects (i.e. content and organization), the WF group produced a higher quality of writing only in language and organization. Furthermore, Hajri & Al-Mahrooqi (2013) researched student perceptions and preferences around instructors' feedback. They discovered the type of written corrective feedback students liked best. The study revealed that students agreed on a preference for comprehensible, selective, positive-sounding, and grammatically-focused feedback. Consequently, it is suggested that teachers adjust their correction practices to suit students' immediate needs, taking into consideration the fact that they are EFL learners of English.

Feedback is the heart of the learning experience in thesis writing (Sutanto, 2015) and the importance of written feedback is widely known by feedback providers. However, the way they are giving written feedback is sometimes confusing and disheartening for students (Hyland & Hyland, 2001: 208). That is why researching written feedback needs to be explored due to its necessity hence some students considered written feedback as to their lifelong learning and the fact that they saved all their marked papers for future referrals for their professional practice (Ghazal, 2014: 25). Moreover, what students do with feedback is as important as the quality and conditions of delivery of the feedback; they need to take responsibility and act on the given feedback. Previous studies resulted that the written feedback role is equally important for both L1 and L2 thesis students, even though L2 students may sometimes require feedback in areas that L1 students do not require (Bitchener; Basturkmen; East, 2010; Robillos & Phantharakphong, 2020). In other words, supervisors give different treatment to L1 and L2 students; they are less critical to those L2 students. Bitchener, Basturkmen, East, and Meyer (2011) in their further study suggest investigating the specific types of written feedback supervisors give to the students hence little attention has been given to this issue. Thus, this study seeks thesis supervisors' and supervisees' attitudes in written feedback.

Method

This is qualitative research especially content analysis. The content analysis focuses on the meaning reflected in the characteristics of materials. Content or document analysis is a research method applied to written or visual materials to identify specified

characteristics of the material. The materials that were discussed in this study were the documents of the process and product in thesis drafts and interviews with the participants: four lecturers (as thesis supervisors). Documentation within four sets of thesis draft was the main instrument which was used to be analyzed to find ⁴³ the qualitative and quantitative data while the interview was used to explore quantitative data. Three instruments were used in this research: researchers, filed notes, and interview guidelines. ⁴⁸ To answer the research question, the data obtained from documents were classified based on the categories: the manner, the timing, the form, the function, and the area of written feedback. After classifying all data taken from documents, it was followed by interviews with the participants; lecturers, and students. This was done to explore further how and why the participants provide certainly written feedback.

Respondents

In selecting the participants, purposeful sampling was used for rich information taken from carefully chosen participants. Four lecturers (two lecturers as supervisor one and two as supervisor two) were selected. In this institution, supervisor one has responsibility for supervising students' thesis content while supervisor two supervises language, mechanism, and organization. This consideration of selection was taken to see deeper how lecturers provide written feedback on students' thesis and the attempt to establish the objectivity of the research findings. Besides technical and functional consideration, the selection of the lecturers was also based on lecturers' characteristics and professionalism in providing written feedback. Lecturers who are cooperative and have a willingness in providing written feedback were chosen. It is important because if it is not taken into account, the data, perhaps could not be gathered as lecturers' objection in providing written feedback. Furthermore, lecturers who are open-minded and welcome to be invited to discuss the finding were also considered, in case, there were some data which needed to confirm. Next, those four lecturers were named as L1, L2, L3, L4. Besides, ten students were also chosen as the respondents to see their opinion towards lecturers' attitudes in providing written feedback. The consideration made in choosing these ten students is: each student had different supervisors, the ten students are the ones who had the thesis drafts taken as the data. This is because the process and progress made

by the students could be traced easily. Moreover, students' opinion towards the written feedback given by the supervisors could be more accurate than that of who were not involved.

Data analysis

The research design started by reviewing the theories related to the study of the ways written feedback was provided in thesis drafts. The theories then were used to develop questions and to design thesis assessment rubrics. The questions were used to collect the data in the form of an interview. The data were put in tables based on themes and codes. The codes were applied to extract text and interpret the data. For analyzing how written feedback is provided by the lecturers, some theories supporting the studies should be used. The theories from Hyland (2010) are used to analyze the manner, Hyland & Hyland (2011) is used to analyze the functions of written feedback, Bitchener, et al. (2011) to analyze the area of written feedback, Mack (2009) to analyze the form of written feedback, and to analyze the timing, the theory from Zhang, Zhang, and Ma (2010) is used. Lecturers' attitudes were defined as the manner, the timing, the form, the function, and the area. There were two kinds of data; qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative data were found from interviews and documentation while quantitative was found from the total numbers and percentage taken from the frequency of appearance of each aspect from the documents. These two kinds of data were presented to make the finding more obvious.

Results

This study aims to find out the attitudes of thesis supervisors and supervisees concerning written feedback in the thesis writing process. The attitudes are defined as the manner, the timing, the form, the function, and the area of written feedback provided by the supervisors to supervisees' thesis drafts.

The Manner

The manner of providing written feedback in thesis writing supervision between lecturers and students was divided into three channels: manual, electronic, and combination (Hyland, 2010). Manual in this case means students and lecturer met at a

certain time consulting the thesis proposal. Electronic means students and lecturers did supervision through email or students transferred the soft file instead of printed paper. While the combination referred to supervision by both manual and electronic.

Most lecturers like handwritten feedback because it is simple but helpful. The reasons why lecturers gave manual written feedback are found from the interview. There were four lecturers interviewed (L1, L2, L3, L4). From the interview, it was identified that two lecturers (L1 and L4) combined manual and electronic supervision while the other two lecturers (L2 and L3) provided written feedback manually.

The reasons why lecturers preferred to provide feedback manually even though all of them are IT literate and young aged is because thesis supervision was already in a schedule which was discussed at the first meeting among lecturer and students. Moreover, the regulation to fulfill the numbers of meeting before and after the proposal leads them to meet students face to face regularly because the meetings were recorded in the consultation sheet. He once gave electronic feedback when the student could not print out the file while the student ensured that only a small part needed to check (L1). The next statements come from L2 who combined electronic and manual written feedback. He stated that he provided manual written feedback mostly to students than electronic. He gave electronic feedback in a very special case for example the student was not able to revise or edit on his/her own without assistance while the time to accomplish the thesis was not that long. The need for the students was the basic consideration to provide electronic feedback. L3 said that manual written feedback was simple. Students showed the draft, the lecturer checked, commented while wrote the feedback on the draft, question-answer session if possible, and then students just could start to revise. L4 reported that she did not like providing written feedback electronically because it seems weird to see students come for thesis supervision by bringing the laptop on or even flash disc. She added that some of her colleagues have already provided E-written feedback it does not become culture yet in her institution and it should change as information technology runs fast.

The Timing

Supervision meeting between student and lecturer was divided into two categories; direct (conference) and indirect (through the paper). Direct supervision was done when the students met the lecturer by schedule or appointment consulting the draft students proposed individually or in a group. While indirect supervision was done when the student/s collected the drafts to be corrected or commented on by the lecturer and returned in some days. Most lecturers did both direct and indirect supervision while the frequency was different from one another. Students, on the other side, preferred direct supervision to consult their thesis so they know the progress, the correction, and the revision they should do. Moreover, they could ask things they did not understand or doubt even somehow they got nervous whenever they were about to see the lecturer.

Related to the thesis supervision meeting, lecturers had varied ways in the timing of giving written feedback; immediate and delayed (Zhang, Zhang, and Ma, 2010). Immediate means lecturer and students did conference during the consultation. They met at a certain time to talk about the thesis draft, lecturer commented on the draft while writing feedback on the draft. The student did the same thing while listening to the comment, she/he wrote feedback from the lecturer. On the other way around, delayed means that written feedback was given after the students submitted the drafts, wait for some days while the lecturer checked the draft. Written feedback was given in drafts checking and students got the checked drafts after some days. There were two ways in returning the checked draft, the lecturer simply put the drafts on his/her table and instructed students to take their drafts or students met the lecturer to discuss the drafts.

Data shows the timing of supervision was done regularly. Supervision is always followed by written feedback. It is confirmed that there is no case in thesis consultation students got no written feedback in their drafts even though it is followed by conferencing. Dealing with the frequency of supervision, thesis consultation sheets reported that each student got six up to twelve times a meeting before the proposal seminar and six up to eight times before the thesis examination. Written feedback was given in regular consultation, seminar proposal, another regular consultation heading to thesis examination, and in thesis examination as the final revision before thesis submission. On the other side, the interview resulted that three lecturers (L2, L3, L4) provided written

feedback the same all the way through the process. L1 preferred to provide written feedback in the first draft.

The Form

The form of written feedback was analyzed based on Mack's (2009) study those are comment, error correction, and question. Hence error correction and question can be categorized as a comment, the form of written feedback is defined in two; comment and mark. A comment is any word, phrase, or sentence produced by the lecturers to inform students to revise or edit the drafts. It is found that the numbers between comments and forms are similar. 46 comments and 47 marks were provided on four sets of students' thesis drafts.

Table 1: The Form of Written Feedback in Thesis Writing Process

Documents	Comments	Marks	Total
Form			
Proposal Writing Process	14	17	31
Seminar Proposal Drafts	12	7	19
Thesis Examination Drafts	11	23	34
Evaluation Sheets	9	0	9
Total	46 (49.5%)	47(50.5%)	93

Table 1 shows the use of comment was found in all stages of thesis writing mostly in seminar proposal drafts. Error corrections were found in the proposal writing process and thesis examination drafts, the question was found in proposal writing only, while marks as the dominant form of written feedback were found in all stages of thesis writing except in the evaluation sheet. It is reasonable hence in the evaluation sheet lecturers could only provide comments as the general feedback after the thesis examination.

Why comments were mostly found in the seminar proposal is because, in this phase, students still needed guidance in changing the content even the topic needed further revision. While the marks were mostly found in thesis examination drafts because in thesis examination, the content was considered fixed and students' need was mostly editing that can be covered through the use of marks as written feedbacks. The comment

was given after the student submitted the drafts and it was checked by the lecturer. This kind of written communication was generally found in thesis writing supervision done in face to face consultation. The students, in this case, accepted all forms of written feedback provided by the lecturers no matter what because written feedback was considered meaningful for them. Some students complained about unclearly written feedback so they did not understand what the lecturer meant, some had to confirm with the lecturer orally to crosscheck their understanding of the written feedback, and some just leave the drafts like before as they did not know what to do. Even though students had different reactions after they got written feedback but they appreciated any kind of written feedback.

The statement “I don't appreciate marks without the text in feedback (such as underlined sentences, circle around a word, question mark, etc.)” appeared in the interview with students as it is known that written feedback in the form of marks sometimes needs further explanation and confirmation. It can be said that marks are not effective written feedback dealing with students' uptake. Meanwhile, in the documents, marks reached the top form of written feedback. Otherwise, students prefer written feedback in the form of comments hence it is easier to understand and revise.

Another thing that students disagreed with is written feedback which tried to change their direction and writing style, which was hard, contradictory, and given because of personal preference. In a further interview it is found that in some cases, lecturers drove students' ideas or writing styles. Students did not say that it was wrong yet difficult to cope. In different cases, students were open to accepting all feedbacks from the lecturer when they were at the beginning of the writing process. The problem came when the instruction of changing the direction or idea was given after the proposal seminar or even in the thesis examination.

The Function

The function of written feedback was analyzed as categories found by Hyland & Hyland (2011). Of 93 written feedback found, 49 corrections, 32 criticisms, 8 suggestions, and 4 praises. Correction is mostly found in the thesis examination draft, criticism is mostly found in the process of writing a proposal, the suggestion was mostly

found in the evaluation sheet, while praise was mostly found ³ in the process of writing a proposal.

Table 2: The Function of Written Feedback in Thesis Writing

Documents	Correction	Criticism	Suggestion	Praise	Total
Function					
Proposal Writing Process	17	10	0	3	30
Seminar Proposal Drafts	7	6	0	1	14
Thesis Examination Drafts	25	9	6	0	40
Evaluation Sheets	0	7	2	0	9
Total	49 (52.7%)	32 (34.4%)	8 (0.45%)	4 (0.21%)	93

Table 2 shows that the function of written feedback was mostly for correction (52.7%) followed by criticism (34.4%), praise (0.43%), and suggestion (0.21%). The examples of each function are shown below. It is found that in the form of written feedback, six are error corrections. While the function, most written feedbacks function as a correction. The frequency of correction was mostly found in the drafts of the proposal writing process and thesis examination. It makes sense hence in those two processes students need the draft in the correct version. Moreover, in the thesis examination draft, the lecturer not only criticized but also corrected students' drafts.

Criticism is found in all documents. Criticism range from how the lecturer asked students to think of what they had written, why they wrote a certain topic, and pay attention to the spot which the lecturer disagreed with. To show how the written feedback function in students' thesis drafts, below are the examples of each function. A suggestion that was characterized as optional was found in the thesis examination draft and evaluation sheet. Different from correction or criticism which had to be revised, the suggestion had a lower tone. Students could revise or not depend on the time limitation, the competence, and the will of the student. The suggestion led students to a better thesis

draft but if it was not done, it did not affect much the previous thesis production. Praise, on the other hand, had fewer numbers than other functions. The praise which aimed at motivating students with a positive comment was not found in this study. The praise, in this study, was in the form of a mark of a checklist (✓) to show the lecturer's appreciation and acceptance of certain points.

As exposed in Table 2, written feedbacks functioning as correction and criticism were prevailing. There are some possible motives for why it occurred. First, it was the first time for students to write a thesis so they made a lot of mistakes and needed strict guidance in producing academic writing. Second, written feedback can be considered as media to learn and progress in writing. Third, the lecturer had a high standard of thesis writing style and topic.

Seen from students' point of view, negative written feedback was given because supervisors had high expectations and students thought when lecturers gave grammar correction they were not interested in the content or not knowledgeable about the content topic of the thesis. It means students agreed that lecturers had high expectations when they provided negative written feedback, and negative perception of lecturers' comments on grammar, sentence structure, format, etc. while ignoring the content. All participants revised their thesis to some degree after receiving written feedback which means no matter the revision consideration they took, but they still did the instruction from the supervisor. This means that not all participants are mentally ready in receiving negative written feedback. These three students could feel uncomfortable in receiving negative written feedback and possibly affected their emotions and mood in writing the thesis even though temporary. This indicates that written feedback should be provided fairly.

The Area

The area of written feedback in the thesis proposal was classified as content, linguistic accuracy and appropriateness, requirements, and organization (Bitchener, 2011). There are 95 written feedbacks found in the process of thesis writing started from writing proposals, proposal seminars, thesis examination, and evaluation sheets. The area which the lecturers concerned most was the content (55) and form (38).

Table 3: The Area of Written Feedback in Thesis Writing

Documents	Content	Form	Total
Area			
Proposal Writing Process	20	11	31
Seminar Proposal Drafts	14	5	19
Thesis Examination Drafts	17	17	34
Evaluation Sheets	4	5	9
Total	55 (59%)	38 (41%)	93

The area of written feedback as shown in table 3 indicates lecturers paid attention more to the content than form. The content was the most aspect lecturer was concerned about. It reached 62.38% which put the content as the most important thing ⁴⁹ to focus on. Written feedback on content gradually decreases in the stages of thesis writing. Written feedback on content was mostly found in proposal writing and appeared less in the thesis examination draft. The same case happens to written feedback on linguistic accuracy and appropriateness. It appears in three kinds of thesis drafts: proposal, seminar proposal, and thesis draft. From the data obtained as shown in table 3, it can be drawn interesting conclusions about the area of written feedback given by lecturers. Lecturers agreed that content was prior more than other areas such as ⁵⁰ linguistic accuracy and appropriateness, requirements, and organization. In the early stages of writing a thesis, requirements, and organization were ignored by the lecturers. No written feedback was provided in this area. Those two areas were notified in the thesis examination. Content, furthermore, was still a priority to be provided in thesis examination drafts for it reached 62.3%.

Regarding students' feelings towards the form of written feedback in thesis writing, all students came to an agreement that they had a positive feeling for all feedbacks had their own importance to help students. Furthermore, seen from the document and interview, it is known that written feedback provided by lecturers had a substantial role in students' thesis writing.

Furthermore, it is shown that students intended to simply revise and edit based on the instruction but they need to ask for clarification before doing so. Similar to the finding obtained from the documents that students' uptake to written feedback is considered very good even not all students could meet the lecturers' standard. All students said that the

action of ignoring, misunderstanding, feeling unable, even deleting the point provided written feedback was experienced by them.

Discussion

In this study, written feedback is defined as information provided by the lecturers which closes the gap between students' actual performance and desired performance. Written feedbacks which were analyzed are in students' thesis drafts starting from students' regular consultation, seminar proposal draft, another draft on regular consultation heading to thesis examination, in thesis examination draft as the final revision before thesis submission, and evaluation sheet of thesis examination. Written feedback was provided by lecturers who were standing as a supervisor in thesis writing. Dealing with the manner of written feedback provision, thesis consultation was divided into three channels: manual, electronic, and combination. There were four lecturers interviewed (L1, L2, L3, L4). From the interview, it was identified that two lecturers (L1 and L4) combined manual and electronic supervision while the other two (L2 and L3) provided written feedback manually. It can be said that most lecturers preferred the manual for providing written feedback with follow-up activity (conferencing) than electronic only. It contradicts Hyland (2010: 12) who said that the utilization of PCs and other technology has turned out to be common in instructive settings, especially in university settings, and is frequently favored by students and teachers of second language writing. Meanwhile, dealing with this issue, Salima (2006) confirmed that written feedback should be used in coordination between two sides to make students comfortable and gain some benefit to improve students writing and encourage them to take more responsibility for their learning.

Thus, as far as the learning goal is achieved, any channel can be chosen. Moreover, the use of manual written feedback found in the present study does not simply indicate that technology is not yet broadly used by the lecturers and students, for the use of technology becomes a daily need for both. It is because, as stated by Lecturer 1 in the interview, thesis supervision needs more than correcting and approving but motivational and emotional relation building between lecturers and students that can be developed easier through face to face supervision. Furthermore, as a small institution with a view

number of students who are staying near the campus, students possibly come to campus regularly as well as the lecturers so manual becomes lecturers and students' preference than other channels.

Dealing with the timing of written feedback provision, it is confirmed that three lecturers (L2, L3, L4) provided written feedback the same through the process. L1 preferred to provide written feedback in the first draft. As found in the interview, lecturers provided different ways of written feedback: immediate and delayed. Immediate written feedback was done when lecturers directly gave written feedback at the time of consultation while delayed written feedback was provided by lecturers after students submitted the draft and returned after some days. Immediate written feedback is considered the most effective (Cowan, 2003). A different finding is found by Murray (2002) that no matter immediate or delayed feedback, as far as supervisors provided sufficient feedback on the students' draft within the allocated length of time is considered fine. This study finds that both immediate and delayed written feedback were treated the same by students; they revised as well as they could.

The form of written feedback is the next aspect this study is concerned. It is found that those marks are dominantly used by the lecturers to provide written feedback followed by comments, error correction, and questions. Ashwell (2000) argues that students used feedback on form more than on content. It aligns with the present study which finds most used written feedback deals with non-content aspects. Proportionally, Dong (1998) listed the aspects nonnative students need for more involvement and help from their advisors in: (1) developing ideas, (2) drawing conclusions, (3) organizing paragraphs, and (4) presenting ideas logically. Those lists show that non-native students are still weak in content but they find difficulties to use feedback related to the content.

The present study finds that written feedback is not only in the forms of comments, error correction, and question as found in Mack (2009), but also mark which is dominant. The marks found in this study cover underline, circular, question mark, and many others which have no certain meaning except an attentive word or phrase student had to revise or edit. Compared to a study conducted by Buckingham & Aktug-Ekinci (2017) who are concerned with interpreting coded feedback in writing, marks used in their study are correction codes which are forms of guided indirect, metalinguistic feedback on learner

writing. Codes used for providing written feedback are generally known by teachers and students hence there is a specific sheet to correct students' writing. Their study resulted in students often found English-sourced correction codes difficult even though the use of the correction code sheet appeared to improve the quality of students' noticing in addressing the error, not yet correcting the errors. Nevertheless, the marks used in this study which have no exact meaning or purpose may drive students into difficulties. That is why, as found in the questionnaire, all students asked for clarification before revising or editing the draft, two students misunderstood the message contained in the written feedback, three students felt unable to come up with suitable revision, the other two simply deleted the offending text to avoid the issue raised, and one student ignored the written feedback when it is not important or unclear. Despite those negative reactions to written feedback, most students simply revised and edited based on the instruction.

The next aspect is the function of written feedback. The function of written feedback was dominated by correction followed by criticism, praise, and suggestion. It is found that in the form of written feedback, six are error corrections. While the function, most written feedbacks function as a correction. The frequency of correction was mostly found in the drafts of the proposal writing process and thesis examination. It makes sense hence in those two processes students need the draft in the correct version. The present research finds that praise has minimum use than that of other written functions such as correction, criticism, and suggestion. Praise was rarely found in the finding because, as found in the follow-up interview, lecturers considered that praise is not appropriate for the thesis writing context yet is suggested for lower writing subjects (Writing I, II, III, and IV). In thesis writing, criticism and suggestion are more appropriate feedback for the sake of students' revision. Imbalanced written feedback is also found in Ghazal et al. (2014) who found the tone of comments lacked a balance of praise and criticism. While different finding comes from Hyland and Hyland (2001) who found feedback providers most frequently employed praise function in their feedback. The varied finding indicates lecturers have their own consideration in providing written feedback to students for they know students' needs and how to cater.

Two different findings were revealed concerning how to treat grammar errors in students' writing. Truscott (1996) argued that in L2 writing classes, grammar correction

should be ignored since it is inefficient and harmful, while Kamler and Thomson (2014) advocate that the final copy of the dissertation must be free of grammatical and spelling errors. Different from classroom context, in thesis writing, grammar is a crucial aspect to be corrected hence no excuse for grammar errors in academic writing. The result of the present study reveals grammar error is important to correct. The timing of correcting grammar is somehow done in an orderly after the content was already fixed and approved by the lecturers who are acting as supervisor one. It is following Leki (1991) in his study that students want to have good writing with error-free writing so they expect their teachers to correct all errors in their written work. This means, even though grammar is not put as the premier object of written feedback in thesis writing supervision but it is not abandoned for error-free writing is considered important for the sake of journal publication.

Regarding the area where written feedback is provided, the present study finds that lecturers paid attention much to the content even though they did not miss the other areas such as linguistic accuracy and appropriateness, requirement, and organization. The area of written feedback in thesis writing was classified as content, linguistic accuracy and appropriateness, requirements, and organization. 95 written feedbacks were found in the process of thesis writing started from writing proposals, proposal seminars, thesis examination, and evaluation sheets. The area which the lecturers were concerned most was the content followed with linguistic accuracy and appropriateness, requirements, organization.

Bitchener et al. (2011) make an imperative point that supervisors viewed feedback as an important part of the teaching and learning dialogue they had with their students and as a way of helping students to move towards becoming independent writers in the tertiary context. Supporting the previous study's affirmation, the present study reveals written feedback was used as a tool by lecturers for guiding students to write appropriately with minimum error. As found in the interview, lecturers also concerned about students' characteristics and background; educational, psychological, and proficiency levels in providing written feedback. In the other words, lecturers treat students differently considering student's competence hence not all students can run at the same speed. To

sum, both previous and present studies discover similar findings that there is lecturers' positive intention as the basis of providing written feedback for students.

From the interview, it is found that students had similar attitudes dealing with thesis supervisors' written feedback in general. Otherwise, students have a different perception of negative written feedback. Some of them disagreed with negative written feedback. One of the students does not appreciate straightforward written feedback and when it directs her to other related resources. Written feedback that is too much-changing students' direction, writing style, and which is hard to revise gets low appreciation from students. Interestingly, how affected their emotion and how hard the revision, students had no choice except revised and edited based on lecturers' instruction. It means students can put their ego away in the process of thesis writing because they realize that lecturers' written feedback is important and helpful. It is in line with Paulos and Mahoney (2018) ³ that the impact of feedback is influenced by students' perception of their tutor, in this case, lecturer. They found that students said that feedback can be demoralizing but they did not ³ go to discuss a particular connection between emotion and students' perception of written feedback.

⁴⁰ The current study finds that students' emotion is related to the written feedback they received. It is found from the questionnaire asking their feeling that they feel scared, embarrassed, lose-confidence, lose-motivation, even give up when they received critical/negative written feedback. Not all students feel those feelings but all participants confirmed that critical/negative written feedback affected them emotionally. This finding supports Ferguson (2011) especially in terms of the feel of loss-confidence. From the interview, it is found that helpful written feedback is when the instruction from the supervisor is clear. This finding confirmed Ferguson (2011) who ³ found that students wanted personalized feedback with clear guidance on how to improve their work. The results show that most written feedback was used by the students but it does not indicate written feedback is clear and understandable, some factors like oral feedback and clarification before revising are assumed as the other aspects of written feedback is mostly used by the students.

Regarding the area/s which are referred to in items more important and helpful for students, students stated that they needed all aspects ¹⁸ content (e.g. range and depth of

knowledge, accuracy, completeness, and relevance) and form (requirements/expectations of different parts/chapters of a thesis, organization/structure of material writing coherence and cohesion, linguistic accuracy). Students thought that linguistic accuracy, organization, writing coherence were important because in thesis writing students should make a good and systematic organization for each chapter. The content was considered the most important aspect because students must understand what she/he writes in the thesis.

This present study's finding is in line with Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Hyland, 1998; Leki, 1991 who found some learners paid the most attention to almost all aspects of their writing, some paid more attention to form, and some paid more attention to content. Second, students' views about the usefulness of teacher feedback are mixed. Most students found teacher feedback useful (Ferris, 1995; Saito, 1994). Some students found feedback on errors more useful than feedback on content (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; Saito, 1994). While students in Leki's (1991) study profited little from error corrections, and students in Cohen's (1991) study reported to benefit most from comments on the organization. Third, students' preferences for feedback have also been found to vary according to writing contexts. Some studies suggested that students want teachers to comment on form as well as on content (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Leki, 1991; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996). Some students preferred more comments on the form (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996).

The findings of EFL students' preferences regarding feedback do support those of Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), in which data of questionnaires indicated that EFL students were concerned about content, rhetorical soundness as well as linguistic accuracy. Moreover, the students' preference for more detailed, specific, and clear feedback is similar to that of the students in Elwood and Bode's (2014) study. Compared together, the perceptions of the lecturer are slightly different from those of students. For the focus of feedback, the teacher thought she had focused on the organization, while the students and the actual feedback showed that feedback on the organization was not much. For the types of feedback students preferred, the teacher assumed that the students would like her personal reader response to the content of the writing, while the students expected to receive feedback on the organization most. The findings of the present study also

support what Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) revealed in their study, that students frequently operate on principles and assumptions that may not match those of their lecturers.

The present study has similar suggestions with previous studies that revision quality may correlate with feedback intake which depends on learner-focus and feedback quality (Leaph, 2011), and providing feedback that is favorable and, hence, more comprehensible to students, is highly recommended (Hajri & Al-Mahrooqi, 2013).

Conclusion

It is found that supervisors had positive attitudes in providing written feedback but they did not realize how important their role in students' thesis writing so some disheartening written feedback was still provided. Moreover, all students had a positive appreciation for written feedback in general but negative feelings in some aspects especially the use of marks and minimum psychological consideration.

Pedagogical Implication

Compared to simply giving grades, feedback positively influenced motivation and achievement (Koenka et al., 2019) hence feedback is a crucial element in helping students identify gaps and assess their learning progress (Cavalcanti, 2020). Sutanto (2015) yielded that feedback helps write development, on the other hand, the communication between students-supervisor contributed to students' stress in thesis writing. Thus, providing effective written feedback in thesis writing is challenging. The results of the present study can be used by the supervisors to reexamine the quality of feedback they give to students. Concerning this issue, supervisors should get training in (a) providing written feedback strategies, (b) explaining those strategies to their students, and (c) helping students learn to revise and holding them accountable for considering feedback they have received in doing so (Ferris, 1997). Based on the finding, it is suggested to the faculty to embed this matter into regulation because effective written feedback will be truly operative when it is held by the faculty level. Furthermore, for an educational institution, it is to address written feedback as a whole issue, as a departure point for discussions in the teaching faculty, as it only is truly effective when embedded in a whole

institution policy which is constantly applied. The result of the study also enriches the supervisors any issues dealing with written feedback. Hopefully, by knowing different kinds of written feedback, the supervisors can consider what written feedback they should use before giving. On the other hand, students who are going to write a thesis will know earlier how the supervisor gives written feedback on thesis writing so mental readiness will help them to face the thesis writing process.

References

- Anderson, T. (2020). The Socialization of L2 Doctoral Students through Written Feedback. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1726758>
- 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. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1060374300000278>
- Bitchener, J. (2010). Writing an Applied Linguistics Thesis or dissertation: A guide to presenting empirical research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (2).
<https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119201>
- Bitchener, J., Basturkmen, H., East, M., and Meyer, H. (2011). Best Practice in Supervisor Feedback to Thesis Students. *Voced Plus*. Retrieved from <https://www.voced.edu.au/content/ngv:52708>
- Budiharso, T., & Arbain. (2019). Teaching practice: Immersion program for teacher development profession. In *Asian EFL Journal* (Vol. 26, Issue 6.2, pp. 270–291).
<https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85078543752&partnerID=40&md5=98cdef8cfb7dfacae313c735695d56de>
- Buckingham, L., & Aktug-Ekinci, D. (2017). Interpreting coded feedback on writing: Turkish EFL students' approaches to revision. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 26, 1-16. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1475158517300012>
- Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31, 219–33.

<https://srhe.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070600572132#.X-B3CFYzbiU>

Cavalcanti, A.P., Diego, A., Mello, R.F., Mangaroska, K., Nascimento, A., Nascimento, F, Gašević, D. (2020). How Good Is My Feedback?: A Content Analysis of Written Feedback. ICPS Proceedings LAK '20: Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge, 428–437.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3375462.3375477>

Chong, S.W. (2018). Three Paradigms of Classroom Assessment: Implications for Written Feedback Research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15, (4), 330-347

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15434303.2017.1405423>

Deveci, T. (2019). Frequently occurring words in education research articles written in English: A preliminary list. *Asian ESP Journal*, 15(1), 8–38.

[https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85068443956&partnerID=40&md5=cf13cf258782b58445ede25084bfec07)

[85068443956&partnerID=40&md5=cf13cf258782b58445ede25084bfec07](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85068443956&partnerID=40&md5=cf13cf258782b58445ede25084bfec07)

Dong, Y. (1998). Non-Native Graduate Students' Thesis/ Dissertation Writing in Science: Self-Report by Students and their Advisors from Two U.S. Institutions. *English for Specific Purpose*, 17, 4, 369-390. Retrieved from

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0889490697000549>

Ferguson, P. (2011). Student Perceptions of Quality Feedback in Teacher Education. *Journal Evaluation & Assessment in Higher Education*, 36, (1), 51-62.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02602930903197883>

Ferris, D. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 31, (2), 315-339.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.2307/3588049>

Ghazal, L., Gul, R., Hanzala, M., Jessop, T., Tharani, A. (2014). Graduate Students' Perceptions of Written Feedback at a Private University in Pakistan. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3 (2), 13-27. www.sciedu.ca/ijhe.

Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about written teacher commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13 (1), 63-80.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.006>

- Hassan, A., Kazi, A. S., Shafqat, A., & Ahmed, Z. (2020). The Impact of Process Writing on the Language and Attitude of Pakistani English Learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(43), 260–277. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85096076595&partnerID=40&md5=f90fcd17eafcd3fc50f8190da0bf756c>
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some Input on Input: Two Analyses of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80 (3), 287-308.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01612.x>
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (2), 171-182. Retrieved from <https://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/view/119251>
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10 (3), 185–212. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1060374301000388>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting written teacher feedback. In book: *Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues*. (206-224): Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.013>
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (Eds.), *Feedback in ESL Writing: Contexts and Issues*. (206-224). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742>.
- Iqbal, S., et al. (2014). Teachers' Accounts of Their Perceptions and Practices of Providing Written Feedback to Nursing Students on Their Assignments. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 3, (3). Retrieved from www.sciedu.ca/ijhe.
- Koenka, A.C., Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., Moshontz, H. Atkinson, K.M. Carmen E. Sanchez, C.E. & Cooper, H. (2019). A Meta-Analysis on The Impact of Grades and Comments on Academic Motivation and Achievement: A Case for Written Feedback. *Educational Psychology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1659939>

- Kumar, V. & Stracke, E. (2007). An analysis of written feedback on a Ph.D. thesis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12 (4), 461–470.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13562510701415433>
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24 (3), 203-218.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x>
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What Conditions Are Necessary for Effective Teacher Written Feedback for ESL Learners? *Polyglossia*, 16. Retrieved from
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Issues-and-dilemmas>
- Murray, R. (2006). *How to Write a Thesis*. Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
<https://books.google.co.id/>
- Poulos. A. & Mahoney, M.J. (2008). Effectiveness of Feedback: The Students' Perspective. Retrieved from
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ787594>
- Robillos, R. J., & Phantharakphong, P. (2020). Enhancing EFL learners' argumentative abilities in written composition and critical thinking dispositions through argument mapping within metacognitive approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(3.3), 181–208.
<https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85090557256&partnerID=40&md5=20412c02b6d528503edbb76b5ba3745d>
- Salima, S. (2006). The Students' Attitudes to Teachers' Feedback in Writing: A Case Study of Second Year Students, University of Constantine. The University of Constantine. A Ph.D. Dissertation. Retrieved from
<http://archives.umc.edu.dz/bitstream/handle/123456789/11401/SEL887.pdf?sequence=1>
- Setyawan, Y., Suwastini, N. K. A., & Ratminingsih, N. M. (2020). Process Approach in the Teaching of Writing for Undergraduate EFL Students. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, 5(2), 149–164.
- Sujito, Budiharso, T., Solikhah, I., & Muttaqin, W. M. (2019). The effect of analogy variations on academic writing: How Indonesian EFL students perform with different cognitive styles. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(1).

- Sutanto, (2015). Thesis Writing Supervision: A Contribution of Feedback to the Development of Students' Thesis Writing. A Doctoral Dissertation. repository.upi.edu. perpustakaan.upi.edu.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Widodo, dkk. (2017). *Buku Pedoman Penulisan Skripsi STKIP PGRI Sidoarjo*. Sidoarjo: Sida Mantap Press.
- Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., and Ma, L. (2010). A Brief Analysis of Correction Feedback in Oral Classroom. *Journal of LT and Research*, 1, (3), 306-308.

EFL Thesis Writing: Revealing the Supervisor's and Supervisee's Attitudes toward the Written Feedback

ORIGINALITY REPORT

15%

SIMILARITY INDEX

13%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	repository.upi.edu Internet Source	1%
2	ijicc.net Internet Source	1%
3	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	1%
4	conference.unesa.ac.id Internet Source	1%
5	www.ukessays.com Internet Source	1%
6	informatik.unibas.ch Internet Source	1%
7	Hanoi University Publication	<1%
8	hub.hku.hk Internet Source	<1%
9	ir.uitm.edu.my Internet Source	<1%

10	www.thesisinfo.com Internet Source	<1 %
11	digitalcommons.usu.edu Internet Source	<1 %
12	Louisa Buckingham, Duygu Aktuğ-Ekinci. "Interpreting coded feedback on writing: Turkish EFL students' approaches to revision", Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2017 Publication	<1 %
13	ecommons.aku.edu Internet Source	<1 %
14	citeseerx.ist.psu.edu Internet Source	<1 %
15	Ken Hyland, Fiona Hyland. "Feedback on second language students' writing", Language Teaching, 2006 Publication	<1 %
16	theses.whiterose.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
17	sutir.sut.ac.th:8080 Internet Source	<1 %
18	akoaootearoa.ac.nz Internet Source	<1 %
19	jurnal.uhn.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %

<1 %

20

ira.le.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

21

psasir.upm.edu.my

Internet Source

<1 %

22

sure.sunderland.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

23

mjltm.org

Internet Source

<1 %

24

eprints.soton.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

25

repositories.lib.utexas.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

26

www.elejournals.com

Internet Source

<1 %

27

hdl.handle.net

Internet Source

<1 %

28

dspace.aiub.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

29

Fatemeh Esfandiar, Baqure Yaqubi, Amir Marzban. "Learning Corrected Target Forms: Students' Corrective Feedback through Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback in

<1 %

Iranian EFL Context", Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2014

Publication

30

JOHN HEDGCOCK, NATALIE LEFKOWITZ. "Some Input on Input: Two Analyses of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing", The Modern Language Journal, 1996

Publication

<1 %

31

eprints.qut.edu.au

Internet Source

<1 %

32

Aridah Aridah, Haryanto Atmowardoyo, Kisman Salija. "Teacher Practices and Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback and Their Implications on Writing Instruction", International Journal of English Linguistics, 2017

Publication

<1 %

33

Icy Lee. "Working Smarter, Not Working Harder: Revisiting Teacher Feedback in the L2 Writing Classroom", The Canadian Modern Language Review, 2011

Publication

<1 %

34

etd.hu.edu.et

Internet Source

<1 %

35

mafiadoc.com

Internet Source

<1 %

36

Internet Source

<1 %

37

"The Assessment of L2 Written English across the MENA Region", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020

Publication

<1 %

38

Achmad Fanani, Slamet Setiawan, Oikurema Purwati, Maisarah Maisarah, Uswatun Qoyyimah. "Donald Trump's grammar of persuasion in his speech", Heliyon, 2020

Publication

<1 %

39

Carola Strobl. "Attitudes towards online feedback on writing: Why students mistrust the learning potential of models", ReCALL, 2015

Publication

<1 %

40

Elke Stracke, Vijay Kumar. "Exploring doctoral students' perceptions of language use in supervisory written feedback practices – because "feedback is hard to have"", Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 2016

Publication

<1 %

41

Gulfidan Can, Andrew Walker. "A Model for Doctoral Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Written Feedback for Academic Writing", Research in Higher Education, 2010

Publication

<1 %

42	Helen Basturkmen, Martin East, John Bitchener. "Supervisors' on-script feedback comments on drafts of dissertations: socialising students into the academic discourse community", Teaching in Higher Education, 2012 Publication	<1 %
43	digitalcommons.csp.edu Internet Source	<1 %
44	ensani.ir Internet Source	<1 %
45	glrjournal.com Internet Source	<1 %
46	irep.ntu.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
47	publications.coventry.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
48	www.academypublication.com Internet Source	<1 %
49	www.culi.chula.ac.th Internet Source	<1 %
50	Murad Abdu Saeed, Huda Suleiman Al Qunayeer, Musheer Abdulwahid AL-Jaberi. "Exploring Supervisory Feedback Formulation on Academic Writing of Research Proposals	<1 %

and Postgraduates' Responses to Feedback: A Case Study", SAGE Open, 2021

Publication

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 5 words

Exclude bibliography On