

Teachers' Beliefs and Practice on Providing EFL Written Corrective Feedback

Muhammad Nafi Annury¹, Nadiyah Ma'mun², Djoko Sutrisno³

^{1,2} English Department, FITK, UIN Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia

³ English Department, FKIP, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Jogjakarta, Indonesia

Contact:	Muhammad Nafi Annury		nafi.annury@walisongo.ac.id
----------	----------------------	---	-----------------------------

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes how and why writing instructors provide written corrective feedback (WCF) on academic writing tasks. It was an ethnography study conducted by the Department of English Education at the University in Semarang, Indonesia. This study investigated and analyzed the attitudes of teachers to get insight into classroom methods for delivering written corrective feedback (CF) on student writing. The major objective of the study was to evaluate instructors' beliefs and practices. Therefore, the teachers' perspectives on providing written corrective feedback (WCF) were required to determine the true answers and provide corrective feedback. The conceptual basis for this study was developed from Borg's concept of teacher cognition (beliefs) and practices, as well as the impediments to written CF reported by several writers. This recent study conducted interviews with three English Education Department instructors who instructed writing classes. This investigation utilized classroom observation, the think-aloud technique, and in-depth interviews. The data was examined using Spradley's technique. The study of the data revealed both congruence and discord between the beliefs and actions of lecturers. For instance, the instructors' focus and number of writing CF were consistent. In addition, it was demonstrated that extraneous influences affected the lecturers' application of their theories.

KEYWORDS:

EFL writing course;
teacher feedback;
teachers' beliefs;
written corrective feedback

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received
February 22, 2023
Accepted
June 28, 2023

Introduction

Most writing instructors are currently debating how to deliver WCF in an efficient manner rather than whether they should offer it at all (Evans et al., 2010). Researchers then looked into the interventions that writing teachers use to respond to L2 students' work and outcomes. These studies examined the immediate effects of various improvement techniques on student reconsideration (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Sheppard, 1992), the effects of error correction on pupils' accuracy in the short and long term (Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Kurzer, 2019; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Polio et al., 1998), and students'

perceptions of teachers' responses (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1990; Montgomery & Baker, 2007).

Writing is a necessary skill for academic success (Aull, 2020). Most universities, particularly in Indonesia, require their students to complete a final undergraduate project as part of their studies. It means that producing good writing is critical to the academic success of EFL students. As a result, no one can deny that writing is one of the important parts of the English curriculum (Song et al., 2021). Furthermore, because writing skills are so complex, teaching writing in English classes is critical (Furnes & Norman, 2015; Kim & Cha, 2015). However, making students learn all the different parts of writing makes writing hard for them. Typically, EFL students face several challenges when writing even a single paragraph. There are several reasons why most EFL learners find writing to be a difficult language skill to master. Furthermore, because writing skills are so complex, teaching writing in English class is critical (Furnes & Norman, 2015; Kim & Cha, 2015). One reason is that writing is not natural (Payant & Zuniga, 2022). From the moment the writer considers writing until the written word is completed, it is a difficult procedure that demands talent. The main issue is a need for more understanding of how to write a well-written product. (Sutrisno, 2018)

Nevertheless, developing writing skills must be prepared. It requires persistence and time. The most crucial thing the pupils require at first is a strong vocabulary (Schmitt et al., 2017). It goes hand in hand with having the capacity for rational thought. However, effective use of language can open up a world of fascinating and fascinating knowledge. The learners can traverse the past, present, and future through their writing. The objectives of this study are to learn more about this topic by finding out how much students' writing corrective feedback (WCF) preferences differ from teachers' real WCF practices and how well teachers' beliefs and actions about WCF match up. Several studies have demonstrated that there are numerous techniques for teaching writing (Teng, 2019). The research has focused on feedback in terms of form, substance, delivery method, and teachers' feedback delivery methods. However, one aspect has been constant: teachers and students agree that teacher feedback on student writing is unquestionably crucial. In the majority of cases, teacher feedback requires the most time and effort (Hajian et al., 2014), significantly more than planning for and performing classroom sessions. In addition to allowing instruction to be adjusted to the requirements of individual students through face-to-face interaction and written criticism at key stages, teacher feedback also affords the option to do so (Hyland & Hyland, 2001).

Therefore, it has an extensive and contentious history in the domains of second language writing and second language acquisition (SLA), sometimes known as written corrective feedback (WCF) or "grammar correction" in second language (L2) writing. After a lull in the 1980s, there was a lot of research on WCF at the beginning of the 1990s (Truscott, 1996). Sutrisno (2016) argued that mistake correction should be done away with because it diverts the attention of teachers and pupils away from more vital matters. Still, teachers keep giving "recalcitrant responses" when students make mistakes in their writing (Santa, 2006). (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Hairston, 1986; Leki, 1990) all say that teachers of composition spend a lot of time annotating their students' writings. Despite this, written feedback from teachers is a difficult topic that has been investigated from a variety of perspectives. (Clements, 2010), for instance, has investigated the methods in which teachers respond to their student's written work, such as through direct correction, the use of codes, and so on. Direct instructor corrective feedback involves the teacher providing students with the right form of their faults or blunders, either orally or in writing. The feedback tells them

what is incorrect and how to compose the correct sentence, but it does not leave them with any task or an opportunity to reflect on their errors (Sutrisno, 2022a).

Identifying the application of corrective feedback is just as important as understanding how pupils interpret it. Some research examines the effect of perception on corrective feedback (Jodaie et al., 2011; Kartchava, 2016; Rejab et al., 2015; Vyatkina, 2011) as well as learners' perceptions regarding corrective feedback perspectives in various circumstances (Kartchava, 2016; Rejab et al., 2015; Vyatkina, 2011). However, teachers' views diverge from students' expectations of their teachers (Buffa, 2016). Therefore, teachers need to decide what students desire from written corrective feedback by assessing what is most beneficial for both sides. Moreover, Rejab et al. (2015) proposed that teachers could offer spoken, written, and nonverbal feedback. Evans et al. (2010) stated that it is important to comprehend EFL instructors' opinions on corrective feedback in order to fully grasp the importance of written corrective feedback in second/foreign language writing education. Since their study was based on what the respondents claimed about themselves, they were required to employ an external measure to assess the written criticism that was intended to be corrective. In addition, each of the aforementioned studies focuses on teachers' viewpoints, although worldwide research has been conducted on students' opinions. Teachers' perceptions of writing CF in EFL writing, particularly in academic writing, in higher education settings have not been thoroughly studied and recognized; therefore, this study is done to fill this gap (Sutrisno & Annury, 2022).

However, several studies have examined what lecturers do concerning writing CF, the consistency between the teachers' views and their actual practices, or the opinions and preferences of instructors and students regarding WCF in an L2 context (Furieux et al., 2007; Jodaie & Farrokhi, 2012; Junqueira & Payant, 2015; Lee, 2009). Research in language pedagogy has shown (Borg, 2003) that teachers' theories and views greatly affect how they teach. Nevertheless, Junqueira and Payant (2015) said as recently as the beginning of 2015 that there is still room for more research into the relationship between how L2 writing teachers react to L2 students' writing and how they do it. Teachers' practices and beliefs must be observed because, as Bazerman et al. (1994, p. 29) point out, "teachers' practices and beliefs are frequently a source of conflict."

According to research in language pedagogy, personal theories and beliefs have considerable impact on teachers' practices (Borg, 2003). Furthermore, teachers who provide written feedback on students' writing are influenced greatly by their assumptions, expertise, convictions, and teaching experience (Furieux, 2021). However, teachers' practices for providing constructive feedback on students' writing do not always match their beliefs. It happens when their beliefs are influenced by the context in which they are working. According to Johnson as cited in Teng (2020), the processes of learning to teach are socially negotiated by students, parents, colleagues, and administrators. As a result, more attention should be paid to the connection between the attitudes and methods used by L2 writing instructors when evaluating L2 students' writing (Junqueira & Payant, 2015).

Moreover, research on corrective feedback (CF) given to second language (L2) writers in the context of Indonesia is still in its early stages. Sutrisno, (2022b) claimed that scholars have examined various aspects of feedback, including its visual appearance, content, delivery methods, and the approaches employed by teachers when providing feedback. One thing has stayed the same: teachers and students agree that teacher feedback on student writing is very important. Most of the time, giving teachers feedback takes much more time and work than planning and running classroom sessions. Teacher feedback gives teachers a

chance to change the way they teach to meet the needs of each student. As a result, the findings from this study will make a valuable contribution to the advancement of writing instruction in Indonesia, particularly in terms of understanding lecturers' expressions about their beliefs on students' writing and providing pedagogical practices to written CF. This study aims to analyze the lecturers' expression of their beliefs and practices in providing written CF on students' writing. It seeks to address the following study question:

- (1) How do lecturers express their beliefs about providing written feedback on student writing?
- (2) How do lecturers provide written constructive feedback on students' writing?

Method

The Research Design

The present study is qualitative since it explores and describes writing instructors' attitudes and actual behaviors in offering written CF on students' work. The purpose of this study is to describe human behavior using data collected from the natural environment in which it occurs (Bogdan & Biklen, 2004). In addition, qualitative multiple-case research investigates the examined problems in the context in which they arise (Yin, 2014; Zainal, 2007). This current study employed an ethnographic research design.

Ethnographic research entails observing individuals in their natural habitats or 'fields' using methodologies that elicit their societal significance and daily activities (Brewer, 2005, p. 10). Moreover, Creswell (2009) defines an ethnographic study as a study that describes and interprets the shared and acquired patterns of values, activities, beliefs, and language of a culture-sharing society. According to Spradley (1979, p. 5), the most crucial element of ethnography is the researchers' comprehension of what the people being studied mean and how they behave. Spradley added that ethnographic study aims to comprehend how individuals behave (Spradley, 1980, p. 16). Ethnography investigates how a person or group behaves, thinks, and communicates based on their culture. This assists researchers in learning more about the individual or group under study.

This research aimed to investigate the cultural patterns of writing lecturers in terms of their behavior (actual practices), which reflects their attitudes toward providing written CF on students' writing throughout teaching and learning activities. Shimahara says that one of the most important parts of ethnographic study is figuring out how people act in different cultures (Gall et al., 2003, p. 486). Following LeCompte et al. (1993, p. 10) definition of educational ethnography, this study focuses on examining how lecturers manifest their beliefs through their teaching methods. The research cycle adopted in this study, inspired by Spradley (1980, p. 29), encompasses several stages. Throughout the investigation, the authors concluded their research by presenting the results of their data analysis and engaging in a comprehensive discussion of the findings.

This study posited that all lecturers deeply understood their own theoretical approaches to the writing process. In essence, each lecturer was knowledgeable about why they employed a specific teaching method for writing. This knowledge was derived from graduate school courses or extensive experience in refining their theoretical perspectives. The authors acknowledged that they could not determine which of the lecturers' theories on writing were objectively "correct" based solely on the origin of their ideas. They believed that it was solely the educators who could articulate their perspectives on the writing process. The authors also recognized that instructors would provide feedback on student papers, often through

student conferences dedicated to discussing their writing. Furthermore, they believed that educators would respond because they believed that students would benefit from incorporating the feedback to enhance their work. However, the authors acknowledged the need for closer attention to how students actually utilized the instructors' comments, suggesting that this aspect deserved more scrutiny.

Participants

This study focuses on the views and practices of teachers in delivering written CF on students' writing, as well as students' perceptions of written CF offered by teachers. Three teachers and nine students of English Education Department at the University in Semarang, Indonesia become participants. The research was conducted during the academic year of 2020/2021.

Data

This study has two types of data: primary data and secondary data. The primary data consisted of all lecturers' words, statements, or utterances discussing their beliefs and practices in giving written CF, as well as students' words or sentences regarding their preferences regarding the written CF offered by their professors. All of the secondary data were obtained through document analysis.

Data were obtained from three writing course lecturers and nine students of the English Education at University in Semarang, Indonesia. Henceforth, we called them informants. This term is adopted from Spradley (1979, p. 25), who mentioned that the informant is a source of information in an ethnographic study since this study used an ethnographic method. Moreover, Johnston and Vander Stoep (2009) state that in a qualitative research, it is important to carefully pick informants in order to identify situations or persons with a wealth of relevant data. This study's goal was to assess how lecturers' approach and implement written CF instruction, hence we specifically targeted writing instructors as our primary informants. Each participant in this research was a complete newbie in their respective disciplines.

In addition, nine students served as informants in this study. They were selected intentionally based on their proficiency level. As informants, each lecturer selected three students, one high-achievement student, one low-achievement student, and one average student. Therefore, it indicates that nine students served as informants for this investigation.

Instruments

This research included both in-depth interviews and classroom observations. In the field of applied linguistics, interviews are a common kind of data collection (Block, 2010), partially because they enable scientists to probe phenomena that would otherwise be hard to study. Furthermore, interviews are the most efficient way to acquire access to the minds of study participants in order to accurately represent their knowledge, values, preferences, attitudes, and beliefs (Cohen et al., 2007).

To better understand the wider (non-linguistic) issues that influence lecturers' beliefs and, by extension, inform their practices, this study conducted interviews with lecturers to inquire into their perspectives on the writing course and writing instruction, to describe their perspectives on the provision of written CF on students' writing, and to gather more information.

This study employed semi-structured interview questions that were organized into two major sections: basic background questions and particular opinions regarding giving written CF. In addition, an open-ended topic was used for this interview, in which informants were encouraged to discuss many concerns and dimensions freely.

Therefore, observation is useful for research because it lets researchers look at the actual learning environment and direct answers to inquiries concerning the efficacy of specific teaching and learning approaches. According to Dörnyei (2007) and Mackey and Gass (2005), classroom observation helps academics to explore educational processes in a natural context and provides more specifics and specific information than other methods of data collection.

We used video recording to record the lecturers' activities during the observation as a type of data triangulation because the key observations would be discussed with the lecturers to confirm them during the stimulated recall. Borg (2006) urged the significance of employing observations in lecturers' cognition research, claiming that they provide a descriptive, solid foundation for what lecturers believe could be studied. Because the purpose of this study was to observe, not to judge, how the teachers' taught writing, witnessing the instructors in action permits researchers to assess the extent to which the lecturers' views and reported practices correlate to their activities in the classroom.

Meanwhile, in qualitative research, the traditional terms of validity and reliability were used to discuss trustworthiness. Mills (2007, p. 308) mentioned that trustworthiness is the "validity of the data collection and analysis methods" in qualitative research. As mentioned by Creswell (2007), the requirements for trustworthiness encompass the concepts of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

Data analysis

The analysis involves a way of thinking which refers to the systematic investigation of something to determine its parts, the relationship among them, and their relationship to the whole (Spradley, 1979, p. 92). However, as Cohen and Macaro (2007, p. 461) urge, "there is no single or correct way to analyze and present qualitative data; how one does it should abide by a fitness to the purpose". This study used Spradley's analytical method (Spradley, 1979, 1980) to look at the data in this study. This method includes four analytic processes: domain' taxonomic, componential, and thematic.

Result

The Lecturers' Expression about Their Beliefs in Providing Written CF on Students' Writing

Most of the research indicates that two out of three writing instructors despise writing education. Mr. Dave stated:

1. *Teaching writing requires a great deal of time, particularly for revising my pupils' writing. Therefore, I dislike it.*

In addition, Mrs. Nada ascribed their aversion to teaching writing to a lack of adequate training. They proposed that someone with years of experience in the profession teach writing.

2. *I informed Mrs. Fad [the department chair] that it is difficult for me to teach writing. It is not that I dislike it. Teaching writing is a highly tiring endeavor. I am a new*

instructor with no prior teaching experience. Therefore, I am not deserving of this subject.

Regarding how lecturers felt about the value of teaching writing, the data showed that most lecturers said they did not like teaching writing, but all of them thought teaching writing was good for students. Mrs. Fad, for example, expressed her thoughts in Excerpt (3):

3. *Obviously, [writing training] is beneficial. And it is one of the most essential classes provided to students in this division*

The next theme explains what the lecturers think about teaching writing or the different methods that should be "used" to help students improve their writing skills. According to the findings, all lecturers agreed that involving students in diverse writing activities will improve their written performance. The actions listed by instructors are writing, redrafting, outlining, utilizing models, and discussing the students' frequent blunders.

In Excerpt 4, Mr. Dave says that addressing common mistakes is important, especially for students who need to read their lecturers' written CF.

4. *It is highly beneficial to select the papers that highlight students' most frequent errors and provide oral feedback on them in front of the class. Many students are unaware of their blunders, and none of them read the lecturers' comments. So, it is preferable to explain it verbally.*

Regarding the significance of several drafts, lecturers believed that excellent writing is generated after many drafts. Mr. Dave stated:

5. *Good writing requires a lengthy process. If we want to produce quality writing, we must practice it again. It is unlikely we can generate decent writing in a single sitting.*

In addition, they thought that students must imitate models. In Excerpt (6), for instance, Mrs. Nada highlighted pupils better imitate models by stating that.

6. *Learners are required to study passages written by others, preferably by an accomplished writer, to discover how something might be communicated and replicate them... Through reading and imitation, students will gradually learn how to contribute.*

In short, this is fascinating to be noted whether all the lecturers agreed that some parts of the process approach were important (such as outlining and redrafting), they also seemed to agree that it could be useful to mix elements of the process and production methods.

Lecturers' Beliefs in Providing Written CF

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Purpose of Written CF

All lecturers agreed that written CF is crucial indeed. In this regard, giving guidance on how to create effective text is beneficial for the development of writing essays. As Mr. Dave stated in Excerpt (7):

7. *As a writing instructor, your most crucial duty is to provide written corrections. Without it, pupils will demonstrate no achievement or growth in their writing and will continue to repeat their errors.*

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Explicitness of Written CF

Directive feedback (i.e., providing the answer; the source of the problem, crossing out, or more additionally student's tasks on writing) is preferred by all professors since it fits the needs and expectations of the students. Mrs. Nada, for example, stated in Excerpt (8) that:

8. *The correct responses should be provided; otherwise, students will not pay attention to that error.*

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Amount of Written CF

Every instructor agrees that mistakes must be corrected carefully. They noted about what is the most effective approach for helping pupils improve their writing, as without it, they would be blind to their mistakes and continue to make them. They emphasized that it is the instructor's responsibility to correct such errors. In excerpt (9), for example, Mr. Dave stated that:

9. *All errors should be corrected. Why should some mistakes persist? How are we to be perceived by the students, or what impression will they have? They will conclude that this is not a mistake or that we are unwilling to carry out our responsibilities.*

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Focus of Written CF

Even though all of the lecturers believed in the written CF, they keep thought that several errors were considered to be examined more thoroughly than others. Regarding the emphasis on written CF, the lecturers' responses can be divided into two categories language form and organization. Excerpt (10) demonstrates why teachers should focus their attention first and foremost on the most important issues while focusing on the essay's organization and generic form.

10. *Since the learner did not adhere to the selected requirement of procedures or structure, the lecturer would not comprehend anything, including her topic, thesis statement, and whether or not it is related to the body. As a result, she would receive a zero.*

In contrast, in the second group, Mrs. Nada and Mrs. Fad agreed that faults in linguistic form should be given greater weight than those in substance and organization. In the following excerpt (11), Mrs. Nada is quoted as saying:

11. *Language arises first; content and organization are equally crucial, but they come later because writing that lacks unity, coherence, and faultless organization but is written in proper sentences will be understood if it is written in the correct language.*

It is essential to notice that lecturers' ideas regarding the focus of written CF correspond to their beliefs regarding the focus of writing training. The lecturers' beliefs demonstrate that their views on written CF are part of a bigger body of thought (Phipps & Borg, 2009). She is more interested in helping students develop their writing abilities through planning, producing many drafts, and examining different models than she is in the content of the writing teaching.

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Source of Written CF

All instructors thought that students should have access to peer feedback.

12. *Peer feedback assists students in exchanging ideas.*
13. *Peer feedback provides pupils with the chance to recognize the challenges faced by other students and to relate them to their own, so boosting their self-esteem and encouraging them to write more freely.*
14. *Peer feedback helps students become less reliant on instructors.*

Although all lecturers recognize the significance of peer feedback, they maintain that it should not replace the lecturers' written feedback as mentioned by Mrs. Nada in excerpt (15).

15. *The initial step for students should be self-editing, followed by receiving input from their peers, and finally the job of editor.*

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Positive versus Negative Feedback

Regarding positive comments, all lecturers agreed on the significance of adopting laudatory language to motivate students of all levels. Mrs. Nada has stated in Excerpt (16):

16. *You must emphasize your regions or strong points by employing positive terminology and expressions. This promotes and develops pupils' tasks because learners prefer to do better when they are to be motivated as well.*

Teachers believed that harsh and offensive language should be avoided so as not to deter students. Mrs. Nada, for example, remarked that:

17. *We must inspire and excite the pupils by complimenting their writing and avoiding any criticism of their efforts.*

Lecturers' Beliefs about the Variation of Written CF

Despite agreement among instructors on the usefulness of the comprehensiveness and direct approach of written CF, several professors noted that the quantity and explicitness of written CF should be varied according to the student's ability levels.

Two lecturers (Mr. Dave and Mrs. Nada) indicated that in the case of low-achieving students, instructors should only focus on frequent and major faults. Mr. Dave asserted in exhibit (18) that:

18. *You must provide more explicit feedback to good students; however, you may only accept some errors from weak pupils to motivate them if there are several remedial errors.*

Discussion

This current study aimed to explore how teachers convey their ideas and how they provide written CF on their students' work. Three lecturers took part in the study, which was done by interviewing them in depth and watching them teach. This study showed that the lecturers' and other participants' ideas about CF were the same. Most of them stated that delivering CF in writing was time-consuming and exhausting. They detest writing instruction and are required to give constant attention when instructing writing. So, teachers thought the best way to help students expand their writing skills was to have them do various writing exercises. However, students needed more training. To achieve a better outcome, pupils must emulate the writing styles of their instructors. The goal of the written CF, beliefs on explicitness, the amount, the focus, the sources used, and the variance of the written CF were further factors to be evaluated. In conclusion, the lecturers' responses indicated that they valued teachers' remedial criticism and had a favorable attitude toward their input. The EFL students indicated that they benefited from corrected feedback on linguistic structure from their teachers and favored direct feedback over other types.

The results were consistent with earlier research examining students' attitudes and perceptions about feedback. For example, Huisman et al. (2018) found that people learning English as a second language liked feedback on various writing qualities more than feedback focused on grammar. This result was consistent with the findings of a separate study (Hamouda, 2011). She discovered about half of the students preferred direct feedback since it made recognizing their flaws easier and enhance their writing accuracy. Therefore,

the instructor is confronted with a plethora of written remedial feedback possibilities. The instructor must select the optimal implementation strategy. Currently, both direct and indirect textual corrective feedback methods are feasible. Due to the fact that metalinguistic feedback necessitates both instructor and student metalinguistic expertise. Next, electronic feedback necessitates that both instructors and students utilize a computer. In addition, a native analyst is required for this formulation. This feedback could help solve the problems because it was easy to see where the students went wrong. Studies from the past (Ferris, 2004; Soleimani & Rahimi, 2021) show that teachers should use feedback and fix different kinds of mistakes. Since the execution of other forms of written corrective feedback is flawed, direct and indirect written corrective feedback are the only viable alternatives. A teacher must choose the superior of these two.

Direct corrective written feedback indicates that the instructor identifies the issue and supplies the right form. There are a variety of formats for providing remedial textual comments (Ellis, 2008, p. 99). For instance, they may cross out unnecessary words, phrases, or morphemes, add new words or morphemes, and insert the proper form of the incorrect word above or adjacent to it. However, direct written corrections hinder kids' ability to study freely and may not aid their education in the long term.

On the other hand, indirect written corrective feedback requires the teacher only marks specific errors and needs to provide the correct form. Marking the error can take the form of circling, underlining, or crossing. Lalande (1982, p. 141) said that guided learning and problem-solving come from written corrections that are given indirectly. It also encourages students to reflect on their linguistic form. Moreover, it leads to long-term learning.

Therefore, teachers are forced to pay continual attention when instructing writing, which they dislike. So, teachers thought giving students lots of writing projects was the best way to help them improve their writing skills. However, students needed additional instruction. Students must imitate their instructors' writing approaches to attain a better outcome. The purpose of the written CF, beliefs about how explicit it is, the number, the focus, the sources used, and how different it is from other written CFs were also things to evaluate. In the end, the lecturers' comments showed that they valued teachers' corrective feedback and saw their contributions positively. The EFL students said they benefited from their teachers' corrected comments on language forms and preferred direct feedback over other sorts.

Overall, the findings of the recent study were consistent with those of previous studies (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b; Elwood & Bode, 2014; Lee, 2008b; Mahfoodh & Pandian, 2011; Ornella Treglia, 2008; Song et al., 2017). In this instance, the pupils' comments demonstrated a favorable attitude toward written corrections. The pupils preferred written corrections from the teacher over other forms of correction. In addition, the students stated that written corrections helped writing in general, particularly in terms of grammar accuracy and structure.

The results showed that EFL writing teachers should be worried about some important things when they think about giving direct feedback to students. First and foremost, receiving feedback should be emphasized to students. For direct teacher feedback to work well in an EFL writing class, the teacher had to know how the students interpreted the teacher's comments. Moreover, EFL writing instructors must describe the entire approach to students. Teachers should choose the error they wish to be corrected, how they wish to fix them, and when they intend to make the corrections involving the students so they may be a part of the process. In EFL writing classes, teachers should watch their students as they make corrections so they can see how their language skills are improving. It was also

suggested that teachers plan how their feedback will be used so that students will get the most out of well-planned feedback.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study delved into the beliefs expressed by lecturers regarding the provision of constructive feedback and corrective feedback on student writing. The results revealed that a majority of the respondents expressed their concerns about the time-consuming and taxing nature of delivering written feedback. The teachers highlighted the continuous attention required when instructing writing, which they found to be a burdensome task. Consequently, they believed that assigning numerous writing projects to students would be the most effective way to enhance their writing skills. However, it was recognized that students also needed additional instruction beyond mere practice in order to achieve better outcomes. The study further emphasized the importance of evaluating various aspects of written corrective feedback, including its purpose, level of explicitness, quantity, focus, sources used, and differentiation from other forms of feedback.

While the study acknowledged the presence of several design faults, it nonetheless marked a significant milestone in the field of textual corrective feedback. It stands as a foundational piece for future research endeavors, particularly in the context of Indonesia where research on this topic remains largely unexplored. The findings of the study underscored the benefits of corrective feedback in writing, as it was found to enhance the precision of students' written work and boost their motivation. However, it was evident that further work is needed to deepen our understanding of this area and optimize feedback practices.

The positive responses from lecturers, who valued the corrective feedback provided by teachers and perceived their contributions positively, highlight the pivotal role of feedback in the writing process. Similarly, the student's preference for direct feedback over other forms reaffirms its significance in improving their writing skills. As a result, future researchers should consider expanding the sample size to include a diverse range of participants, thereby increasing the generalizability of the findings. Moreover, incorporating the perspectives of students themselves and exploring variables such as the timing of feedback, the incorporation of self-assessment, and the integration of technology would yield a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of corrective feedback. Additionally, conducting comparative studies that examine different approaches to feedback and investigating the long-term effects of corrective feedback would contribute substantially to the existing knowledge base.

Given the dearth of published research in the field of corrective feedback in Indonesia, there are numerous unexplored areas that warrant further investigation. For instance, it would be valuable to explore the efficacy of direct versus indirect written corrective feedback for low-level learners, as well as the benefits of metalinguistic written corrective feedback for advanced-level learners. By addressing these gaps in research, valuable insights can be gained, not only in the context of Indonesia but also in other foreign countries where English is learned as a second language. Consequently, it is imperative for future researchers to undertake additional studies that bridge these knowledge gaps and advance our understanding of effective practices for corrective feedback in the realm of EFL writing instruction.

References

- 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8)
- Aull, L. (2020). Student-centered assessment and online writing feedback: Technology in a time of crisis. In *Assessing Writing* (Vol. 46). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100483>
- Bazerman, C., Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (1994). *Genre and the new rhetoric: Vol. null* (Null, Ed.).
- 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>
- Block, D. (2010). Researching language and identity. *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 337–349.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2004). *Investigação qualitativa em educação: uma introdução à teoria e aos métodos*. Porto: Porto Editora, 1994. BONETI, LW *Vicissitudes na Educação Inclusiva. REUNIÃO ANUAL DA ANPED*, 27.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, 36(2), 81–109. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903>
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Continuum.
- Brewer, M. B. (2005). Ethnocentrism and prejudice: A search for universals. In *Social psychology of prejudice: historical and contemporary issues/edited by Christian S. Crandall, Mark Schaller*. Lawrence, Kan.: Lewinian Press, c2005. Lawrence, Kan.: Lewinian Press.
- Buffa, I. M. (2016). Written corrective feedback in secondary education: Learners' and teachers' preferences and perceptions. *Fòrum de Recerca*, 21, 525–546. <https://doi.org/10.6035/forumrecerca.2016.21.29>
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267–296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Clements, S. J. (2010). *Writing conferences in kindergarten: Using feedback to enhance student writing*. Walden University.
- Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (2007). *Language learner strategies: Thirty years of research and practice* (Issue Sirsi) i9780194422543).
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches / J.W. Creswell*.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics : Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies. In *Oxford: Oxford University Press*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System*, 42(1), 333–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.023>
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written corrective feedback: The practitioners' perspective. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47–77.
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, 9, 178–190.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*.
- Ferris, D., & Kurzer, K. (2019). Does error feedback help L2 writers? *Feedback in Second Language Writing*, 106–124. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.008>

- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587804>
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Furneau, C. (2021). Second language writing/feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues. *ELT Journal: An International Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages*, 75(3), 381–388.
- Furneau, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45(1), 69–94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2007.003>
- Furnes, B., & Norman, E. (2015). Metacognition and reading: Comparing three forms of metacognition in normally developing readers and readers with dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, 21(3), 273–284. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1501>
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research, an introduction. Seven Edition*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hairston, M. (1986). On not being a composition slave. *Training the New Teacher of College Composition*, 13, 117–124.
- Hajian, L., Farahani, A. A. K., & Shirazi, M. A. (2014). A study of students' and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(5), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.5p.287>
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128–129.
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 955–968. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00038-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00038-8)
- Jodaie, M., & Farrokhi, F. (2012). An exploration of private language institute teachers' perceptions of written grammar feedback in EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p58>
- Jodaie, M., Farrokhi, F., & Zoghi, M. (2011). A Comparative Study of EFL Teachers' and Intermediate High School Students' Perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Errors. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n4p36>
- Johnston, D. D., & VanderStoep, S. W. (2009). *Research methods for everyday life: Blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Jossey-Bass.
- John W. Creswell. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing five tradition* (p. 159). Sage Publication.
- Junqueira, L., & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.001>

- Kartchava, E. (2016). Learners' Beliefs About Corrective Feedback in the Language Classroom: Perspectives from Two International Contexts. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), 19. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v33i2.1235>
- Kim, H. II, & Cha, K. A. (2015). Korean learners' metacognition in reading using think-aloud procedures with a focus on regulation of cognition. *English Language Teaching*, 8(6), 178–193. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p178>
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140–149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06973.x>
- LeCompte, M. D., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Academic 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. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Leki, I. (1990). Potential Problems with Peer. Responding in ESL Writing Classes. *CATESOL Journal*, 3(1), 5–19.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research methodology and design*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mahfoodh, O., & Pandian, A. (2011). A Qualitative Case Study of EFL Students' Affective Reactions to and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Written Feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14>
- Mills, K. A. (2007). Access to multiliteracies: a critical ethnography. *Ethnography and Education*, 2(3), 305–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820701547310>
- 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>
- Ornella Treglia, M. (2008). Feedback on Feedback: Exploring Student Responses to Teachers' Written Commentary. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 27(1), 105–137. <https://doi.org/10.37514/jbw-j.2008.27.1.06>
- Payant, C., & Zuniga, M. (2022). Learners' flow experience during peer revision in a virtual writing course during the global pandemic. *System*, 105(10271), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102715>
- Phipps, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices. *System*, 37(3), 380–390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.03.002>
- Polio, C., Fleck, C., & Leder, N. (1998). "If I Only Had More Time:" ESL Learners' Changes in Linguistic Accuracy on Essay Revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 43–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90005-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90005-4)
- Rejab, H. M., Ismail, Z., & Jamaludin, S. (2015). Teacher's feedback on Arabic student writing process. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(2), 608.
- Santa, T. (2006). *Dead letters: Error in composition, 1873-2004*. Hampton Press (NJ).
- Schmitt, N., Cobb, T., Horst, M., & Schmitt, D. (2017). How much vocabulary is needed to use English? Replication of van Zeeland & Schmitt (2012), Nation (2006) and Cobb (2007). *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 212–226. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444815000075>
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 103–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829202300107>
- Soleimani, N., & Rahimi, M. (2021). (Mis) Alignment of Iranian EFL teacher's written corrective feedback beliefs and practices from an activity theory perspective. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1901640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1901640>

- Song, G., Hoon, L. H., & Alvin, L. P. (2017). Students' response to feedback: an exploratory study. *RELC Journal*, 48(3), 357–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217691445>
- Song, S. Y., Wang, C., Espelage, D. L., Fenning, P. A., & Jimerson, S. R. (2021). COVID-19 and school psychology: contemporary research advancing practice, science, and policy. *School Psychology Review*, 50(4), 485–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1975489>
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). Interviewing an informant; making a domain analysis. *The Ethnographic Interview*, 55–61; 107–119.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. In *Reinhardt & Winston*. Holt.
- Sutrisno, D. (2016). Supporting the Development of Autonomous Learning Using the internet in a Digital Age: Building Independent Language Learning and Learners' Content Knowledge. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 7(1).
- Sutrisno, D. (2018). *Engaging Students in Literature Circles on Critical Reading and Text Analysis*.
- Sutrisno, D. (2022a). Fostering student's critical reading through technology integrated instruction. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(2), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.12928/tefl.v1i2.215>
- Sutrisno, D. (2022b). Fostering student's critical reading through technology integrated instruction. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(2), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.12928/tefl.v1i2.215>
- Sutrisno, D., & Annury, M. N. (2022). Role-reversal and discussion-oriented models for flipping digital vocabulary achievement in English classrooms for Electronic Engineering learners. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Journal*, 1(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.12928/tefl.v1i1.165>
- Teng, F. (2019). A comparison of text structure and self-regulated strategy instruction for elementary school students' writing. *English Teaching*, 18(3), 281–297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-07-2018-0070>
- Teng, F. (2020). Tertiary-Level Students' English Writing Performance and Metacognitive Awareness: A Group Metacognitive Support Perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 64(4), 551–568. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2019.1595712>
- 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>
- Vyatkina, N. (2011). Writing Instruction and Policies for Written Corrective Feedback in the Basic Language Sequence. *L2 Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2319070>
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods (applied social research methods)*. Sage publications Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*, 5(1).

This page is intentionally left blank