

## **WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON EFL STUDENTS AT AN ISLAMIC JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

**Eka Mareta Suharyanti<sup>1</sup>; Endang Fauziati<sup>2</sup>**

*Master of English Education, Post Graduate School of Universitas Muhammadiyah  
Surakarta, Indonesia<sup>1</sup>; Department of English Education, Education Faculty  
Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia<sup>2</sup>*

*Corresponding email: s400190010@student.ums.ac.id*

### **Abstract**

Teachers provide students with corrective feedback for guiding them in the process of teaching a language. This study aimed to investigate the types of corrective feedback that the teacher used in teaching writing recount text, this also employed to reveal the students' motivation for writing recount texts, and to explore the benefit of teacher corrective feedback to the students' ability in writing recount text at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School Central Java Indonesia. Descriptive qualitative method was employed by interviewing both the teacher and the second-year students. The participants were three teachers and twenty students. There were three guided Interview questions for teachers and two questions for students. The findings of this study turned out that the teacher employed indirect corrective feedback and gave symbols to the student's error production. Most of the students are highly motivated to be able to write a status on Facebook or other online media by using English. The most important advantage of obtaining corrective feedback for the students is to understand the use of grammar in making a sentence. This study concluded that the motivation of the students to write recount text was to get teacher corrective feedback to be able to write the appropriate sentence and to increase their ability in writing English. This also implied that different types of corrective feedback might impact differently to the students in improving their motivation to learn English more.

**Keywords:** EFL Learners, Indirect corrective feedback, Secondary school, writing.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The learner's error writing composition production provide teacher corrective feedback as observed by Akmal & Mahrup (2019); Chen, (2018);

Klimova, (2015); Zheng & Yu, (2018). Most of Indonesian learners' study English writing subject in the school. Writing English is not easy as the students think because they must use the correct types of phrases which indicate common error is on noun phrase (Sitorus & Sipayung, 2018), and the correct grammar (Royani & Sadiyah, 2019).

Based on Brown (2001) writing is a written product that focuses on generate concepts, organize them coherently, use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions to put them cohesively, revise the meaning, modify the grammatical and produce very last product. In the system of writing, editing or re-drafting, it turns into the subject of students' technique because it is important step that determines the standard of writing product earlier than it comes to final result. The corrective feedback is the tool for students to get improvisation. Corrective feedback is given by the teachers when the students get incorrect of the target language. In processing teaching-learning in the classroom, the teacher and students should be cooperated. Then they can help each other.

Ferris (2002) there are two types of technique that the teacher use of teacher uses in giving Corrective Feedback. It consists of direct feedback and indirect feedback. There are two types of indirect feedback, such as; coded or symbolic feedback and un-coded feedback. Corrective feedback supportive teaching environment which gives benefit for the student and teacher: based on Feedback is the correct form which is given by the teachers to the students' error production (Dana Ferris & Roberts, 2001). (1) Teachers can get the student progress and by assessing the student's task, it is such as evaluation of teaching learning activities. For the learners, feedback has function to correct their error production. The students will not increase their score but they will increase the additional target on developing knowledge. By highlighting strengths and weakness, the comments offer data regarding individual progress, not like rank. Then the comment will give the direction regarding the language, by telling rule or giving an example. (2) The teacher provides Feedback by using language; even it is used oral or written. The use of language is important in giving comments on the student's production by writing comments in the form of error production. The teacher can examine the vocabulary that the teacher uses and also the structures of grammar, and put the perfect of them based on the context. (3) Feedback is the tool to motivate the students. It can inspire the students to study and to use English language for the better one to improve the students' ability. The teacher discovers more about the student's capability means like as encouragement can take personal conditions report. (4) Feedback provides students with advice about learning. The teachers can give students the correct answer by using the simple language that is easy to understand in learning English process. (5) Feedback is able to read students

toward autonomy. By having corrective feedback from the teacher, the students will be used to find their own error in learning English Language process.

The teachers help the students in finding the error written production. Then the students can improve their writing ability. But the teacher should improve their skills in giving corrective feedback to the students. Teacher should prepare good service to the students. They are being able to undertake explicit professional schooling on written corrective feedback provision. The teacher can join some courses or seminars to add their knowledge. Shae & Crosthwaite (2019) stated that students and teachers cooperate to acquire the ultimate goals of written feedback. Mulati, Nurkamto, & Drajadi (2020) assumed that teacher practical experience in teaching writing became additional factor. According to Wicaksono, (2018) most of the teachers use direct un-coded written corrective feedback in providing feedback on the students' writing production. The dynamic corrective feedbacks that occur proved that the teachers not only focus on the form of the students writing but also the content.

The previous works related to this study had been conducted by many researchers, among other. The gaps on corrective feedback implementation which found that corrective feedback improved students' abilities on writing English. The opposite previous study found that corrective feedback did not improve the students' ability on writing.

Seiffedin & El-Sakka,(2017) found that corrective feedback used by the teacher for trying to detect the student's errors production of writing, It improved the accuracy of the students writing production. Han (2019) found that students have relation with Written Corrective Feedback. He said that Written Corrective Feedback is process of perceiving the learner's ability by using Written Corrective Feedback. The students who gets Written Corrective Feedback will know their error' and will memorize it in their brain. Nagode, Pižorn, & Jurišević, (2014) discussed the variety of aspects that teacher provides written corrective feedback in the purpose of developing L2 writing and the function is young learners will be easy develop more effectively their L2 writing skills.

On the other hand Khanlarzadeh & Taheri, (2017) studied for investigating the use of corrective feedback on the student's error production of grammar. The finding is there is no difference in the effectiveness found between Written Corrective Feedback and SEMI corrective feedback. Both experimental groups exceeded the control groups in the immediate and delayed post-tests. Based on Zheng & Yu (2018) Students' decreasing English proficiency may additionally negatively affect their cognitive and behavioural engagement with Written Corrective Feedback and reason imbalances many of the three sub-dimensions of

engagement. Abuseileek, (2013); Ghufron, (2019) found that teacher corrective feedback is better in terms of improving the student's error of content, organization, and mechanics of writing than Grammarly checker in the computer or computer-mediated corrective feedback, but teacher corrective feedback in the terms of language use and diction is less effective.

The other researches showed that students derived two kinds of feedback, which were oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback on writing class. The result after getting corrective feedback is the students improved their writings' quality (Rahmawati, 2017; Royani & Sadiyah, 2019). On the other hand, Çepni (2016) found oral corrective feedback in writing class. He stated that explicit feedback took less time and energy on the part of the teacher than the graduated feedback.

There were 3 criteria of effective corrective feedback which are provided by the teacher. The teacher is consistent in treating the errors, giving correct form without breaking the flow of the communication, and do not ridicule the process of giving feedback to the students (Astia, 2018). So, the students were happy, even got corrective feedback, the feedback motivated them to learn more knowledge. And the students also were not afraid about the teacher method of correcting their error tasks. Mali, (2015) studied there was important of constructing the collaboration between teachers, students, and parents in determining the motivation of students in learning in EFL writing classroom.

Most of the previous studies reviewed have been devoted to corrective feedback which the teacher used, the students preferred, and the improvisation of students after getting corrective feedback. Such as, Fithriani (2017) the result was students preferred direct than indirect form of feedback. And perceptions of students about written feedback have three benefits, they are the benefits: it improves the writing quality and skills productions, encourages critical thinking in giving reason, and promotes autonomy of the learner. Students who derived more feedback from peers than the teacher but they incorporated more teacher feedback than peer feedback in their writings. Hamidnia, Ketabi, & Amirian, (2020) studied to examine the differences of Written Corrective Feedback sources or types which gave benefit to the participants. The findings revealed that Working Portfolio Group participants were more responsive to the working portfolio model than those in Showcase Portfolio Group who received delayed tutor evaluation in showcase portfolio approach.

Hapsari (2018) stated that teacher's corrective feedback had the aim in improving ability on of the students on writing English. It helped the students to correct write form and give motivation to the students to get progress on writing. Chen (2018) also had the same finding. The result showed that improving the students writing ability that Chen found was

different types of the feedback used and that different types of errors form production in the writing done by the students show that the teacher used different various feedback strategies. It was different with in the direct Corrective feedback that had the most effective in minimizing linguistic error production of students in vocabulary (AR, 2018).

Based on various studies described above, the researcher is interested in researching the teaching learning of English foreign language students, especially teaching English to junior high school, the researcher aims to investigate types of teacher corrective feedback of writing recount text, students' motivation and its benefit to them at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School, Indonesia, with limited facility of internet connection. This is crucial since previous studies only conducted in university students settings (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Dilâra & Hakk, 2017). Therefore, differences of this research from the previous one are object of the study and subject of the study. In the object study of we analyzed types of corrective feedback used by the teacher, the student's motivation on studying writing, and the benefit of corrective feedback for the students, but on the previous research analyzed types corrective feedback, the dominant, and purpose of corrective feedback used by the teacher. This study aimed to investigate the types of corrective feedback that the teacher used in writing recount text on the students at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School, Indonesia, to reveal the learners' motivation on writing recount text, and to explore the benefit of corrective feedback on the learners' ability in writing recount text at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School, Indonesia

## **METHODS**

This research used descriptive qualitative methods. The researcher investigated teacher's corrective feedback in writing English text on English composition at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School, Indonesia. They were in the second semester of the academic year of 2020/2021. The research subjects were 3 teachers and 20 eight grade students at the school. The students learn to write and have learned English as a foreign language for at least 2 years through formal schooling. Their average age was 14 to 15 years old. In this research, the methods of collecting the data were observation, interview the teacher and to the students. Interview is a communication among people to share the information through question and answer in a meaning. Sugiyono (2013), by doing an interview with the English teachers and students, the more explicit information the researcher gets. It is useful to complete the data about type of corrective feedback that the teacher used and the benefit of corrective feedback on the students' ability of writing recount text during English classroom activities in 8th graders at Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School, Indonesia.

The collected data were also classified based on the theory Bitchener & Ferris, (2012) the most local error intermediate English learner writing resulted from misuse and omission of prepositions, lack of subject-verb agreement, and incorrect spelling and word choice.

### **Instruments**

The instrument in this research was guided question for interview to the teacher and the students. The questions were about writing recount text test given by the teacher to the students. The researcher also asked to the teacher about the student's production of writing test to check about the teacher corrective feedback and student's error productions. The following were the guided interview questions given to the teacher and students.

#### **Guided Interview Questions for Teacher**

1. What are the types of corrective feedback that you give to your students in English writing classroom activities?
2. Why do you give corrective feedback to your students writing assignment?
3. What are the types of students' error in Writing recount text in English classroom activities?

#### **Guided Interview Questions for students:**

1. What is the benefit of getting corrective feedback about your writing assignment in the classroom activities?
2. What is your motivation in studying English in the classroom activities?

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

Analyzing the data from the result of interviewing the teacher is by concluding the teacher's answer to the question. The researcher rewrote on the paper about the result of the recorded video, and then categorized the result data which were taken from interviewing twenty students. Categorizing the students answer based on the outline if the answer is almost the same means that the students answer is the same.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Types of Corrective Feedback**

In this study, the researcher found a type of corrective feedback that the teacher used to their students in English writing classroom activities namely "Indirect feedback". In this kind of feedback, the teacher technique was that she gave feedback to students' error task by giving symbols such as crossing circling or underlining. The symbol will help them to focus on their error production. Then the teacher gives the right form (word, grammar, delete

word, rewritten sentence). There are examples which the teacher gave to the students by using indirect feedback. The correction below was that the teacher gave correction feedback by using circle, and underline incorrect words, such as; student wrote "my father goes", then the teacher gave the structure of grammatical feedback by underlining and writing the correct one "my father gone". The teacher technique was that she gave corrective feedback by using crossing sign to change "health". She rewrote the correct word by writing in the top of the incorrect word which is the word "health" to become "healthy".

### **Reason for Corrective Feedback Employed in the Class**

The teacher used indirect corrective feedback because the students would know the error by using code. If there was no code, the students would be confused. Therefore, the teacher gave corrective feedback using any code. The code or symbol would help the students to read the special symbol and focus on the teacher feedback. She told that the reason of choosing Indirect feedback because the teacher focused more on finding the error and gave code and symbol by using indirect feedback.

### **The Purpose of Teacher's Corrective Feedback**

There are four purposes of the teacher using corrective feedback for the students in writing assignments; they are to show the students' error production, to show the correct production, to assess the students writing product, and to increase the teacher's strategies in teaching.

### **The Types of Students' Error**

The researcher found some errors in writing recount text in English classroom activities Lexicogrammatically such as: To be (was, were), verb 1, 2 or 3, the use of pronoun, conjunction, plural or singular.

### **The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback for both Students and Teacher**

There are two impacts for students: The student understood their error after getting corrective feedback. The students understood the correct form of writing. They got more understanding after getting direct corrective feedback. There are 3 impacts for the Teacher, if the students had many errors; it means that teacher would have to repair their strategy to teach. If the students got good production, it means that the teacher is successful in teaching English. Then the teacher took the students result score.

### **Result of students' Motivation in Studying Writing English**

Table 1. Result of interviewing the student (motivation in writing English)

No	Type of Motivation	Percentage
----	--------------------	------------

No	Type of Motivation	Percentage
1.	Fluent in singing English song	25%
2.	Become an English teacher	5%
3.	Having a job in Abroad	10%
4.	Having Communication with tourist	15%
5.	Make a status on Facebook or Social Media use English language	40%
6.	Increase the status of style	15%

Table 2. Result of interviewing the student (benefit of corrective feedback)

No	The Benefit of Getting Corrective Feedback	Percentage
1.	To understand the error of putting plural or singular and the correct form	5%
2.	To understand the use of v1, v2, v3 in the sentence the correct form	35%
3.	To understand the use of to be in the sentence the correct form	45%
4.	To understand the use of conjunction in the sentence the correct form	5%
5.	To understand the use of pronoun in the sentence the correct form	10%

## DISCUSSION

The result of this study shows that the type of corrective feedback that teachers used to their students in English writing classroom activities was indirect feedback. The same finding was found by Fithriani (2017); Wijayatiningsih (2018). The feedback is important to give to the students in writing text. The term of Indirect feedback (Ellis 2009) in Sermsook, Liamnimitr, & Pochakorn (2017) states that the technique gave information to the students about the location and the correct forms of the errors production, while direct feedback according to Ferrel (2006) in Seiffedin & El-Sakka, (2017) is strategy that provides feedback for the students about their task production to correct their errors by correcting structure or linguistic form of the target language. The teacher gave recount text material in teaching-learning process in the school. It is in line with the teaching English Foreign Language Based on Fauziati (2014) text types are text prototypes defined according to their primary social purpose. The six main text types are identified as a) narratives is telling story which entertains the reader, b) recount is telling what is happened in the past time, c) information reports provide factual or real information, d) instructions tell the reader or hearer what to do, e) explanations explanation is to show how or why something happened, and f) expository texts is giving argumentation about the viewpoints.

The result is in the line with (Chen, 2018) the teacher can be mainly used indirect feedback code and symbol feedback. By getting indirect feedback the students will understand the error by look at the code, if there

is no code the students will be confused. Why the teacher gives corrective feedback without any code.

There are 4 purposes of the teacher in using corrective feedback for the students in writing assignments: (1) to show the students error, to show correct production, (2) to assess the students writing product. (3) to increase the teacher strategies in teaching, which are in line with the findings of Klimova (2015), show that students are quite aware not only of their shortcomings in the learning of English but also of the strategies which can help them to improve this process of learning.

A look at the types of students' errors that the researcher found in Writing recount texts in English classroom activities Lexicogrammatically such as: To be, verb 2 or 3, the use of pronoun, conjunction, plural or singular. A similar problem was found in the studies Royani & Sadiah (2019) and Sitorus & Sipayung (2018), in which the students' English writings students had grammatical error content.

There are two benefits for students: The students understand their error after getting corrective feedback. The students understand the correct form of writing, they more understand after getting indirect corrective feedback. There are 3 impacts for the teacher if the students have many errors production in writing. It means that teachers have to increase their strategies to teach the students. If the students get good production, it means that the teacher is successful in teaching English. Then the teacher took the result score. The teacher is not only teaching but also assessing the students' knowledge progress in the classroom activities. Another function of the assessment is such as report of the students' performance process and skill production in teaching-learning writing English especially. Thus, the writer concludes that the function of corrective feedback is for detecting the student's error production. On the other hand Sermsook, Liamnimitr, & Pochakorn, (2017) state that a good relationship was built between teachers and learners in the process of giving corrective feedback and also encouraging teacher corrective feedback can contribute to English Foreign Language Learners' in improving writing productions.

The result for the student's interview there are six types of the motivation of the students in studying English especially in writing: They want to be able to Fluent in singing English song (25%), Become an English teacher (5%), Having a job in Abroad (10%), Having Communication with tourist (15%), Make a status on Facebook or Social Media use the English language (40%), Increase the status of style (15%). This means that the students who were intermediate EFL learners found that the most students have motivation to be able to make a status on Facebook or social media use English language. They want to express their ideas in English. However, some of them did not have motivation on writing in the social media. It

supported by (Inayah, 2019) that as a teacher, they have duty to support and build motivation of students to love writing in English activity as a part of their daily lives. It means that by having motivations of writing English in social media improves it also increases the student's motivation to learn English.

The importance of getting corrective feedback for the students are: Knows the error of putting plural or singular and the correct form (5%), Knows the use of v1, v2, v3 in the sentence the correct form (35%), Knows the use of "to be" in the sentence the correct form (45%), Knows the use of conjunction in the sentence the correct form (5%), Knows the use of pronoun in the sentence the correct form (10%). Thus, from the data, it can be concluded that the most important of getting corrective feedback for the students on the use of "To be" in making a sentence. To be is pattern on the tenses of grammar. The researcher concludes that the teacher and students have the same answer that the benefit of corrective feedback is to make the students know the correct productions. The same study found by Luan & Ishak, (2018) students who get corrective feedback in their subsequent revision of their writing production improved the accuracy of tenses.

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The finding of this study produced the following conclusion. First, the teacher of Manbaul Huda Islamic Junior High School employed indirect corrective feedback type on students writing production. They gave symbol to the student's error production. Second, most of the students were motivated to be able to write a status on Facebook or social media by using English. Lastly, the most important benefit of getting corrective feedback for the students was that to understand the use of grammar in making a sentence. By finding the result, the important of getting corrective feedback the students would be motivated to learn English more.

In this study the teacher gave indirect corrective feedback type only. The writer suggests for the teacher to treat the students with others types of corrective feedback. Then, the writer also suggests investigation of the research studies particularly on the involvement others corrective feedback such as direct feedback, semi corrective feedback, etc., for detecting the students' error production. The studies should do in longitudinal time, in some of the various contexts, with the different backgrounds of students' knowledge and also different types of students' age. Thus, the study will provide a more reliable instrument and valid data.

## REFERENCES

Abuseileek, A. F. (2013). Using track changes and word processor to provide corrective feedback to learners in writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted*

- Learning*, 29(4), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12004>
- Akmal, & Mahrup. (2019). Direct-unfocused-corrective feedback: A model for improving writing skills. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 9(11), 206–220.
- AR, N. (2018). Effects of Corrective Feedback on Students' Linguistic Errors. *International Journal of Education & Curriculum Application*, 1(2), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.31764/ijeca.v1i2.2147>
- Astia, M. (2018). Corrective Feedback in English Class. *Center of Language and Culture Studies*, 3(3), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl-tl.v3i3.502>
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York: Routledge Taylor and francish Group.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principle An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Çepni, S. B. (2016). A Replication Study: Oral Corrective Feedback on L2 Writing; Two Approaches Compared. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 520–528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.072>
- 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, 267–296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Chen, W. (2018). The Effects of Corrective Feedback Strategies on English Majors' Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 11(11), 55–64. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n11p55>
- Dilâra, Ş., & Hakk, İ. (2017). Contribution of Corrective Feedback to English Language Learners' Writing Skills Development through Workfolio Based Tasks. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 9(1), 1–30.
- Fauziati, E. (2014). *Method of Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. surakarta: Pustaka Utama.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, Dana, & 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)
- Fithriani, R. (2017). Indonesian Students' Perceptions of Written Feedback in Second Language Writing.

- Ghufron, M. A. (2019). Exploring an Automated Feedback Program ' Grammarly ' and Teacher Corrective Feedback in EFL Writing Assessment : Modern vs . Traditional Assessment. *ELLIC*.  
<https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-4-2019.2285308>
- Hamidnia, M., Ketabi, S., & Amirian, Z. (2020). Feeding Written Corrective Feedback Forward : English Language Learners ' Writing Improvement in a Portfolio-Keeping Atmosphere. *Teaching English Language*, 14(1), 31–70.
- Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective : The interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, 80, 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.009>
- Hapsari, N. E. (2018). *Corrective Feedback In Students' English Composition*.
- Inayah, R. (2019). the Implementation of Collaborative Technique in Teaching Writing To Enhance Students' Skill in Writing English Text. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bina Bahasa*, 12(2), 49–55.  
<https://doi.org/10.33557/binabahasa.v12i2.741>
- Khanlarzadeh, M., & Taheri, P. (2017). Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing : Does SEMI- Feedback Suffice ? *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences 2017*, 6(2), 329–342.
- Klimova, B. (2015). Diary Writing as a Tool for Students' Self-reflection and Teacher's Feedback in the Course of Academic Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197(February), 549–553.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.189>
- Luan, N. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's direct and indirect feedback: How do they impact learners' written performance? *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(3), 95–110.  
<https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-08>
- Mali, G. Y. C. (2015). Motivational Factors in the Indonesian Efl Writing Classroom. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 15(1), 1.  
[https://doi.org/10.17509/bs\\_jpbsp.v15i1.794](https://doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v15i1.794)
- Mulati, D. F., Nurkamto, J., & Drahati, N. A. (2020). the Teachers' Beliefs in Teacher Written Corrective Feedback on the Students' Writing. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics & Literature)*, 5(1), 1–10.  
<https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.7644>
- Nagode, G. P., Pižorn, K., & Jurišević, M. (2014). The Role of Written Corrective Feedback in Developing Writing in L2. *English Language and Literature Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.11.2.89-98>
- Rahmawati, E. D. (2017). *Students ' Oral and Written Feedbacks on Students ' Writing Quality At One of Pre – Intermediate Writing Class*.
- Royani, S., & Sadiah, S. (2019). an Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Students' Writing Descriptive Text. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 2(6), 764.

- <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v2i6.p764-770>
- Seiffedin, A. H., & El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2017). The Impact of Direct-indirect Corrective E-feedback on EFL Students' Writing Accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(3), 166.  
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tppls.0703.02>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback on EFL Student Writers' Grammatical Improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 43-49.  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n10p43>
- Shae, S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback : ( Mis ) alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45(November 2018), 46-60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Sitorus, G. S., & Sipayung, K. (2018). An Error Analysis of Using Phrases in Writing Recount Text at Tenth Grade in SMA Parulian 2 Medan. *Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, 18(1), 74.  
<https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v18i1.562>
- Sugiyono. (2013). *metode penelitian kuantitatif and kualitatif*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- Wicaksono, W. P. (2018). Types and Frequencies of Written Corrective Feedbacks in Adult ESL Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*.
- Wijayatiningsih, T. D. (2018). Direct Corrective Feedback on Studentswriting Performace. *4th ELTLT Conference Poceedings*, 1-18.
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing : A case study of Chinese lower-pro fi ciency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37(March), 13-24.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>