CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON EFL WRITING CLASS: A NARRATIVE STUDY AT INDONESIAN PRIVATE UNIVERSITY

Siti Sunarsih[1], Moh. Arif Mahbub[2]
[1,2]Universitas Islam Jember
e-mail: sitisunarsih383@gmail.com[1], *rifelbarzmahmub@gmail.com*[2]

ABSTRACT

The aim of this current study is to investigate EFL students perspective about CF who enrolled in writing course in an Indonesian private university. Data gathering used interview. Question of the interview contain four questions.The findings indicate that the participants' need CF in her writing product. The findings have practical implications for EFL teachers and course designers. Conclusions were then drawn as well as discussing recommendations. Overall, the result of this current study tried to answer the research question about the EFL students' motivation enrolled in Writing course situated in one of private universities in Jember, East Java, Indonesia. To answer the research question reseacher we employed narrative inquiry (Barkhuizen et al., 2014; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The results indicated that student need CF as a strategy to evaluate their writing product. Second, the teacher usually provides some types of CF such as Direct feedback, indirect feedback and metalinguistic feedback. . Thirdly, the the direct feedback can significantly affect their writing product especially in structure case.The implication from this research is motivation greatly influences students' affectiveness and teachers play an active role to increasing student writing development. This research has several limitations such as this study still has limited participants (n=1) and cannot to be generated. Also this present study only conducted in eastern java Indonesia. Further, the topic of the research only focused on learners writing skill. Therefore it is suggested for future researched to involved in large skill of participant in another skills.

Key Words*: A Narrative Inquiry, Corrective Feedback, Indonesian EFL Students, EEL Writing*

INTRODUCTION

Giving of feedback is viewed as a potent tool for the academic performance of the learners in various academic literatures. According to Ellis (2009) feedback is a means of boosting learners' motivation and verifying their language accuracy. Corrective feedback is one thing that is very important. Giving corrective feedback is thought to be useful in the classroom, however the way and kind of feedback itself has different efficacy (Dana, n.d.; Hattie & Timperley, 2007)

Providing corrective feedback on learners' writing products correctly and properly can be useful to help SLA (Lim & Dass, 2014) Corrective Feedback (henceforth CF) is absolutely essential for both teachers and students in order to increase their ability. It is thought as contributing factor in language learning. It has been recognised in earlier studies (Baz et al., 2016; Isnawati & Java, 2019; Wahyuni, 2017; Wang, 2017) that CF plays a crucial role in helping learners strengthen their writing skills. Furthermore, according to Ferris (1999), studies that support the usefulness of CF are proliferating. He said that by emphasizing error correction in CF, it can aid students in enhancing their writing. Numerous academic works have looked at the impact of CF. They concentrated on providing both explicit and implicit written corrections.

Based on the studies, the corrective feedback is effective in improving learners writing accuracy. It indicates that the indirect corrective feedback is more effective than direct corrective feedback (Bitchener, 2008; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al., 2015). Additionally, according to studies by Moussaoui et al. (2012) students who offer and receive corrective criticism displayed favourable attitudes toward the process, which reduced their writing anxiety and boosted their writing self-efficacy.

Although CF is crucial to SLL, it has been found to be lacking. Some academics continue to argue the importance of providing CF, particularly in academic writing settings. Although Truscott (1996, 1999) asserts that there isn't any conclusive evidence that CF helps students improve their writing correctness, he suggests that CF is annoying for language learning of students. According to him, CF is a time waster that stresses out both kids and teachers, hence it ought to be discontinued.

As abovementioned, the contemporary researches on the effectiveness of corrective feedback on language learning have been mushrooming in various realms in many different countries around the world (Baz et al., 2016; W. Chen, 2018; El Ebyary & Windeatt, 2010; Ghazal et al., 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Hsieh et al., 2017; Lei, 2017; Vattøy & Smith, 2019; Wang, 2017). However, the studies of

corrective feedback on learners' EFL writing class for college students, particularly in Indonesia, have been rarely researched. Therefore, this study is conducted to explore the issue about CF from students' perspectives that will contribute to expand the literature of that issue. Then in this study the researcher wants to investigate the Indonesian private students' perspectives on corrective feedback to their writing development. That, the research question in this study is as follow, "What are students' perspectives toward corrective feedback on their writing development?"

LITERATURE REVIEW
Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback has been a long-debated issue contextualized in both ESL/EFL learning (Guo & Yang, 2018; Li & Vuono, 2019) Although Truscott Truscott (1996, 1999) claimed the abolition of CF, Ferris (1999;2004) in a series of publication, still argued that CF remains powerful for the development of students' writing products. Li (2017) has specifically defined CF as an attitude, views, opinions, or stances by teachers and students exposed to learners' imprecision when creating learning in second language (L2). Li & Vuono (2019) stated that CF is defined as the corrections to the learner's creation or understanding of errors provided in the second language domain. CF is described as information that given by teacher both directly or indirectly about learners' unintentional use of their writing and made for the purpose of correcting and modifying the original usage of language (Pham & Iwashita, 2018). In this case the use of CF in teaching writing process, the differences between direct feedback and indirect feedback have received much attention both in research and classroom practice. Direct feedback is the provision of explicit target language form for error correction students Ferris (2004). On the other hand, indirect corrective feedback includes teacher feedback which is provided using underlines, codes, or other symbols to point out students' writing errors. In indirect CF the exact form is not provided by teachers, instead learners are responsible for self-reviewing, self-editing the error correction based on teachers' code (Bitchener, 2008).

Ellis (2009) has classified six types strategies of providing CF for students writing performance. Those are direct feedback (Boggs, 2019; Khaki & Tabrizi, 2021) indirect feedback (D. Ferris & Roberts, 2001), metalinguistic feedback (Pourdana et al., 2021), focused and unfocused feedback (Colpitts & Howard, 2018), electronic feedback and reformulation.

Types of CF	Description
1. Direct CF	The teacher provide the student with the correct form
2. Indirect CF	The teacher indicate the error position that appear, but does not provide the correction
a Indicating + locating the error	This takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text.
b. Indication only	This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.
3. Metalinguistic CF	The teacher provide several kind of metalinguistic clueto indicate student's error
a Use of error code	Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. ww ¼ wrong word; art ¼ article).
b Brief grammatical descriptions	Teacher numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.
4. The focus of CF 5.	This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students' errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options
a. Unfocused CF	Unfocused CF is extensive.
b. Focused CF	Focused CF is intensive.
6. Electronic feedback	The teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of correct usage.
7. Reformulation	This consists of a native speaker's reworking of the students' entire text to

make the language seem as native-likeaspossiblewhilekeeping the content of the original intact.

Previous Studies

Many researchers from all around the world have been drawn to the different varieties of CF. This recent research highlighted a few benefits of CF supply in unique delivery techniques. Rouhi et al. (2020) conducted research, this study evaluates the distinct impacts of providing and receiving unfocused direct feedback in increasing the writing correctness of Iranian EFL learners. In order to do this, 61 English language learners were divided into three groups at random: a control group (n = 20), a feedback receiver group (n = 22), and a feedback giver group. The participating groups conducted four translation tasks as part of the Cambridge English Preliminary Test (PET) and two tests, a translation test and a picture description test. The results of the data analysis demonstrated the value of peer input. Further data analysis demonstrated that in translation and picture description tests, participants in the feedback giver group outperformed those in the feedback receiver and control groups, highlighting the beneficial impact of providing feedback on learners themselves as opposed to learners who receive feedback.

Meanwhile, Al Ghaithi & Behforouz (2023) The effectiveness of corrective feedback on learners' writing performance on electronic platforms is examined in the current study. 94 Omani students who are studying English as a foreign language (EFL) were chosen based on the outcomes of their assessments. One experimental group and one control group, each with 47 students, were randomly allocated. To gather the necessary data, a pretest writing test was administered to both groups. The control group simply received corrected advice on the final draft's forms and structures, while the experimental group underwent the treatment employing corrective feedback. Participants in the experimental group were given surveys to learn more about their opinions on corrective feedback. When the control and experimental groups were compared using the Mann- Whitney U test, the mean scores of the two groups were significantly different. A statistically significant improvement in writing skills was seen in EFL students after receiving constructive feedback. The poll results also showed that respondents emphasized the importance of receiving helpful criticism from their teachers.

In the same idea Abbas & Tawfeeq (2018) conducted research in Kurdish. Data was gathered from writing testing samples (pre-test,

post-test, and delayed post-test) produced by 105 undergraduate English department students from two public universities as part of the author's PhD study on the impact of direct and indirect corrective feedback on the academic writing accuracy of Kurdish EFL university students. The study's findings is L2 learners can benefit from teacher written feedback to develop their accuracy in writing.

Numerous earlier research above gave unambiguous proof that CF offers important advantages in the English area, especially for writing mobility. However, those investigations did not adequately record the opinions of the participants. As a result, this study tries to close any gaps in the existing research. This study stressed the neutrality of the data gathering techniques, which would have an impact on choosing the topic of a thorough conversation, through in-depth interviews.

METHOD

Research Design

This qualitative study used a constructivist research paradigm (Ivankova et al., 2006) that employs narrative design as a research method (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) to explore the real-world phenomenon of students' experiences with the use of corrective feedback in writing subjects in the context of a private universities in Jember, Indonesia. The narrative approach was chosen for this study because its design needed that the researchers get involved in the participants' real-life narratives (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The goal of this study, which employed semi-structured interviews, was to use the verbal data that had already been gathered to provide more comprehensive empirical evidence than earlier investigations.This qualitative study used a constructivist research paradigm (Ivankova et al., 2006) that employs narrative design as a research method (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) to explore the real-world phenomenon of students' experiences with the use of corrective feedback in writing subjects in the context of a private universities in Jember, Indonesia. The narrative approach was chosen for this study because its design needed that the researchers get involved in the participants' real-life narratives (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The goal of this study, which employed semi-structured interviews, was to use the verbal data that had already been gathered to provide more comprehensive empirical evidence than earlier investigations.

Data Generation and Analysis

For this study, a semi-structured interview (Barkhuizen et al., 2014) was set up as the research tool. Participant was asked to answer the interview guidelines as follows: 1. What do EFL university student belief about the use of corrective feedback techniques in correcting the writing errors? 2. What types of corrective feedback does the EFL teacher usually provide in the classroom? 3. What kinds of corrective feedback methods do EFL university students prefer in the classroom? and 4. What do EFL university students think about the efficacy of using corrective feedback on their writing development?

We used theme analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to examine the qualitative information obtained from semi-structured interviews as part of the data processing process.

Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes your data set in (rich) detail. For them, there are several proceduress to do thematic analyses described as follows: 1) familiarizing yourself with your data, (Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas) 2) generating intial codes, (Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code) 3) searching for themes, (Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme) 4) reviewing themes, (Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic 'map' of the analysis.) 5) defining and naming themes, (Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.) and 6) producing the report. (The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
FINDINGS

The purpose of the current study is to investigate how students view toward corrective feedback in EFL classroom activities. The data arised from the verbal partisipant's utterances that transcribed before. When the participant asked about teacher's practice of the corrective feedback in their classrooms, she states:

"…..*yes, my teacher provided CF in our class,,, he usually ask us to write with the topic that has been prepared before then we write it.*

After that he will evaluate our product while give us CF on our writing. When he provides indirect CF I feel worried because I am afraid there will be so many mistake of my writing. Because I think it is not easy to fix the implicit correction of our teacher. On the other hands I am lucky when he gives me a direct feedback to my writing because I can know my mistake and I can learn from it. " (Interview unnamed 20, April 2023 via WhatsApp)

After doing a theme analysis and being questioned about what teacher provide CF in their class activities, the participant explained that her teacher provides CF in their classroom. She explained that the CF itself had an effect on his psychological condition therefore when the teacher give correction on her writing, she feels worried because the participant afraid if there are so many mistakes on her writing. On the other hands the participant also feels lucky when her product is corrected by the teacher because by receiving CF she knows the mistakes that have been made and she can learn more about the correction itself.

Likewise, the researchers does not layoff the curiousity only to the previous topic, we tried to deliver the question about types of CF that used in the classroom to respond students' error in writing. Participant explained in detail as follows:

"...Practically. My teacher tends to give us feedback directly, indirectly or metalinguistic cf. she used some strategies to correct our writing. Those are like underlined the mistake or circle it without any feedback. So, we have to identify our mistakes by ourself. But sometimes she circled or underlined it with given the correct form to the wrong word or wrong grammar. When he gave the correct form into the wrong sentence, I feel free because it makes me understand easily about the correction without any curiosity on it." (Interview unnamed 20, April 2023 via WhatsApp).

Based on the result of the interview, unnamed stated that usually the teacher give some strategies in giving CF for students writing. Such as direct feedback, indirect feedback metalinguistic feedback. The teacher usually underlined or circle the mistake made by students with provides correct form of the mistake. Sometimes she just underlined or give a code without correct form. It indicates that the teacher facilitates CF feedback in his class with some strategies.

Afterwards, we also tried to dig deeper into the participant's experiences about which type of CF do the participant favor, she expressed that:

"…..I prefer direct correction, because if an indirect or metalinguistic we dont learn and know directly what, where, and how an error condition happened. I think direct CF is clearer than other. The teacher clearly marks my mistakes either circling or underlining it and he gave me a correct form so I could understand it easily. I need feedback to more understand about where I make an error, why it was false, and how to deliver it properly" (Interview unnamed 20, April 2023 via WhatsApp).

During the participant's interview, she mentioned the CF she likes. She said she preferred direct CF since she believed it to be more efficient than other varieties. She explained that direct corrective feedback provides clear explanation why the product is wrong and it has been the correct form on the product itself.

In the next question the researcher asked about the efficacy about direct CF itself for the student. The unnamed said that it is very useful and it is very important. Furthermore, she added that it is significantly help her in improving her writing result. The statements have described as follows:

"… According to my opinion, direct Cf is very useful and important. It can significantly help me to improve my writing result because by giving CF on my writing I understand that indirectly I learn from the mistakes I made, whether it's about structure, singular/plural form and word choice. Indirectly when I get Cf from my teacher I learn new material that I don't know how to apply it" (Interview unnamed 20, April 2023 via WhatsApp).

The participant said that direct corrective feedback has significant effect on her writing especially in structure case. She thinks that direct corrective feedback helps the participant to know the use of structure, singular or plural form and word choices

DISCUSSION

This current study explored beliefs, types, perspective and effectiveness of students' CF to give key solution difficulties faced by the students while writing. Through one model data analysis, researchers presented discussion of the research through the following sections. The first section focused to the teacher whether provide CF or not. Based on the data the participant said that the

teacher provided CF in their class and the participant feel that when the teacher provides CF she feel worried on it. In line with previous studies (Supiani et al., 2023) which stated that negative engagement emerged when the teacher provided the CF to fix the students' macro writing issues, including unclear main ideas, disconnected ideas, lack of logical sequencing and development of the topic. Additionally, the study found that low English proficiency, a lack of writing experience, negative views, and attitudes toward the corrective feedback were the main causes of students' anxiety when they get it. It can be concluded that in principle corrective feedback has a great influence on a person' psychological condition. It follows that educators ought to adopt new strategies for giving insightful, indirect feedback on their students' writing. On the other hands the participant also feel the benefit of corrective feedback itself because it can help her to fix the writing error with the aim to eliminate the writing errors. When the participant stated that by receiving CF she knew whether her writing product is correct or incorrect. This findings in line with previous research studies S. Chen et al. (2016) stated that the value of CF was derived from the following factors: (1) CF can assist in identifying recurring errors; (2) CF offers opportunities for further writing quality improvement; and (3) unlike spoken language, English writing requires more attention to form and accuracy. In this case it proves that CF is needed in teaching learning writing process to examine the product of student.

Furthermore, the second item reported to teachers strategies in providing corrective feedback. Based on the explanation from unnamed' participant, her teacher usually provided some types of CF. Like direct CF, indirect CF, metalinguistic feedback and others. In lines with (Ellis, 2009) there are so many corrective feedback strategies that can use in class. It can be concluded that providing some strategies in giving feedback it can help students easy to identify which feedback strategies that they favor in order to make them easy to understand the feedback itself.

As a continuation of the discussion section, determining CF types for the learning activity becomes our theme topic elaboration. In the third item, data revealed that there were six types of the CF which elected from the frequently used, namely: direct correction, indirect correction, metalinguistic, focus feedback, Electronic feedback and Reformulation. The data reported that student tend to use a direct correction categorize for her classroom. She explained that by receiving direct CF she automatically knows the correction of her product. She preferred direct CF because it's easier than other

types of CF. By receiving direct CF students do not need to find the location of the error because the teacher has identified and provided corrections to the product. In line with Lim & Dass (2014) stated that in terms of the preferred kind of feedback for students, the respondents preferred receiving direct criticism from teachers regarding their errors over being given the chance to make corrections.

In line with Saragih (2021) and Supiani et al (2023), the majority of participants favored immediate feedback. They had a positive impression of the direct strategy's implementation. It may be deduced that students favored a direct corrective feedback approach in which they could analyze their blunders and flaws in writing and receive immediate revisions from their professor. Since the teacher had given them clear, straightforward corrections or assistance, the majority of the students felt positively engaged. They chose the direct approach because it enabled them to rectify the faults in their micro writing, including sentence structure, singular/plural forms, word choice, and article errors. However, it did not mean that they totally ignored the other strategies to be implemented in the practice.

In light of the foregoing explanation, our discussion's final topic was assessments of the effectiveness of CF distribution. Our research revealed that the participant stated her agreement with the usefulness of CF specifically for excluding the negative effects of deeply ingrained student errors. She explained that receiving direct corrective feedback indirectly help her in writing especially in mastering the structure, singular or plural form and vocabulary choice. In keeping with earlier research (Shirazi & Shekarabi, 2014) showed that just direct feedback enhanced the linguistic aspect of written essays of students with indirect feedback having little or no role to play in writing practice. From this finding it can be concluded that direct corrective feedback helpful for students writing in case of structure. Therefore, it is useful to provide students with direct corrective feedback in writing classroom.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the result of this current study tried to answer the research question about the students' perspectives toward corrective feedback on their writing development situated in one of private universities in Jember, East Java, Indonesia. To answer the research question researcher we employed narrative inquiry (Barkhuizen et al., 2014a; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The results

indicated that student need CF as a strategy to evaluate their writing product. Second, the teacher usually provides some types of CF such as Direct feedback, indirect feedback and metalinguistic feedback. Thirdly, the direct feedback can significantly affect student writing especially in structure case.

The implication from this research is motivation greatly influences students' affectiveness and teachers play an active role to increasing student writing.

REFERENCES

Abbas, A. M., & Tawfeeq, H. M. (2018). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in Second Language Writing. *English Language Teaching*, *11*(6), 33.

Ahmed, A. H. (2010). Students' Problems with Cohesion and Coherence in EFL Essay Writing in

Ahmed, A., & Abouabdelkader, H. (2016). Teaching EFL writing in the 21st century Arab world:

Al Ghaithi, A., & Behforouz, B. (2023). the Effect of Corrective Feedback Via a Computerized

Alister, C. (2016). *Theoritical Perspective on writing*. *1998*, 1–23.

Allen, M. (2017). Leadership. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, *and Behavioral Sciences*, *69*(Iceepsy), 1775–1784. *and Challenges*, 1–261. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46726-3*AND LEARNING RESEARCH Narrative* (S. M. Gass & A. Mackey (eds.)). Routledge.

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2014a). *Narrative Inquiry in Language Teaching and*

Barkhuizen, G., Benson, P., & Chik, A. (2014b). *NARRATIVE INQUIRY IN LANGUAGE TEACHING*

Baz, E., Balçıkanlı, C., & Cephe, P. (2016). *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching Behavioral Sciences*, *185*, 190–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.360

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language*

Boggs, J. A. (2019). Effects of teacher-scaffolded and self-scaffolded corrective feedback compared

Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written

Chen, W. (2018). The Effects of Corrective Feedback Strategies on English Majors' Writing. *English* Classroom. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *11*(2), 147–166.

Colpitts, B. D. F., & Howard, L. (2018). A comparison of focused and unfocused corrective feedback

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational* corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: does giving and receiving feedback corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific* Course on Omani Efl Learners Writing Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance*

Dana, F. (n.d.). *The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott* Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Education*, *24*(1), 74–87. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1025572 Egypt: Different Perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal*, *1*(4),

El Ebyary, K., & Windeatt, S. (2010). The impact of computer-based feedback on students' written

Ellis, R. (2009a). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 97–107.

Ellis, R. (2009b). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, *1*(1). English as a foreign language. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *85*, 260–268. Explanatory Design: From Theory to Practice. *Field Methods*, *18*(1), 3–20. Female Iranian EFL Learners on their Writing Performance. *Procedia - Social and*

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes How explicit does it need to be? focused on EFL learners' discourse markers accuracy in mobile-mediated context. *Asian-*

Ghazal, L., Gul, R., Hanzala, M., Jessop, T., & Tharani, A. (2014). Graduate Students' Perceptions of

Guo, X., & Yang, Y. (2018). Effects of Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Acquisition of Third-

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), have fair mutual benefit? *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving

Hsieh, Y., Hiew, C. K., & Tay, Y. X. (2017). *Computer-Mediated Corrective Feedback in Chinese as* in Enhancing Algerian

Students ' Writing Autonomy and Positive Affect. *Procedia - Social* in Japanese EFL writing classes. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, *60*(1), 7–16. Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 668–

Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using Mixed-Methods Sequential

Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written

Janesick, V. J. (2015). Peer Debriefing. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, 2–3. *January 2017*.https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n293

Jebreil, N., Azizifar, A., & Gowhary, H. (2015). Investigating the Effect of Anxiety of Male and *Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *1*(1), 1–17. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(3), 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-

Khaki, M., & Tabrizi, H. H. (2021). Assessing the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback in *Language Learning* (Vol. 46, Issue 2).

Lei, Z. (2017). Salience of Student Written Feedback by Peer-Revision in EFL Writing Class. *English*

Li, S. (2017). Student and Teacher Beliefs and Attitudes about Oral Corrective Feedback. *Second*

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in

Lim, C., & Dass, R. (2014). *Examining Taylor ' s Center for Languages IEN Students ' Perspectives*

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). The Disturbing and Disturbed Observer. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, 92–linguistic accuracy of Iranian Japanese learners' writing. *Iranian Journal of Language*

Moussaoui, S., Beggueg, C. Ben, & Bt, D. (2012). An Investigation of the Effects of Peer Evaluation *on*. *4*(1), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.7603/s40*Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *6*(1). *PERCEPTIONS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS AND*. 54–68. Person Singular Form and the Mediating Role of Cognitive Style. *Journal of Psycholinguistic*

Pham, N. L., & Iwashita, N. (2018). Using Corrective Feedback on Writing to Enhance Vietnamese

Pourdana, N., Nour, P., & Yousefi, F. (2021). Investigating metalinguistic written corrective feedback process-based vs product-based instruction on learners' writing. *Language Teaching* Quantitative Analysis in an EFL Context. *World Journal of Education*, *7*(2), 74.

Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of giving and receiving written

Saragih, N. A. (2021). *Written Corrective Feedback : Students ' Perception. 8*, 676–690. *Sciences*, *192*, 116–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018 *Second Language Writing*, *46*(May). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100671

Shirazi, M. A., & Shekarabi, Z. (2014). The role of written corrective feedback in enhancing the

Supiani, Yansyah, & Basthomi, Y. (2023). Indonesian University Students' Engagement with System. *System*, *84*, 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006 Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback in English as an Additional Language Writing *Teaching Research*, *2*(1), 99–118. to direct corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in English L2 writing. *Journal of*

Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. In

Truscott, J. (1999). The Case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A

Vattøy, K., & Smith, K. (2019). Students ' perceptions of teachers ' feedback practice in teaching

Wang, X. (2017). The Effects of Corrective Feedback on Chinese Learners' Writing Accuracy: A we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language* work. *IJES, International Journal of English Studies*, *10*(2), 121–142.