Exploring Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing Assignment at Junior and Senior High Schools: A Descriptive Study at SMP Negeri 22 Padang and SMA Negeri 12 Padang

Dini Hijriani[1] and Hamzah[2]
[12]Universitas Negeri Padang
Correspondence Email: dinihijriani2603@gmail.com

Article History	Abstract
	This study intended to figure out the types of English teachers' written corrective feedback, the techniques used and the challenges faced by English teachers when giving written corrective feedback. This study was descriptive research. A total of four English teachers from SMP Negeri 22 Padang and SMA Negeri 12 Padang were selected by maximal variation sampling. Students' writing assignment and interview were used as instruments to collect data. Students' writing assignments were used to figure out what kinds of written corrective feedback and techniques that teachers used when giving feedback, while interview were used to figure out what challenges that teachers faced when giving written corrective feedback on students' writing assignment. According to the study's findings, English teachers at SMP Negeri 22 Padang and SMA Negeri 12 Padang only used two forms of written corrective feedback. They were direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. Then, English teachers' techniques when giving written corrective feedback were adding, deleting, substituting, circling, commenting, crossing out, questioning, moving around, and underlining. Last, the challenges that English teachers faced when giving written corrective feedback were limited time, students' attitude, students' proficiency, and students' handwriting.

INTRODUCTION

Writing serves as one of the most prominent abilities in language offered to ESL and EFL students at any educational level, particularly students at junior and senior high schools. This skill is very important for students since it is one of the

communication tools. It is integral to the language learning process because it allows students to communicate their opinions, thoughts, and feelings in writing. However, when students are assigned to write a writing assignment, the majority of them encounter a variety of writing issues. This fact has discovered by the researcher when the researcher has taught at SMA Negeri 12 Padang when teaching practice in the seventh semester ago. It was found that many students made mistakes when doing writing assignments. The errors occurred due to students' lack of vocabulary, lack of understanding of how to write correct words, lack of understanding of grammar and many more.

When students make mistakes in writing, it is the responsibility of English teachers to maintain that students do not make the same mistakes repeatedly. One thing that English teachers may do to help students prevent making the same mistakes is to provide feedback. Feedback is a strategy employed by English teachers to assist the students who are experiencing difficulties in learning by providing responses such as encouragement, suggestion, and correction on students' writing results in order to make students understand about their assignments.

In accordance with Lewis (2002), feedback is a way of telling students about their achievement and boosting their progression. English teacher is extremely significant in helping students improve their writing. Feedback will also assist students enhance the value of their writing and push them to write more. On the other hand, Harmer (2001) agrees with what was said above. He claims that feedback not simply corrects students, but as well indicates how well they performed, either during a class or after a longer period of language practice. How we grade and fix students will be determined not only by the types of mistakes they make and why they make mistakes, but also on what they are doing when they make mistakes.

Written feedback is essential in EFL contexts because it offers students with advice on accurate and appropriate forms of writing creation in a language that is not their first language. Written feedback, rather than spoken feedback, according to Wirantaka (2022, p. 388), is more flexible and may be clearly captured in students' works of writing. Teachers frequently provide written comments as a sort of communication in written form to students about their writings because of its benefits. According to Feuerherm (2012, p. 133), written feedback to student writing is a one-of-a-kind written dialogue in which the student (as learner) and teacher (as expert) positions are implicit and the corresponding identities are negotiated through successive responses and solutions.

In short, written feedback is a crucial part of the feedback system and has been used in education alongside spoken feedback. The goals of written feedback are similar to those of oral feedback. The primary purpose is to support students and provide feedback in such a way that they can grow their skills to the maximum extent possible. Written feedback, on the other hand, involves to the rectification of flaws and shortcomings in content, structure, and language over writing.

According to Ellis (2008), there are six basic types to provide written corrective feedback. First is direct corrective feedback. It signifies that the teacher gives the right form to the students. Identifying incorrect words or phrases and placing them in the proper form are two methods of providing direct feedback. There are several ways to provide direct feedback, such as highlighting the inaccurate word

or phrase and switching it with the proper version (Ellis, 2008, p. 99; & Ferris, 2006, p. 83). The second is indirect corrective feedback. This feedback indicates the evidence of a language error that has not been corrected. This gives the learner the opportunity to correct the error (Bitchener, 2008). This feedback can also be given by highlighting the mistakes or applying cursors to indicate failures in the student's text, or by putting a mark in the empty space next to the paragraph that contains faults.

The third is metalinguistic corrective feedback. Metalinguistic corrective feedback gives students a precise answer based on the type of their faults. This type of feedback often employs codes for students' mistakes, which imply that the teacher adds shortened marks (for example, art. = article, WW = Wrong Word, pre. = preposition) where the error exists in the students' writing. Marks can be inserted in the body of the sentence or in the margins of the page to highlight the position of the error (Ellis, 2008). The fourth is focused and unfocused corrective feedback. Focused corrective feedback concentrates on specific kinds of faults while ignoring others. Meanwhile, unfocused corrective feedback is addressed at all or a broad range of faults in students' writing assignments.

The fifth is electronic feedback. According to Zhang (2015), electronic feedback is feedback that is digital, written, and transmitted over the internet, and it includes either asynchronous interaction such as e-mail and online synchronous interaction in multiple users object oriented domains. The last is reformulation. It means that the teacher rewrites or creates a native – speaker version of some of the students' writing that contains errors.

Additionally, there are various issues that English teachers have while offering written corrective feedback. According to Paris (2022), the difficulties teachers had when offering feedback to their students included a heavy workload, student action or inaction, and their own impact and perspective.

RESEARCH METHOD

This was descriptive research. Calderon (2006) defines descriptive research as the procedure of gathering, interpreting, organizing, and accumulating data relating to recent events, method, patterns, and causal connection, and then drawing acceptable and relevant inferences of such data using or without minimal, statistical techniques.

The population of research was four English teachers from SMP Negeri 22 Padang and SMA Negeri 12 Padang. The maximal variation sampling technique was used for sample selection. The data of this study was English teachers' written corrective feedback, English teachers' technique when providing written corrective feedback, and English teachers' challenges when providing written corrective feedback. It was sourced from students' writing assignment that has been corrected by English teachers and interview with English teachers about their challenges when providing written corrective feedback.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Providing Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing Assignment at Junior and Senior High Schools

Types of WCF	Junior High School	Percentage	Senior High School	Percentage
DCF	63	**63%**	53	**52%**
ICF	37	**37%**	49	**48%**
Total	100	100%	102	100%

The table showed that there were only two types of feedback on students' writing assignments. The first was direct corrective feedback with a total of 63 times which was always used by English teachers when checking students' assignments at grade 7 and grade 8. Then the second type was indirect corrective feedback with a total of 37 times. As a result, it became clear that the most often used type of feedback was direct corrective feedback with a percentage of 63%. While, indirect corrective feedback had a percentage of 37%.

Senior high school English teachers, like junior high school English teachers, only provided two kinds of written corrective feedback. As mentioned in the table, they were direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. According to the study's findings, 52% of senior high school English teachers used direct corrective feedback. Meanwhile, indirect corrective feedback has a proportion of only 48%.

Direct corrective feedback was the most popular type of written corrective feedback used by English teachers at junior and senior high schools. Direct corrective feedback showed students the proper form of their errors. Therefore, Ferris and Robert (2001) in Ellis (2008: 99) propose that direct corrective feedback is probably preferable to indirect corrective feedback for students who write with low levels of ability. By using this type, students could immediately see the correct form which they could not create themselves due to lack of grammar rules. In line with this, Sheen (2007) in Ellis (2008: 99) shows that direct corrective feedback can help in fostering the use of particular grammar characteristics. This is why English teachers used direct corrective feedback the most frequently with beginner learners.

Indirect corrective feedback was the second kinds of written corrective feedback that teachers provided to students' writing assignments. Indirect corrective feedback entailed stating that students had made a mistake without actually correcting it. To highlight errors or omissions in the students' text, underline them or circle them. The researcher examined how teachers provide indirect corrective feedback on students' writing assignment to help them spot faults. According to Ellis (2008), teachers believe that delivering indirect corrective feedback helps capture students' attention and guide them to self-correct.

Based on the findings of data analysis, it was found that there were seven techniques of providing written corrective feedback at junior high school and eight techniques of providing written corrective feedback on students' writing assignments at senior high school.

Table 2 Techniques of Providing Written Corrective Feedback by English Teachers at Junior and Senior High Schools

Techniques of Providing WCF	Junior High School	Percentage	Senior High School	Percentage
Adding	22	**22%**	17	**17%**
Deleting	9	**9%**	10	**10%**
Substituting	26	**26%**	17	**17%**
Moving around	-	**-**	10	**10%**
Circling	3	**3%**	21	**20%**
Underlining	-	**-**	14	**14%**
Crossing out	31	**31%**	5	**5%**
Commenting	6	**6%**	-	**-**
Questioning	3	**3%**	9	**9%**
Total	100	100%	103	100%

The table showed that providing written corrective feedback using adding technique on students writing assignment at junior high school was 22%. Then, deleting technique was 9%. Substituting technique was 26%. Circling technique was 3%. Commenting technique was 6%. Crossing out technique was 31%. Last questioning technique was 3%. It can be said that English teachers at junior high school gave corrective feedback on students' writing assignments by crossing out the students' writing errors as the dominant technique.

Then, the table also showed that providing written corrective feedback on students' writing assignment at senior high school with adding and substituting techniques were 17%. Deleting and moving around techniques were 10%. Circling techniques was 20%. Crossing out technique was 5%. Questioning technique was 9%. Last, underlining technique was 14%. Based these results, it was found that English teacher at senior high school provided written corrective feedback on students' writing assignments by substituting and circling the students' writing errors as the dominant technique. It meant that when there were language errors or unnecessary words or sentences that students made, English teachers tend to substitute or circle the students' writing errors.

In this situation, the researcher examined the teachers' techniques for offering direct corrective feedback on students' writing assignment. It is accomplished by substituting, deleting, adding, moving around, and circling the incorrect form. Then, the teacher offered the proper solution to the students' error which listed at the bottom and top of errors. In line with that, Ferris (2006: 83) state that direct corrective feedback may occur in several forms, like removing unneeded word or phrase, adding an absent word or putting the proper word alongside the incorrect one.

Whereas, indirect feedback happens when the teacher identifies an error with an underline, circle, code, or other indication but does not supply the proper form (Ferris, 2006: 83). It is consistent with Ellis idea. He highlights the characteristic of indirect corrective feedback, which identifies and indicates faults without offering the proper form. It can be accomplished by underline the typos or applying markers

to identify flaws in the student's text (Ellis, 2008). This is supported by study from Betha et al (2021), who found that indirect corrective feedback can also assist students avoid writing errors. In offering this type, the lecture marks or underlines or crosses out or comments on students' writing error without delivering the right form. Consequently, indirect corrective feedback may assist students in activating their learning autonomy because they are required to correct their error on their own.

In addition, information on problems associated with written corrective feedback on students' writing assignments was acquired through interviews. Some issues were discovered while examining the teachers' responses. The data is presented in the following table.

Table 3 English Teachers' Challenges when Providing Written Corrective Feedback at Junior and Senior High Schools

No	English Teachers' Challenges when Providing WCF	Junior High School English Teachers	Senior High School English Teachers
1.	Limited time	2 teachers	2 teachers
2.	Students' attitude	2 teachers	2 teachers
3.	Students' proficiency	-	2 teachers
4.	Students' handwriting	1 teacher	1 teacher

Based on the table above, it was found that there were four challenges that the teachers faced when giving written corrective feedback. They were time, students' attitude, students' proficiency, and students' handwriting. First, delivering written corrective feedback on students' writing assignment required time. It can also be time consuming. Based on the teachers' confessions from interviews, junior high school and senior high school English teachers felt they were constrained by the time when checking students' writing assignments. This was due to the busy teaching schedule that makes teachers unable to check all students' assignments. There were even teachers who are forced to bring student assignments home so that they can be checked. Therefore, time was the biggest challenge for teachers. It was consistent with Lee's conclusion (2003: 228), which found that for her research subject, time was the most commonly cited concern by teachers.

Second, students' attitude was the biggest challenge after time. The attitude of students who sometimes did not take learning seriously, did not pay attention to the teacher when explaining the lesson, and like to cheat on friends' assignments were things that often happen in class. This had an impact on the assignments they made because in the end they did not understand the lesson. So when the teacher gave feedback on the assignment, many students ignore it. They did not care about the feedback and did not even understand it at all. Similarly, Chandler (2003) discovered that some students do not read or understand the correction provided to them.

Third, a number of students demonstrated low proficiency. According to the findings of teacher interviews, many students seem to have low levels of competency. This results in students not knowing the basic knowledge of English which can eventually also have an impact on their writing assignments. So that if the teacher also gives feedback on their assignments, they also did not understand what the teacher corrects. It was consistent with Roza et. al (2016) who indicated that students were unable to notice errors, rectify them, and relate them to prior knowledge.

Finally, the last challenge was the students' handwriting was difficult to read. Two teachers said that students' handwriting was sometimes illegible. This often found by teachers when they wanted to check students' writing assignments. Students' handwriting that was difficult to read provides its own challenges for teachers. This made it difficult for teachers to identify students' writing errors. This was consistent with Roza et. al (2016) who noted that grammatical faults refer to inappropriate forms. If the "form" is unclear, teachers will find it difficult to read, interpret, and even make revisions.

CONCLUSION

Through examining students' writing assignment, it was found that there were only two kinds of written corrective feedback practiced by English teachers. They were direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. Among the two, direct corrective feedback was used the most by English teachers. Then, when providing written corrective feedback, English teachers used several techniques that made it possible to make feedback understood by the students. English teachers' techniques when providing written corrective feedback at junior high school included adding, deleting, substituting, circling, commenting, crossing out, and questioning. Then, English teachers' techniques when providing written corrective feedback at senior high school included adding, deleting, substituting, moving around, circling, underlining, crossing out, and questioning. Finally, through the interview, there were four challenges related to written corrective feedback such as limited time and high workloads, students' attitudes towards feedback, students' proficiency and some teachers argued that students' handwriting also affected the teachers' continuity in providing written feedback.

Here are a few suggestions for teachers, students, and the next researcher. First, teachers should be inventive in offering corrections so that students would study, accept, and apply them. Second, teachers need to expand their mastery about written correction, including its different types. As a result, they can determine which one is best for their students and practice different sorts of corrective feedback with them. Third, students should understand the significance of corrective feedback for them. They should be more proactive in confirming or asking their teachers if they are unfamiliar with the correction given to their assignment. Finally, for future researchers interested in error correction studies, they can do a study comparing written corrective feedback in diverse contexts, such as rural or metropolitan places, as well as schools with varying socio economics backgrounds. Furthermore, teacher gender differences and teaching experience can also be investigated to find out how these contexts affect the usefulness of written corrective feedback.

REFERENCES
Betha, N. A., Rosa, R. N., & Hamzah (2021). Exploring Lecturers' Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Research Proposal Writing. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 539, 173-178.* DOI: 10.2991/assehr.k.210325.032

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(2), 102-118.* DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Calderon, J. (2006). Methods of research and thesis writing (2nd Ed.). Mandaluyong City: National Bookstore.

Chandler, J. (2003). The Efficacy of Various Kind of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Students' Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 267-296*. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Ellis, R. (2008). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107*. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ferris, D. (2006). Does Error Feedback Help Student Writers? New Evidence on short and long term effects of written error correction in K. Hyland and F. Hyland (eds.). Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(3), 161–184*. DOI: 1 0.1016/s1060-3743(01)00039-x

Feuerherm, E. (2012). Written Feedback, Student Writing, and Institutional Policies: Implications for Novice Teacher Development. The CATESOL Journal, 23, (1).

Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed.) Completely Revised and Updated. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 Writing Teachers' Perspectives, Practices and Problem Regarding Error Feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8(3), 216-237*. DOI: 10.1016/j.asw.2003.08.002

Lewis, M. (2002). Giving Feedback in Language Classes. The Universitiy of Auckland: SEAMO Regional Language Centre.

Roza, P. R.; Saun, S.; & Fitrawati. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback Given by Teachers of MTSN Durian Tarung Padang on Students' Grammatical Errors. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 1(5), 80-88*. DOI: 10.24036/jelt.v5i1.7274

Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41(2), 255-283*. DOI: 10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x

Wirantaka, A. (2022). Effective Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Academic Writing. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra, 6(2), p. 387-399.*

Zhang, M. (2015). Briefly Review of E-Feedback. International Conference on Economics, Management, Law and Education (EMLE 2015). DOI: 10.2991/emle-15.2015.104