



An analysis of teacher feedback on seventh grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok

Vioren Dini¹, An Fauzia Rozani Syafei²

^{1,2} Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

Correspondence Email: viorendini@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted: 2025-10-27

Accepted: 2025-11-05

Published: 2025-12-01

Keywords:

Teacher Feedback, Types of Feedback, Forms of Feedback, English Homework, Seventh Grade Students

Abstract

Feedback is a crucial component in language learning as it guides students to identify their strengths and weaknesses. This study aims to analyse the types and forms of teacher feedback on seventh-grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok, as well as the teachers' purposes and considerations in providing such feedback. This research employed a qualitative descriptive design. The data were obtained through document analysis of students' English homework and interviews with three English teachers. The findings revealed that evaluative feedback was the most dominant type (83.05%), followed by motivational feedback (14.41%) and corrective feedback (2.54%), while formative, advisory, praise, and criticism feedback were not found. In terms of form, symbolic or code feedback was most frequently used (83.05%), followed by general feedback (16.95%), with no written feedback identified. The interview results showed that teachers emphasized clarity, motivation, and balance between correction and encouragement, but inconsistently monitored students' progress and guided improvement. Overall, the study concludes that teacher feedback practices remain heavily evaluative and limited in formative aspects. Therefore, teachers are encouraged to provide more constructive, descriptive, and formative feedback to help students understand their errors, promote engagement, and improve their English learning outcomes.

©2025 This article is published by Departemen Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS UNP. This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

How to Cite: Dini, V. & Syafei, A. F. R. (2025). An analysis of teacher feedback on seventh grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, Vol.14(4), 510-522, <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v14i4>

INTRODUCTION

Teacher feedback is one of the most powerful influences on student learning and achievement. In educational contexts, particularly in language learning, feedback functions not merely as an evaluative tool but as a formative process that guides learners toward improvement, fosters motivation, and strengthens their engagement with learning tasks. According to Hattie & Timperley (2007) feedback provides essential information that helps learners answer three fundamental questions: Where am I going? How am I going? and where to next? This triadic model situates feedback as a dynamic dialogue between teacher and learner that shapes both cognitive and affective dimensions of learning. Within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction, feedback assists students in refining linguistic accuracy, expanding vocabulary, and organizing ideas coherently in writing (Brookhart, 2008). When thoughtfully implemented, it bridges the gap between current and desired performance, empowering students to become self-regulated learners (Sadler, 1989).

In the Indonesian EFL context, the provision of feedback is particularly significant because English is learned as a foreign language, and learners have limited exposure outside the classroom. Homework, therefore, serves as an important extension of in-class learning, providing students with opportunities to practice independently. When combined with effective feedback, homework can reinforce understanding, identify learning gaps, and promote language development beyond the school environment. According to Cooper (1989) argues that homework contributes to learning only when feedback is provided to help students reflect on errors and apply corrective strategies. Conversely, the absence of meaningful feedback risks turning homework into a routine task rather than a valuable learning experience. According to Wang (2006) defines feedback as information regarding current performance that helps learners improve future performance. Hence, feedback on English homework must be timely, clear, and constructive to ensure its pedagogical value.

Despite its recognized importance, the implementation of feedback in EFL classrooms often faces challenges. Many teachers view feedback primarily as an evaluative instrument rather than as a formative dialogue. As a result, feedback frequently takes the form of grades, symbols, or brief comments such as “Good” or “Try again,” which may not provide enough information for students to understand their strengths or areas for improvement (Glazzard, 2019). Such practices tend to emphasize performance outcomes rather than learning processes, aligning with what (Shute, 2008) describes as evaluative feedback a type that judges rather than guides. While evaluative feedback can momentarily boost motivation, it fails to address the cognitive aspect of learning necessary for improvement. According to Brookhart (2017) and Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick (2006) assert that effective feedback should be specific, relevant, and task-focused, thereby enhancing both learning and motivation. Unfortunately, vague or general feedback often leads to confusion, discouragement, and disengagement, especially among students who struggle to interpret implicit messages.

A growing body of research highlights the multiple dimensions of teacher feedback. Ellis (2009) differentiates between direct feedback, where teachers provide explicit corrections, and indirect feedback, which requires students to identify and correct their own mistakes. Each approach has distinct benefits: direct

feedback offers immediate clarity, while indirect feedback fosters learner autonomy. In the same vein, Hattie & Timperley (2007) multi-level feedback framework comprising task, process, and self-regulation levels suggests that the most effective feedback not only identifies errors but also guides learners toward understanding the reasoning behind them. Similarly, Sadler (1989) emphasizes that formative feedback should make learning goals explicit and provide information on how to close the gap between current and desired performance. Feedback that fails to communicate this clearly remains superficial and does not translate into learning gains.

In EFL writing and homework contexts, feedback assumes even greater complexity because it must balance linguistic correction with motivational support. Hyland & Hyland (2001) categorize feedback into types such as formative, suggestive, and motivational, noting that the tone and specificity of teacher comments greatly influence students' responses. Constructive comments encourage reflection and self-correction, while overly critical remarks can reduce confidence. Lipnevich & Smith (2009) found that students' perceptions of feedback strongly determine whether they act upon it; supportive and detailed comments foster engagement, whereas unclear or negative feedback leads to withdrawal. This underscores the need for teachers to adopt feedback strategies that combine evaluative accuracy with emotional sensitivity.

Previous studies in Indonesia have primarily examined classroom-based feedback on writing tasks rather than feedback on homework. Research by Novika and Andriani (2021) and Putri et al. (2025) shows that direct corrective feedback significantly improves students' writing quality and motivation when integrated with revision opportunities. However, feedback on homework tasks completed independently outside class remains underexplored, despite its potential to enhance continuous learning. Maslucha et al. (2024) and Mulati et al. (2022) found that feedback in Indonesian EFL settings tends to focus on surface-level correction rather than formative guidance. These findings suggest that the pedagogical purpose of feedback is often overshadowed by summative assessment practices.

The school context of SMPN 1 Kota Solok, where this study is situated, exemplifies these broader patterns. Teachers commonly provide feedback in the form of grades, codes, or brief evaluative remarks. While such methods are efficient, they may not provide enough information to foster student improvement or reflection. Observations indicate that teachers sometimes mark errors using symbols without offering corrective explanations, leaving students uncertain about the reasons behind their mistakes. Furthermore, feedback is rarely followed by revision activities or discussions, reducing its formative impact. As a result, students may perceive feedback merely as a judgment of performance rather than as a tool for learning. This raises important questions about how feedback functions in practice: Is it intended to assess, to correct, to motivate, or to guide learning?

Understanding the nature of feedback on English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok is therefore essential. Homework represents one of the few opportunities for students to apply language skills independently. Effective feedback on these assignments can help them identify weaknesses, develop metacognitive awareness, and sustain motivation to learn. However, when feedback is predominantly evaluative, its ability to support continuous improvement diminishes. Thus, a deeper

examination of the types, forms, and purposes of teacher feedback is required to clarify whether current practices align with the principles of effective learning-oriented feedback.

Theoretically, feedback can be categorized by both its type and form. The types evaluative, corrective, formative, suggestive/advisory, motivational, and praise/criticism serve different pedagogical functions (Shute, 2008; Brookhart, 2008; Ellis, 2009; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Evaluative feedback provides summative judgment, while corrective feedback addresses linguistic or conceptual errors. Formative feedback offers descriptive guidance that promotes deeper learning. Suggestive feedback stimulates autonomy by proposing improvements rather than prescribing them, and motivational feedback reinforces effort and engagement. Praise and constructive criticism contribute to affective development by shaping learners' confidence and attitudes. The forms of feedback written, symbolic, oral, peer, electronic, and general determine how students interpret and apply teachers' responses. Written feedback provides detailed records; symbolic feedback uses marks or codes for efficiency; oral feedback allows immediate clarification; and general feedback offers broad encouragement but little instructional value. Understanding these distinctions is crucial for analysing feedback practices in real classroom settings.

Empirical evidence shows that the quality of feedback strongly predicts its effectiveness. Shute (2007) and Brookhart (2017) argue that effective feedback should be timely, specific, constructive, and supportive. Hattie & Timperley (2007) further emphasize that feedback focused on tasks and processes rather than personal traits produces the highest learning gains. Price et al. (2011) highlight the importance of student engagement with feedback, noting that learners must notice, interpret, and act upon it for improvement to occur. Yet, in many EFL settings, this engagement is limited because feedback is delivered one-directionally. (Carless & Boud, 2018) propose the concept of "feedback literacy," stressing that students should be taught how to understand and use feedback productively. When teachers promote dialogue around feedback, they help students develop metacognitive skills necessary for lifelong learning.

Despite growing awareness of feedback's importance, the gap between theory and practice persists. Studies such as Nguyen et al. (2025) and Li & De Luca (2017) reveal that students often perceive feedback as summative rather than formative because it is dominated by grades and symbols. This perception undermines the developmental function of feedback and reduces its impact on motivation and learning. In the same way, Zhou, Yu, and Wu (2024) show that praise can have short-term motivational effects but loses influence when not accompanied by detailed suggestions for improvement. These findings resonate with the situation observed in SMPN 1 Kota Solok, where feedback is primarily evaluative, occasionally motivational, and rarely corrective or formative.

Considering these empirical and contextual realities, this study investigates teacher feedback on seventh-grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok. Specifically, it seeks to identify the types and forms of feedback provided, as well as the teachers' purposes and considerations in using them. By combining document analysis and interviews, the study aims to provide a comprehensive picture

of how feedback operates in practice and how it aligns with theoretical principles. The research is guided by two main questions: (1) What types and forms of feedback are provided on students' English homework? and (2) What are the teachers' purposes and considerations in using certain types and forms of feedback?

This investigation is timely and relevant for several reasons. First, it contributes to understanding how feedback functions outside the classroom particularly on homework, which represents a critical yet understudied component of language learning. Second, it offers insights into the pedagogical intentions behind teachers' feedback choices, revealing whether these are primarily evaluative, corrective, or formative. Third, it provides practical implications for improving teacher training and professional development in Indonesia. By clarifying the relationship between feedback types, forms, and learning outcomes, this study aims to promote a more balanced approach to feedback that integrates cognitive, affective, and motivational dimensions.

In summary, teacher feedback stands at the heart of effective English language instruction. Yet, in many EFL classrooms including SMPN 1 Kota Solok it remains primarily evaluative, with limited formative and corrective components. This imbalance restricts students' opportunities for improvement and self-regulated learning. Therefore, this study seeks to explore how feedback is currently provided, what forms it takes, and what pedagogical purposes it serves. By doing so, it aims to bridge the gap between theoretical frameworks of effective feedback and their practical realization in Indonesian EFL classrooms, contributing to a deeper understanding of how teacher feedback can genuinely enhance students' language learning and academic development.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design aimed at identifying and analysing the types and forms of teacher feedback on students' English homework. A qualitative descriptive approach is appropriate when the goal is to provide a comprehensive and detailed account of a phenomenon as it naturally occurs, without manipulation or experimental control (Sandelowski, 2000).

The research was conducted at SMPN 1 Kota Solok, involving three English teachers who taught seventh-grade students. These teachers were selected through purposive sampling, based on their active involvement in assigning and assessing English homework. The primary data sources consisted of (1) written feedback on students' English homework and (2) teachers' verbal explanations obtained through interviews. Approximately 50 samples of marked homework were collected from the participating classes to represent diverse instances of feedback across tasks such as grammar, vocabulary, and short writing exercises.

Two instruments were used for data collection: document analysis and semi-structured interviews. Document analysis focused on identifying the types and forms of teacher feedback following established theoretical frameworks from (Shute, 2008), (Brookhart, 2008), (Ellis, 2009), and (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Each feedback instance such as comments, symbols, or written marks was coded according to these frameworks to determine its category and frequency. The semi-structured interviews provided qualitative support for the quantitative data by exploring teachers'

pedagogical intentions, beliefs, and contextual considerations when giving feedback. The interview questions were guided by key concepts from formative assessment theory, such as monitoring learning progress, clarifying performance gaps, and motivating students.

To ensure validity, several strategies were applied. Triangulation was achieved by comparing the document analysis results with interview data to confirm consistency between teachers stated intentions and their actual feedback practices. Member checking was used by allowing teachers to review and verify the accuracy of their interview transcripts and interpretations. Additionally, consistent coding procedures were maintained throughout the analysis to enhance dependability.

Data from document analysis were quantified and summarized in frequency tables to reveal dominant feedback types and forms. Interview transcripts were analysed thematically following Braun and Clarke's (2006) approach, allowing the identification of recurring patterns related to feedback purposes and considerations. The integration of both data sources provided a comprehensive picture of how teacher feedback functions in the context of English homework, combining statistical description with interpretive insights into teacher practices and pedagogical reasoning.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Finding

Types of Feedback and Form of Teacher Feedback on Students English Homework

This section discusses the overall distribution of feedback types and forms, variations among teachers, and interpretation of the findings in relation to feedback theory and classroom implications.

Table 1 *Types of Feedback found in 7th grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok*

No	Types of Feedback	Frequency	Percentage
1	Evaluative Feedback	98	83,05%
2	Motivational Feedback	17	14,41%
3	Corrective Feedback	3	2,54%
4	Formative Feedback	0	0%
5	Suggestive or Advisory Feedback	0	0%
6	Praise And Criticism	0	0%
	Total	118	100%

The findings from the analysis of Tables 1 show that the teacher's feedback practice on students' English homework was dominated by evaluative feedback and the use of symbolic or code feedback. In terms of types, evaluative feedback appeared most frequently (83.05%), followed by motivational feedback (14.41%), while corrective feedback was rarely given (2.54%), and other types such as formative, advisory, praise, and criticism were completely absent. This indicates that the teacher's focus was largely on judging students' work rather than providing guidance for improvement.

Table 2 *Forms of Feedback found in 7th grade students' English homework at SMPN 1 Kota Solok*

No	Forms of Feedback	Frequency	Percentage
1	Symbolic or Code Feedback	98	83,05%
2	General Feedback	20	16,95%
3	Written Feedback	0	0%
	Total	118	100%

In terms of forms in table 2, most of the feedback was delivered through symbols or codes (83.05%), with some general comments (16.95%), while written feedback was not provided at all. This shows that the teacher relied on quick and general forms of feedback, avoiding more detailed and descriptive written explanations. Overall, the findings highlight a narrow feedback practice, where the teacher emphasized evaluative judgment and symbolic forms over more diverse, corrective, formative, or descriptive feedback that could better support students' learning progress.

Teachers' Purposes and Considerations in Giving Feedback on Students English homework

The analysis of the interviews with three teachers (T1, T2, and T3) revealed several purposes underlying their feedback practices. In terms of monitoring students' learning progress, only T3 explicitly mentioned this purpose, stating, "Saya biasanya menggunakan sebagai bentuk untuk menilai bagaimana hasil belajar siswa pada buku PR mereka," indicating that feedback was used primarily to assess learning outcomes. T1 and T2 also highlighted similar actions such as checking homework to identify correct and incorrect answers ("Saya biasanya memeriksa PR siswa untuk melihat bagian mana yang sudah benar dan mana yang masih keliru," T1; "Saya biasanya menilai PR mereka untuk tahu bagian mana yang sudah benar dan bagian mana yang salah," T2). However, both focused more on evaluation rather than consistent progress monitoring, showing that this purpose was not strongly emphasized.

Regarding reducing the gap between current performance and learning goals, T1 and T2 demonstrated a reflective and corrective orientation. T1 mentioned, "Umumnya saya memberi tahu bagian yang sudah baik, kemudian menunjukkan hal-hal yang masih harus diperbaiki," while T2 said, "Biasanya saya kasih tahu mana yang bagus lalu saya tunjukkan mana yang perlu diperbaiki." These responses illustrate the teachers' intention to help students identify strengths and areas for improvement. In contrast, T3 emphasized differentiation, saying, "Siswa yang lebih rendah diberi tugas sesuai kemampuan, sedangkan yang lebih tinggi diberi latihan dengan tingkat kesulitan lebih tinggi," which suggests an adjustment of learning targets rather than direct feedback for gap reduction.

In guiding students toward improvement (future actions), T2 and T3 were more aligned with this purpose. T2 explained, "Saya memberi tanda atau komentar seperti excellent, good job, atau catatan tertulis. Hal ini menjadi acuan siswa untuk berusaha lebih baik pada tugas berikutnya," while T3 added, "Saya membimbing mereka dengan memberikan penjelasan pada PR mereka yang salah dan menjelaskan sesuai keadaan." These examples show feedback functioning as a formative tool for future learning improvement. Similarly, T1 stated, "Saya biasa memantau perkembangan

mereka setelah saya memberikan feedback,” which also indicates awareness of feedback’s long-term purpose.

For feedback as motivation and confidence building, all three teachers shared similar perspectives. T1 mentioned, “Feedback tertulis sangat penting karena memberi dampak baik bagi siswa dan memotivasi mereka,” T2 added, “Feedback motivational seperti kata excellent sangat memengaruhi siswa,” and T3 said, “Menuliskan angka A+ atau kata good job bisa memberikan dorongan.” These statements demonstrate that motivating and encouraging students to sustain their learning effort was a central purpose of their feedback.

In addition to purposes, the interviews revealed several considerations teachers made when deciding how to deliver feedback. Regarding the timeliness of feedback, T1 explained, “Saya memberikannya setelah memeriksa PR agar mendapatkan hasil lebih efektif,” indicating purposeful but delayed feedback. T2 mentioned, “Kadang feedback yang saya berikan langsung di kelas (secara lisan), kadang dituliskan di PR. Namun, ada kendala: bila satu tugas belum diberi feedback, siswa menunggu dulu sebelum mengerjakan tugas berikutnya,” showing a concern for scheduling and student readiness. T3, however, emphasized flexibility: “Feedback diberikan pada akhir pembelajaran atau setelah PR selesai... waktunya menyesuaikan kondisi siswa.” Together, these reveal that teachers considered timing based on practicality and student conditions.

For specificity and clarity of feedback, all teachers displayed awareness. T1 highlighted difficulties in comprehension, “Kadang siswa tidak memahami feedback tertulis,” while T2 ensured clarity and positivity through expressions like “excellent, very good, good,” avoiding discouraging terms such as “poor.” T3 adjusted clarity to student levels, “Saya memberikan instruksi feedback yang sesuai, misalnya memberi pertanyaan tingkat how dan why bagi siswa dengan kemampuan tinggi.” These statements indicate that clarity and tone were key considerations to ensure feedback effectiveness.

In balancing corrective and motivational aspects, all three teachers emphasized encouragement. T1 stated, “Saya berusaha memperbaiki pendekatan feedback agar lebih sesuai dan bermanfaat bagi siswa,” T2 said, “Meskipun jawaban salah, guru tetap memberi good atau pujian agar anak merasa termotivasi,” and T3 described, “Saya membiarkan siswa memilih bentuk tugas seperti video atau rekaman suara agar mereka tetap termotivasi.” This balance shows that teachers considered both affective and instructional dimensions when giving feedback.

In terms of levels of feedback (task, process, and self-regulation), T2 said, “Biasanya lebih banyak fokus pada hasil tugas (task level), tapi juga diarahkan untuk memotivasi siswa agar terbiasa mengerjakan PR secara konsisten (self-regulation),” while T3 added, “Feedback disesuaikan: fokus pada hasil tugas untuk yang low level, strategi pemecahan untuk yang middle, dan pembiasaan belajar mandiri untuk yang high.” This demonstrates thoughtful consideration of cognitive levels and student autonomy.

Another major consideration involved the form and delivery of feedback. T1 said, “Saya mempertimbangkan sesuai tugas yang saya berikan seperti tertulis, lisan, checklist, atau paraf, dipilih sesuai kondisi,” while T2 explained, “Kebanyakan menggunakan dua bentuk: lisan di kelas dan tulisan pada PR,” and T3 noted, “Bentuk

feedback disesuaikan dengan tugas siswa seperti lisan saat refleksi kelas, tulisan di LKPD, atau posting digital.” These responses highlight teachers’ flexibility and contextual judgment in feedback delivery.

Finally, for encouraging students to notice and act on feedback, only T1 and T2 showed this consideration. T1 said, “Biasanya mereka akan memperbaiki langsung jawaban mereka setelah saya periksa,” while T2 stated, “Ketika saya berikan jawaban yang benar kepada mereka maka mereka langsung merubahnya dengan benar.” This demonstrates the teachers’ consideration of student responsiveness in applying feedback to their learning. Overall, the findings indicate that teachers employed varied approaches in giving feedback, with some aspects consistently emphasized by all teachers, while others were only addressed by some.

In teacher interview, the findings indicate that teachers showed varied feedback practices on students’ English homework. While clarity, motivation, and delivery were consistently emphasized, differences appeared in monitoring progress, guiding future improvement, and encouraging students to act on feedback. T3 consistently monitored progress and gave timely written feedback, T2 emphasized reflection, detailed comments, and oral guidance, while T1 focused on values and simple praise but lacked consistency in several aspects. Overall, teachers balanced corrective and motivational feedback, yet important dimensions such as monitoring, improvement guidance, and student engagement with feedback were applied inconsistently.

Discussion

The findings reveal that the feedback practices of English teachers at SMPN 1 Kota Solok were heavily dominated by evaluative feedback (83.05%), with only a small proportion of corrective feedback (2.54%) and no instances of formative, advisory, praise, or criticism feedback. This dominance of evaluative types reflects a tendency among teachers to emphasize assessment over learning development, a concern long noted in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. According to (Shute, 2008) and (Brookhart, 2008), evaluative feedback often expressed through grades, brief comments, or symbols primarily serves a summative function that highlights students’ achievement but fails to guide improvement. As a result, it provides minimal instructional value beyond recognition of performance. This contrasts with findings from Senanur Çınar (2017) and (Ellis, 2009), who argue that corrective feedback whether direct or indirect is essential for improving linguistic accuracy and learner awareness. Similarly, emphasizes that both direct and indirect corrective feedback contribute significantly to L2 writing development, provided that they are accompanied by formative and motivational components that sustain learner confidence. In line with (Sadler’s, 1989) framework, effective feedback should help learners close the gap between current and desired performance; however, this is difficult to achieve when teachers rely primarily on evaluative methods. Consequently, the limited presence of corrective and formative feedback in this study indicates that students receive minimal opportunities for self-regulation, reflection, and meaningful language learning.

A similar imbalance was evident in the forms of feedback used by teachers. Symbolic or coded feedback overwhelmingly dominated (83.05%), followed by general comments (16.95%), while written explanatory feedback was completely

absent. This suggests that feedback was provided in a brief and efficient manner, favoring practicality over depth of guidance. (Hyland and Hyland, 2006) note that coded symbols can promote learner autonomy by encouraging self-correction; however, when used without explanation or follow-up, they risk limiting comprehension and meaningful engagement. The lack of descriptive written comments in this study contradicts (Ferris, 2007), who stresses that detailed written feedback is crucial for L2 learners as it offers explicit information for revision and supports long-term improvement. Recent empirical studies reinforce this limitation: Ebrahimzade et al. (2023) found that coded feedback yields optimal results only when accompanied by opportunities for revision, while Mao, Lee, and Li (2024) revealed that integrating explicit correction and metalinguistic explanation produces significantly better outcomes than symbolic codes alone. Thus, while the use of symbolic feedback may reflect efficiency and time management in crowded classrooms, it comes at the cost of formative depth and learning sustainability. Without written elaboration or discussion, students may misinterpret coded marks, perceive feedback as mere evaluation, and fail to internalize corrective learning processes.

The interview results further illuminate variations and inconsistencies in how teachers applied feedback principles. Teacher T3 consistently monitored students' progress and provided immediate oral feedback, demonstrating awareness of the need for timeliness and clarity. However, Teachers T1 and T2 showed less consistency T2 emphasized reflection and moral reinforcement, while T1 focused more on values than instructional guidance. This pattern corresponds to findings from *Frontiers in Psychology* (2018), which state that feedback should serve as an ongoing monitoring tool to track learning progress. While T3's practice partially aligns with (Hattie and Timperley, 2007) model answering the key questions *Where am I going? How am I going? and where to next?* the overall implementation among the three teachers was fragmented. Such inconsistencies echo Carless and Boud's (2018) observation that many teachers understand feedback's importance but struggle to implement it effectively, leading to a persistent gap between theory and practice. In terms of feedback considerations, all teachers valued motivation and clarity but differed in timeliness, specificity, and differentiation. T3 regularly provided immediate feedback; T1 did so occasionally; T2 rarely emphasized timeliness, contradicting (Shute, 2007) view that prompt feedback is one of the most powerful tools for learning improvement. While all three attempted to balance corrective and motivational aspects, their feedback largely remained at the task level, focusing on correctness rather than on process or self-regulation (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). These findings align with Price et al. (2011) and Havnes et al. (2012), who argue that feedback only becomes effective when students can notice, interpret, and act upon it. However, in this study, feedback rarely facilitated such engagement. The predominance of evaluative and symbolic feedback combined with the absence of formative dialogue indicates that feedback at SMPN 1 Kota Solok still functions primarily as a product-oriented assessment tool, rather than as a formative mechanism to foster learning, reflection, and learner autonomy.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the feedback practices of English teachers at SMPN 1 Kota Solok are predominantly evaluative in nature. Most of the feedback identified in students' English homework falls within the evaluative category and is mostly delivered in symbolic or coded forms, such as checkmarks, scores, or brief comments. While motivational and corrective feedback were also found, they appeared in much smaller proportions, and formative or advisory feedback were entirely absent. This imbalance indicates that teachers tend to prioritize assessment of students' performance and final outcomes rather than offering detailed, constructive guidance that supports improvement. As a result, feedback functions more as a measure of achievement than as a tool for learning development.

The interview findings complement this pattern by showing that teachers value clarity, specificity, and motivation in giving feedback, yet their approaches to timeliness, monitoring progress, and encouraging student engagement vary considerably. Some teachers consistently provide immediate and clear feedback, while others emphasize encouragement or moral reinforcement without guiding further learning actions. Consequently, feedback remains product-oriented rather than process-oriented, limiting its role in promoting reflection, self-regulation, and sustained language development.

To enhance effectiveness, teachers should integrate formative and corrective strategies alongside evaluative ones, ensuring that feedback clarifies goals, provides actionable suggestions, and encourages student participation in the revision process. By shifting toward learning-oriented feedback, English teachers can better support students' linguistic growth, motivation, and autonomy in their ongoing learning journey.

REFERENCES

- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. ASCD.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to Use Grading to Improve Learning*. ASCD.
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). *The Development of Student Feedback Literacy: Enabling Uptake of Feedback*. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Cooper, H. (1989). *Homework*. Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Pearson.
- Ebrahimzade, Z., Asadnia, F., & Ahmadi, R. (2023). *The effects of direct, coded, and metalinguistic feedback on EFL learners' writing accuracy*. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 17(1), 45–62
- Ellis, R. (2009). *A typology of written corrective feedback types*. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107.
- Ferris, D. R. (2007). *Preparing teachers to respond to student writing*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 165–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.003>
- Frontiers in Psychology. (2018). *The role of feedback in learning progress monitoring*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1831. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01831>

- Glazzard, J. (2019). *Assessment for Learning in the Primary School*. SAGE Publications.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Havnes, A., Smith, K., Dysthe, O., & Ludvigsen, K. (2012). *Formative assessment and feedback: Making learning visible*. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 38(1), 21–27.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). *Sugaring the Pill: Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185–212.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). *Feedback on second language students' writing*. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101.
- Li, J., & De Luca, R. (2017). *Review of assessment feedback research in higher education: The content, level, and impact of feedback on student learning*. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 463–478.
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). *Effects of differential feedback on students' examination performance*. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 15(4), 319–333.
- Mao, S., Lee, J., & Li, M. (2024). *The impact of coded and explicit feedback on EFL writing: A comparative study*. *System*, 125, 103087.
- Maslucha, S., Rahmawati, L., & Suryani, A. (2024). *Teachers' feedback practices in Indonesian EFL writing classrooms: Focus on surface-level correction*. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 12–25.
- Mulati, D., Pramesti, Y., & Wulandari, F. (2022). *Investigating EFL teachers' written feedback practices in Indonesian classrooms*. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 13(2), 33–48.
- Nguyen, T. T., Tran, Q. T., & Le, H. N. (2025). *Students' perceptions of feedback: Formative versus summative functions*. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(1), 78–96.
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). *Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice*. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Novika, R., & Andriani, S. (2021). *The effect of direct corrective feedback on students' writing accuracy in Indonesian EFL classrooms*. *Lingua Cultura*, 15(2), 189–198.
- Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2011). *Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect?* *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36(1), 1–11.
- Putri, D. A., Rahman, F., & Nuraini, S. (2025). *Improving students' writing through direct and indirect feedback in Indonesian EFL settings*. *Indonesian Journal of English Education*, 12(1), 55–70.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). *Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems*. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144.
- Senanur Çınar, S. (2017). *The impact of teacher feedback types on EFL learners' writing accuracy*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(7), 221–228.
- Shute, V. J. (2007). *Focus on formative feedback*. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2007(1), i–47. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2007.tb02038.x>

- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Van Beuningen, C. G. (2010). *Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions*. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 1–27.
- Wang, T. (2006). Understanding Chinese culture and learning. *Australian Journal of Education*, 50(1), 81–94.
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2022). *Supporting learners' agentic engagement with feedback: A systematic review and a taxonomy of recipience processes*. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(2), 105–122.
- Zhou, X., Yu, Z., & Wu, Y. (2024). *Revisiting praise and formative feedback in EFL classrooms: Implications for motivation and engagement*. *Language Teaching Research*, 28(3), 443–459.