

English Education Journal

Volume 11, Number 1, September 2022, pp. 58-71

ISSN: 2302-6413 (Print) 2716-3687 (Online)

The Implementation of Direct Corrective Feedback to Teach Writing: A Case Study of English Education Students

Ima Yosi Antari, Muhammad Asrori, Dewi Cahyaningrum

English Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta
e-mail: yosi.antari@gmail.com

Received: 7 August 2022

Reviewed: 16 August 2022

Accepted: 26 August 2022

Abstract

The objectives of this study are to figure out how the lecturer implements direct corrective feedback to teach writing in paragraph development class, and to discover the problem that the lecturer faces during the implementation of direct corrective feedback. This research applied qualitative research and used a case study method as research design, which involved 1 lecturer and 21 EFL university students. The data is collected from classroom observation, online questionnaire, online interview, and documents. To analyze the data, the researcher used a data analysis technique proposed by Miles and Huberman. The steps were data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The finding of the research shows that the lecturer combined the use of direct and indirect corrective feedback to teach writing through oral and written feedback. The feedback given by putting the symbols, codes, or comments right above or next to the errors which are underlined or circled. The lecturer also provides further information related to the errors made by the students. Furthermore, the difficulty faced by the lecturer was related to time management in which the lecturer applied peer feedback to overcome the problem.

Keyword: case study, direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, peer feedback, teaching writing.

INTRODUCTION

Writing skill is one of the four skills that plays crucial roles in human life. It has a power of permanent record and is a form of expression in which those are means of communication. As stated by Graham and Perin (2007: 3), writing skill is a determinant of academic success and becomes a basic requirement to participate in social life and the global economy. In the academic field, writing can be used to demonstrate knowledge. Students used to write their ideas in a paper in the form of an essay, journal or even in a diary. The need for mastering writing skills is increasing both in technology and

globalization era. Besides, there are many student competitions that demand the students to write an essay in English written text. English is very important and has many functions for students especially in daily communication and academic purposes.

However, writing is one of the English language skills that is believed by most learners as a difficult skill to acquire. According to Richard and Renandya (2002), writing is regarded as the most difficult skill for English language learners to master. It is supported by Ganapathy, et al (2020) on his study, it revealing that many students struggle more with writing than other language skills. The challenge is not only in coming up with ideas, but also in turning them into a prose that is readable. Bashyal (2009) supported it by assuming that writing involves mastering language, grammar, and text arrangement, a difficult undertaking requiring specialized knowledge. Writing is not only about mastering how to use language but also everything about what we are going to arrange and write. Referring to the complexity of writing, it seems common that many learners, especially foreign language learners, have the same thought that writing is the most difficult skill to master.

The problem of students' writing deficiencies or students who lack achievement in writing can be attributed to many factors: 1) Students have a negative attitude toward writing, which is compounded by previous writing failure experiences. In other words, they don't pay attention to the mistakes they have made and the way to fix it. (Cumberworth & Hunt, 1998; Buhrke and others, 2002); 2) Students are unmotivated to pay attention to the process of writing and lack a cognitive awareness of the purpose for the writing process. Whereas, by knowing the process and the purpose of writing, students will be able to connect each sentence one to another. (Cumberworth & Hunt, 1998); 3) The difficulties faced by the students are due to the following factors: having problem on spelling and handwriting, having poor mechanical skills, or having lack of confidence to expose their feelings (Pierce and others, 1997); 4) the students got inadequate teacher training, ineffective past practices, and lack of immediate and positive feedback (Adams and others, 1996); and 5) Some teachers tend to believe that writing can be accomplished in a silent way, so that the students are having no interactive environment (Accomando and others, 1996). Having some interactions with the students towards their writing is important. Without it, both the students and the teacher will have some difficulties to analyze the errors in writing, the difficulties that the students face and how to solve it.

Regarding the problems faced by the students, an appropriate strategy of teaching writing is un-doubtfully important. Giving feedback to the students is the appropriate one. Feedback is one of the methods for reducing the errors that students commonly make in their writing before submitting their draft to the teacher (Ur, 1996). It is supported by Hyland and Hyland (2006), who suggested that giving feedback and revisions during the writing process is more beneficial than at the final process. Providing feedback in the process of writing is crucial to enhance students' writing quality (Brown, 2001). Walking through the process of writing becomes one of effective ways to teach or correct writing. The teacher can help students to focus on the process of creating text through the various stages of generating ideas, drafting, revising and editing. Since the students were not used to writing in English in their daily life, they did not notice the errors in their writing unless the teacher gave them feedback. Giving feedback on students' writing is just as important as revising and editing during the writing process. The feedback provided is a source of information about the students' writing strengths and weaknesses that is useful for the students' writing improvement. Feedback holds an essential role in developing writing

proficiency among second language learners (Magno & Amarles, 2011). Teacher's feedback on students' writing will help students to identify the mistakes they have made and know how to fix it.

There are several ways for providing feedback. Direct feedback is one of the ways. Ferris and Robbert in Ellis (2008) suggested that direct feedback be appropriate for a low proficiency level of a student writer. In implementing direct feedback, the teacher provides the right form of the errors made by the students so that they know what needs to be corrected. Ellis (2009) added that teachers choose direct feedback as a way to improve students' writing. Direct feedback shows the student what needs to be fixed or revised. It is more specific than facilitative feedback, which gives suggestions and comments to assist students in revising and conceptualizing themselves. This type of feedback can serve as information that is possibly beneficial for correcting inappropriate task strategies, procedural errors, or misconceptions (Narciss & Huth, 2004). In directive feedback, the teachers provide the correct form of the students' errors so the students can change the certain errors to the correct one. Furthermore, this feedback can be a powerful motivator when delivered in an appropriate way so that students are encouraged to avoid the same errors and mistakes.

Despite the fact that some researchers are conducting corrective feedback research, there is still a limited number of those investigating corrective feedback in terms of the online learning environment, which is a new term since the global pandemic. In this kind of learning environment, producing a text becomes a great challenge due to the condition where the students and the teacher do not share time and physical space. Moreover, there is a significant difference in the technique of giving feedback using Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) when it is done online compared to being done as usual. Therefore, the researcher is interested in conducting a study that is focused on exploring how teachers implement online corrective feedback on how students use feedback they received and its effect on their quality of text during writing activities performance.

The researcher conducted preliminary research to find out the students' difficulties in producing good writing especially on the level of undergraduate students of English education. The freshman year was chosen as participation in this study. As they are still in the second semester, it is the most likely time to establish their writing's character. Based on the preliminary research, difficulties in writing happen as they learn to produce some texts. Half of the students who are still in the second semester have problems producing paragraphs due to lack of vocabularies, difficulties to find a suitable topic for a certain text, lack of ideas, and grammatical errors such as spelling, fragment, punctuation and organization. Moreover, they do not acknowledge the mistakes when writing the paragraphs and do not know how to correct them.

To solve the problems above, the teacher implemented direct corrective feedback which is based on the theories that have been mentioned before showing that direct corrective feedback is effective to improve students' writing ability. Feedback is the grammatical features. It is convenient to be implemented for low level proficiency students because this technique provides the correct forms of the errors in the students' writing. In this writing class, the lecturer applied direct corrective feedback to teach

writing. The students were given direct corrective feedback where they are having the lecture to read and directly provide feedback on what students have written. In this technique, teachers will read and give comments, corrections, and also suggestions on what students have written.

Considering the fact above and knowing the importance of writing skill, the writer is interested to conduct a case study research in a fully online teaching environment during the sudden transition to online teaching due to the Covid-19 pandemic entitled "The Implementation of Direct Corrective Feedback to Teach Writing: A Case Study of English's Students".

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing

Definition of Writing

According to Browne (1999) stated that writing is a means of communication that can be used to establish and maintain contact with others, transmit information, express thoughts, feelings, and reactions, entertain, and persuade. In line with this, Troyka (1987:3) in Rahardian (2003:11) said that writing is a way of delivering a message to readers to share information, persuade, and entertain.

According to Harmer (2001), writing has unquestionably evolved into a tool that enables people to interact with one another swiftly and simply. Writing must be clear in order to make it easy for the readers to understand it because it is used to convey meaning or purpose. It requires sophisticated reasoning that must be combined with various writing conventions. According to Richard and Renandya (2002), writing is regarded as the most difficult skill for English language learners to master. The challenge is not only in coming up with ideas, but also in turning them into a prose that is readable. Bashyal (2009) supported it by assuming that writing involves mastering language, grammar, and text arrangement, a difficult undertaking requiring specialized knowledge.

In conclusion, writing is a means to share ideas, thoughts and even to express feelings in the form of text which has several purposes. It is considered as the most difficult skill to master and one of the most important skills for human's life.

Aspects of Writing

Jacobs, as cited in Weigle (2002: 114) mentioned that there are five aspects of writing, those are: 1) content refers to how to generate ideas and provide supporting detail. 2) Organization, how to express ideas effectively, clearly and help the ideas to be both cohesive and coherent. Cohesiveness deals with how each sentence sticks together based on grammatical rule or lexical relationship while coherence is when one sentence is related to another that makes a clear meaning. 3) Vocabulary, how to choose effective and correct words or idioms. 4) Language use refers to how to use correct grammar. 5) Mechanics mean the use of correct English writing.

Through those explanations above, it can be seen that there are many aspects of writing. The researcher comes to the conclusion that aspects of writing are content,

organization, vocabulary, mechanics and language use. By considering those aspects, the students can write well-structured sentences.

The Process of Writing

One of the aspects of writing that some English teachers focus on is the writing process (Hyland, 2003). It focuses on the process of writing and producing a text. To produce written text, there must be a sequence of steps that reflect the nature of a writing process. According to Harmer (2004), the process of writing consists of several elements, that is planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and producing a final version. Since the current approach to teaching writing is a process approach, it is important not to see writing as a product and instead focus on the process of writing. Since the writing process is recursive, student writers can re-plan, re-draft, and re-edit their work by considering the writing process.

Teaching Writing

According to Harmer (2004), teaching writing is about more than just mechanics; it is also about assisting students in communicating real messages in appropriate ways. In line with this, Harmer (2004) proposed some tasks that English teachers should implement when teaching writing. The first step is to demonstrate. Specific types of writing conventions and genre boundaries must be demonstrated by the teacher. The goal of writing conventions is to make the writing meaningful, while the goal of genre boundaries is to give the writing a specific purpose. Secondly, the teacher needs to provoke the students in writing. It includes how to generate ideas, engaging them with the value of the task, and convincing them how much fun it can be. Responding is the third task. In the responding activity, the professors provide constructive feedback on the students' writing content and structure, as well as frequent ideas for improvement. The last task is to evaluate. Teachers evaluate students' writing in order to test them by pointing out where they did well and where they made errors.

To summarize, teachers need great effort to teach writing so that the learners are able to produce valid communication in an appropriate manner. The English teachers play an important role in teaching writing. They are expected to optimize their roles to demonstrate, provoke, respond, and evaluate students' writing in the writing teaching learning process. To some extent, for the orientation in teaching writing, the instructor must include the concept of writing

Feedback

Definition of Feedback

Ur (1996) defined feedback as information provided to a student about their performance on a learning task, with the objective of enhancing that performance. According to Keh (1990), feedback is defined as input from a reader to a writer that has the benefit of providing information to the writer for revision. It means that the comments, questions, and suggestions a reader gives to the writer are aimed to make some improvements to the writer's performance. In line with this, Kepner (1991) in Magno and

Armales (2011) defined feedback in general as a procedure used to inform students whether an informational response is right or wrong. A procedure is a set of actions that are decided to provide feedback. It is related to the method of providing feedback.

According to the preceding definitions, feedback is a procedure in the writing process that provides information related to revision in a specific way according to the type and goals of the assignment in the writing learning process. Providing feedback on students' writing has become so crucial because it allows the writer to improve their writing performance by learning from their errors.

The Source of Feedback

Knowing feedback has an important role in the writing process, the issue of who is proper to provide feedback becomes a consideration to an English teacher in the writing teaching learning process. According to Nation (2009), the feedback can be from the instructor, classmates, and the learners themselves in self-assessment.

a. Feedback from Teacher

The role of the teacher in providing feedback is to explain and justify students' work while also making suggestions for the students to be considered in the next occasion.

b. Feedback from Peers

Peer feedback is a response that is given by one student to other students' drafts. According to Harmer (2004), peer feedback has the benefit of empowering students to work co-operatively. It is also claimed that peer feedback is beneficial for students' drafts improvement and readers' understanding of good writing development.

c. Feedback from the Learners Themselves

As stated by Ferris in Richards & Renandya (2002), it is barely possible for the teacher to check all the students' writing all at once. Therefore, the students are expected to self-edit their own writing. However, the teacher should provide a framework as a guideline for the students to do self-edit.

Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback refers to the teacher's correction by providing the right form of errors directly. Ellis (2009) stated that direct feedback refers to overt correction of student's errors, that is, locating and correcting errors for students; the correct form is directly provided. Marifin et al (2018) stated that direct corrective feedback means having teachers to read and give feedback on what students have written directly. According to Ferris in Elham and Amir (2016), direct corrective feedback is a way of providing feedback to students in order to help them resolve their errors by giving the right linguistic form or linguistic structure of the target language. Furthermore, Bitchener and Ferris in Elham and Amir stated that when teachers notice grammatical errors, they usually provide correct answers or the expected response above or near the linguistics or grammatical error. According to Abadikhah and Ashoori (2012), direct corrective feedback occurs when the learners are overtly informed of the existence of an error and provided with the target-like reformulation. Based on the definitions of the direct corrective feedback defined by the

experts, it can be concluded that direct corrective feedback is the feedback in which the correct forms are directly provided.

The Forms of direct Corrective Feedback

In the development of direct feedback, the techniques of giving direct feedback also change over time. The first form is proposed by Ellis (2009). According to Ellis, providing written comments in response to students' writing defines the form of feedback. The forms involve removing any unnecessary words, phrases, or morphemes; adding what is missing; and writing the right form close to the wrong one. Secondly, Santos et al. (2010) differentiate between two categories of direct feedback: reformulation and error correction. The teacher copies the students' original text and reformulates the draft in the reformulation technique. Meanwhile, it is called an error correction when the teacher fixes the students' writing in a copied version. Thirdly, Sheen (2009) proposed focused and unfocused direct corrective feedback. Focused direct feedback refers to feedback that is used to locate and fix specific language features. Meanwhile unfocused direct corrective feedback is used when the teacher reveals and fixes the errors in the whole text. The last, Sheen also proposed that sometimes, the implementation of direct corrective feedback should be combined with another type of feedback. Since, the form of providing direct feedback develops time by time. It is possible to combine direct feedback with another technique of feedback that is convenient with the aspect of writing itself.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the researcher employed case study methodology to explore the implementation of direct corrective feedback to teach writing. Yin (2009) stated that case study is used in order to get a close and depth-understanding of a situation since it allows researchers to collect and observe data in a natural setting. Since this study is aimed to figure out the best way to implement direct corrective feedback, it makes more sense to use this kind of methodology. Moreover, Sunbul in Z Cakmak et al (2018) stated that a case study is a method used to assist students in finding effective solutions to overcome the problems they encounter in similar real-life situations in a shorter period of time.

Qualitative data is fully used in this study. Sugiyono (2008: 225) stated that the fundamental method relied on by qualitative researchers for gathering information is participation in the setting, direct observation, in-depth interviewing, and documentation review. Similarly, the data of this study were taken through classroom observation, interview, and documentation. Observation is used to find out the reason why DCF is used to overcome students' difficulty during writing activity. Meanwhile, the interview is used to dig further about the lecturer's implementation of DCF to teach writing, find out the problem she faced and solutions she used to overcome the problem. Moreover, the documents supported the credibility of the result of observation and interview. To analyze the data, the researcher followed the procedure based on Miles and Huberman (1992), they are data reduction, data display and conclusion.

Source of Data

In terms of resources, there were two participants who took an important part in this study. The first one was one of the English lecturers of the English Education Department who taught the Paragraph Development class. She handled A1 class in the academic year 2021/2022. The second participant was the 3rd semester students in the academic year 2021/2022. The class consisted of 21 students. Besides, documents are involved to complete the data which include students' artifacts and portfolio.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. The implementation of Direct Corrective Feedback to Teach Writing

Feedback was provided both in writing and orally. Written feedback is given through comments on the student drafts. In this paragraph development class, the lecturer used Google Docs as a media for collecting students' drafts and making corrections. Meanwhile, oral feedback was given at the next meeting. Usually, it is given to provide general corrections for all students. Direct corrective feedback is applied to correct five writing indicators, they are content, vocabulary, mechanics, language use and organization. The lecturer gives feedback on each indicator of writing based on the scoring rubric of writing's assessment. The scoring rubric is presented below:

QUESTIONS	YES	NO
Are all the components (topic-supporting-concluding sentence-title available)?		
Are all the supporting sentences relevant to the topic?		
Is there irrelevant detail?		
Has the title represented the content?		
Is the concluding sentence appropriate?		
Are there any issues with spelling, capitalization, and punctuation?		
Are there grammatical problems?		
Is there vocabulary that is not appropriate?		

This research was conducted during the pandemic where the lecturer and the students could not conduct face-to-face meetings. The teaching and learning process was completely done online using several media. They were Nearpod and WhatsApp group discussions that were used to help the lecturer to brainstorm, explain the whole material generally, and reflect on the material that had been done in the previous meeting. Furthermore, there were two media that the lecturer used to provide feedback, those are

Google Meet and Google Docs. Google Meet was used to provide oral feedback meanwhile Google Docs was used to provide written feedback.

The lecturer conducted a discussion related to the material given through some media that had been mentioned above. In every meeting, the students got an assignment that must be collected through the submission link of Google Docs. The lecturer provided written feedback on each students' writing in the comment box after they collected their assignment. Oral feedback was also given to all students simultaneously through Google Meet to provide general and comprehensive feedback. The first indicator to be analyzed was content. To correct the errors, the lecturer gave feedback through some suggestions including deleting and modifying the sentence. As the impact of deleting some sentences, the students need to revise or modify them so that the content can be delivered clearly through well-structured sentences. In applying the feedback, the lecturer used several steps to correct the content of the student's writing. First, she marked the wrong sentence as she did in some lines of the paragraph. Then, she explained the reason behind the errors of the sentence. It showed in "this sentence repeats the topic sentence". This information helps the students to have better understanding about the errors they made and make it easier to correct them. Lastly, she indicated the direct feedback by providing direct solutions or pointing out how to correct the errors and become the correct form through example. "A study by Day (date of publication) shows that...". The explanation about the error and correction that were given by the lecturer helps the students to get a better understanding of what they should do with the content of their writing.

The second indicator was organization. The right form of paragraph consists of the main sentence that is followed by supporting sentences as the lecturer said on the comment box of the students' draft "the topic sentence should be supported by details and a concluding sentence". The previous comment indicates the errors on how students organize the paragraph. It is shown that the student misplaced the sentence. Therefore, the lecturer provides direct feedback by locating the error then showing where the sentence should take place by saying "it will be better if you put it as the second sentence". The third is mechanics. It is about consideration in writing applications such as spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. There were only a few mistakes made by the students, one of which was an error in placing punctuation marks. So, the lecturer provided direct corrective feedback by asking the student to replace the comma with a conjunction "and" or to split the sentence.

The next indicator is language use. This component is usually assessed from the accuracy of sentence structure, such as subject-verb-agreement, tenses, word order and others. There are two kinds of corrective feedback that the lecturer provided to fix an incorrect student's sentence structure, those are direct and indirect corrective feedback. The lecturer provides direct correction by giving an expected answer directly when the errors and correction is clearly understood. In another point, she only indicates the errors without addressing the correct answer. However, the lecturer not only indicated the errors but also provided solutions by offering some options to be considered by the students in correcting their errors. The lecturer explained why the sentence was wrong before giving some suggestions to correct them. She also provided better alternatives to make it easier

for the students to make revision. The last indicator was vocabulary. The lecturer said “looks creamy is okay but for delicious it’s better to use the word taste”. It is important to pay attention on word’s selection because not all words that have the same meaning can be used in the same context. The lecturer also provided direct correction by saying “savory”. It means that the students are expected to be able to choose the right descriptive words so that the readers can understand what the writer is trying to describe.

In providing feedback, lecturers often gave motivation, support and praise to the students, such as: “good concluding sentence”, “you made a few mistake”, “revise a little more this will be a good writing”, “good idea” and “I see progress on your writing, I have a plan to collect your final writings and turn it into a book”. The lecturers not only gave corrections and assessment to the students’ writing but also provided a lot of encouragement to keep students motivated to make revisions and improvements. It is important to encourage the students during class through positive praises as a means to reach the objective of teaching writing itself.

During the research, the lecturer used many ways and steps for providing corrective feedback including combining both direct and indirect feedback so that the feedback can be applied and well received by the students. These steps of the form of giving feedback have been proposed by some experts, such as the first form was proposed by Elis (2009). According to Elis, the forms of direct corrective feedback involve removing any unnecessary words, phrases, or morphemes; adding what is missing; and writing the right form close to the wrong one. Due to the pandemic, this step was done through Google Doc where the lecturer can not directly cross out the wrong word in the students’ draft. This step is replaced by giving a mark to the error word that was connected to a particular comment box that consisted of the right answer. The second form was proposed by Santos, et al, (2020). Santos et al stated that feedback involved reformulation and error correction. It is similar to the feedback given by the lecturer. The lecturer corrects as well as reformulates the error on the sentence that was made by the students by providing alternative answers. The third is fixing specific language features. According to Sheen (2009), it is related to focused direct corrective feedback which only indicates and corrects specific errors. The lecturer marks the error and corrects specific writing indicators by providing the right answer, such as savory to fix the word choice and should be singular to fix the grammar. Lastly, sheen also proposed unfocused direct corrective feedback that is called metalinguistic error correction. This form of feedback is done by indicating and correcting errors in the sentence by providing the right form and explaining it through comment. Some errors not only need to be fixed directly but also need to be given further explanation.

However, there was not only direct corrective feedback found to be implemented in this writing class. As the lecturer stated in the interview, she combined the use of direct and indirect corrective feedback. According to Eslami, E (2014) indirect feedback occurs when the teacher indicates in some ways that an error exists but does not provide the correction, thus leaving it to the student to find it. In this type of feedback, the teacher shows the error, but the teacher does not guide the students with the correct form. It means that the students should think by themselves about the correct one. It means that during

teaching and learning activities, the lecturer not only provides direct correction, but also combines it with indirect correction including giving suggestions and additional explanation.

2. The Problem that The Lecturer Faces in Implementing Direct Corrective Feedback.

The implementation of Direct Corrective Feedback had some problems related to time management. The lecturer did not have enough time to check students' writing one by one due to lots of activities. Meanwhile, providing appropriate direct feedback to the students' assignments takes a long time. The lecturer needs to check, respond and sometimes give explanations on students' drafts one by one. Giving explanation to direct feedback that is given is necessary so that the students know the errors they made and are capable of making a correct revision. There are several ways to overcome the difficulties in managing time so that each student keeps getting feedback they deserve. Firstly, the lecturer found out what errors that mostly appear on students' writing. By knowing those errors, the lecturer could immediately check the errors on certain indicators. Secondly, the lecturer did not correct all students' writing. She chose some students' writing randomly to be corrected and discussed in the next meeting as a sample. Lastly, the lecturer asked the students to do peer feedback. She provided writing's scoring rubric assessment on each students' worksheet to help them give feedback to each other based on the scoring rubric listed.

Peer feedback is one of the alternative's resources for the students to get more opinions and resources related to their assignments from the other students at the same level. The students gave feedback to the other students writing based on the guideline of scoring rubric assessment. This guideline was used to help the students to be aware of the areas of writing and to develop their peer editing skills. They will give a sign to the certain criteria according to the errors listed on the students' worksheet. After that, the students will provide feedback in a form of comment, explanation and also solutions related to the errors and mistakes on the comment section. Although the feedback given by some students was not always correct, providing feedback on their friend's worksheet can stimulate students' analytical skills. The students can enlarge their knowledge and practice to think deeper by reading other students' writing submissions.

As stated by Ferris in Richards & Renandya (2002), it is barely possible for the teacher to check all the students' writing all at once. However, the teacher should provide a framework as a guideline for the students to do peer feedback. It is in line with Ferris et. al. (1997) that stated the performance of feedback that the teacher provides may not be constant throughout the semester; or it is possible to change depending on the task difficulty or the level of the students. Moreover, according to a recent survey conducted by Maarof et al. (2011) the combination of direct corrective feedback and peer feedback was also found to be welcome by the student. According to the students' perspective, implementing different types of feedback could reduce boredom and allow them to learn more from various sources.

CONCLUSION

Feedback holds a role as an important aspect in teaching and language learning, especially writing. According to the lecturer's perspective, providing proper feedback is necessary in assisting students' writing development. Feedback allows the teacher to help

the students reflect on their weaknesses and improve them. Moreover, feedback also allows the teacher to find the strengths of the students' abilities. Feedback is not only a way to evaluate the students' weaknesses, but feedback is also a way to motivate students to maintain their strength.

In implementing feedback, the lecturer could provide more than one type of feedback depending on the class condition, students' proficiency and types of error. The first type of feedback was corrective feedback including direct and indirect corrective feedback. This type of feedback was done in written and oral. Written direct or indirect corrective feedback was used to provide feedback to the students one by one by commenting in the students' worksheet. Meanwhile, oral direct or indirect corrective feedback is used to provide comprehensive feedback to all students. Besides that, peer feedback was also used due to the lecturer's condition who was not able to provide feedback to all students. It is possible to combine some different types of feedback in certain conditions.

Combining different types of feedback in teaching writing is beneficial for both lecturer and students. Direct - Indirect corrective feedback and peer feedback could complete each other when one of them were not enabled to assist students' writing. Even though combining different types of feedback is somehow necessary, the lecturer still has to consider which type of feedback that can be combined according to the students' need and class condition.

To assist the students writing by providing more than one type of feedback, the lecturer is expected to set the condition where the students can receive oral direct corrective feedback more, use simple language in delivering feedback especially in providing written feedback, and guide the students to do self-correction and peer feedback. So that the students do not consider the feedback delivered by the teacher as the only one source to make revision and they can learn from any possible sources available.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). Canada: Nelson Education.
- Abadikhah, S., & Ashoori, A. (2012). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Performance after Collaborative Output. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 3(1).
- Almasi, E., & Tabrizi, A. R. N. (2016). The effects of direct vs. indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(1), 74-85.
- Arifin, M., Zaim, M., & Ningsih, K. (2019, March). The Effect of Direct Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing of Recount Text. In *Seventh International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2018)* (pp. 292-297). Atlantis Press.
- Bashyal, G. P. (2009). MTDP: A model for teaching writing. *Journal of NELTA*, 14-20.
- Browne, A. (1999). *Teaching writing: Key stage 1 and before*. Nelson Thornes.
- Çakmak, Z., & Akgün, İ. H. (2018). A Theoretical Perspective on the Case Study Method. *Journal of education and learning*, 7(1), 96-102.

- dalam Sugiyono, S. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta, CV.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 445.
- Harmer, J. (2006). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education India.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Writing and teaching writing. *Second language writing*, 1-30.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. 2006. Contexts and Issues in Feedback on L2 Writing: An Introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds), *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 1-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). *Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation*.
- Magno, C., & Amarles, A. (2011). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 6(2).
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis (Third Edition)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Narciss, S., & Huth, K. (2004). How to design informative tutoring feedback for multimedia learning. *Instructional design for multimedia learning*, 181-195.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*.
- Penny, U. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Rahardian, R. (2003). *Constraints in the Classes of Writing I at the English Language Education Department, Faculty of Language and Arts, State University of Yogyakarta in the Academic Year of 2002/2003*.
- Richard, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Approaches to teaching. Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 1-5.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Santos, M., Serrano, S. L., & Manchón, R. M. (2010). The differential effect of two types of direct written corrective feedback on noticing and uptake: Reformulation vs. error correction. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 131-154.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556-569.
- Sholihah, L. (2015). The implementation of peer feedback strategy for writing instruction at the first semester of writing 1 class At Muhammadiyah University of Metro. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 4(1).

- TOKDEMİR DEMİREL, E. L. İ. F., & Enginarlar, H. (2016). Effects of combined peer-teacher feedback on second language writing development. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(4), 657-675.
- Ur, P. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Utami, U. T. (2012). Improving students' writing skill through teachers direct feedback in SMAN 1 Jogonalan. Yogyakarta. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Vol. 5). sage.