

WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON ONLINE LEARNING

Larasati Nur Yuliawati¹, Bambang Harmanto², Diyah Atiek Mustikawati³, Ana Maghfiroh⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo

¹ larasatinyy98@gmail.com, ² bambange.unmuh@gmail.com, ³ diyah_mustikawati08@yahoo.com, ⁴ ana_maghfiroh@umpo.ac.id

Abstract

WCF from the lecturer is useful information for student writing improvement. It aids students in identifying their English learning problems and skills. Students, on the other hand, may interpret lecturer WCF differently than the lecturer intended. This study is aimed at describing the type of lecturer's WCF and the students' perception of lecturer's WCF in a paragraph writing class. It is descriptive qualitative research, employing documentation and interview as research instruments, which was conducted with 18 students of the third semester English department students of Muhammadiyah University of Ponorogo. Furthermore, there were five out of 18 students randomly selected to be interviewed to discover students' perspective of the given feedback. The findings revealed that, firstly, the lecturer use praise, criticism, and suggestion based on students task in paragraph writing class. Secondly, students' positive responses of having feedback and the benefit of written corrective feedback that students get. Finally, most students responded that they appreciated the lecturer's WCF. In addition, the students believed that lecturer's WCF could improve student's writing especially on grammar accuracy and organization, and it could motivate the student in developing the ideas.

Keywords: Student's Perspective, Written Corrective Feedback, Writing

INTRODUCTION

Compared to other English skills, writing is equally important. Writing is mostly seen as the toughest language skill for second language students to master. It also requires special criteria or techniques to get ideas, to create them creatively, and to arrange them on a well-formed basis. Writing is an activity in learning skills, as Nation says (2009:113) that writing is an activity that can be prepared by focusing on other listening, speaking, and reading skills. Writing is an act that takes place in a particular sense which is suitably influenced by its intended audience and achieves a specific objective as Hamp-Lyons and Kroll (1997:8). Writing is a crucial language skill since it allows you to learn, discover, grow, and enhance your language skills (Maghfiroh et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, writing is a thought process based on Brown (2001:331), writing can be designed and revised multiple times. Writing seems to be well-structured and pre-planned, in contrast to the occasionally chaotic and co-constructed earlier (Harmer, 2007). That is why writing required unique techniques and criteria because, in the process of shaping the writing product, the small elements such as punctuation become well-intentioned. It can be inferred that writing is one of the ways of reflecting well-formed and structured ideas that have unique requirements than the other abilities.

However, many researchers issued ineffective strategies for teaching writing, student writing challenges, students' low motivation to learn writing that has not been solved yet, and others. These problems occur as a result of the fact that writing is a complex process with various specific criteria or techniques on the inside. Some of the researchs issued that have arisen in teaching writing to second-language students have remained controversial over the last few decades (Brown, 2001). As a result, teaching writing was required to undertake extensive research in many ways that would help students to improve the writing achievement

One type that makes writing different from another skill is the process aspect. There is a long process of writing the product that students need to do from pre to final to follow-up. The pre-writing, drafting, revision, and editing process or stage of writing begins said Urquhart and McIver (2005). In each process, students need to develop a set of competencies and basic writing skills that cannot naturally develop on their own. One of them is writing pedagogy that expects students to be able to focus on generating ideas, to organize them coherently, to use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions to put them coherently, to revise the meaning, to edit the grammar, and to produce the final product (Brown, 2001:335). In the process of writing, editing, or re-writing, the student process is concerned because it is an important step to determine the quality of the writing product before it is finalized. The editing process is important in a foreign language writing class than in a first language writing class (Harmer, 2007:325). We all know that the writing system in a second language class differs from that of a first language writing class. Students will require extra assistance in the writing process, including pre-writing, writing, and, in particular, this editing process, from an expert such as a lecturer.

In this regard, lecturers must be aware of how to help students achieve writing pedagogy to improve the student writing process to be better equipped with an effective teaching strategy, for example in the teaching and learning environment. A supportive teaching environment by providing potential feedback helped lecturers to convey and model ideas about good writing in classroom situations said Hyland and Hyland (2010). Through feedback provided in the monitoring and guidance process, the lecturer will help students and correct some of the errors in their essays.

Monitoring lecturers is one of the roles they play in writing, other roles become a motivator, resource, tutor, and also feedback provider. The roles of lecturer, starting with a motivator lecturer as the main role that needs special skills to be played, then as a resource to provide information to students, including advice and suggestions, and lastly as a feedback provider to offer corrections and respond positively as describe by Harmer (2007:330). Feedback provider is a key role that helps students develop their writing before it is finalized after motivation and knowledge in the writing process.

The approach employed by a lecturer to rectify faults produced by students in writing is known as corrective feedback in the writing classroom. Corrective feedback from lecturers can take the shape of both direct and indirect feedback strategies. Direct feedback relates to how a lecturer recognizes an error and provides the correct form, whereas indirect feedback refers to how a lecturer recognizes an issue but does not provide a correction, leaving the student to diagnose and rectify it (Mufanti:2016).

The lecturer must provide feedback to students as their role as a provider in a single form of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), particularly in the editing process. WCF is believed that it can contribute to the editing process as Bitchener and Ferris (2012:140) set out their goal of

developing writing skills, building awareness, knowledge, and strategic competence. Lecturers should know if they need to find an effective strategy to help students produce a writing product. After considering the benefits, they can choose WCF from their strategies.

The WCF from the lecturer, which was used to detect the students' mistakes in writing, Seiffedin and El-Sakka (2017), improved student writing production accuracy. WCF is related to students based on Han (2019). He said WCF is a way to understand the ability of the learner with WCF. Students receiving written feedback will know and memorize their mistakes in their brains. The varied aspects that the lecturer gives WCF to develop L2 writing have been discussed in Nagode, Pižorn, and Jurišević (2014) and the function is young students can improve the development of their L2 skills.

WCF increased written consistency and is one of the primary and demanding tasks of instruction in classrooms. Lalande (1982) describes written feedback as "any procedure that informs a student if an educational answer is correct or incorrect." Then WCF is defined in writing to mean input from the lecturer to improve the grammatical adequacy of lecturers when interacting through the written medium.

WCF is effective in making students' independent researchers aware of their previous experience's errors. WCF is an indication to students that their use of the target language is incorrect it states by Kirgoz & Agcam (2014). The lecturer's WCF will help students as well as the writing process in particular to correct some of the errors in their essays.

WCF is not only used for writing mistakes but also to commend what is nice in writing (Mory, 2004; Cardelle & Corno, 1981). In other words, lecturers should use WCF for their good work to thank and compliment their students. WCF is used to help language students prevent mistakes and to revision their writing (e.g. grammatical, syntactic, or semantic errors), and to make lecturers aware of learner deficiencies in their writing.

WCF that will be provided may include several aspects of student writing based on Saeli (2016) that research Iran, such as feedback on the form (grammar), content (coherence), organization (introduction/ methods/ results), discussion (framework in many empiric essays) and mechanics (pointing) that depend on the lecturer/lecturer to choose as necessary. Students can provide their experience with the WCF they receive from the lecturer so that WCF can improve their writing product.

In contrast, the use of corrective feedback on the student's grammar error production has no difference is found among written feedback and SEMI corrective feedback in the effectiveness of the results based on Khanlarzadeh & Taheri, (2017). In the immediate and delayed post-tests, both experimental groups exceeded the control groups. In addition, the reduced skill of English students can adversely affect their cognitive and compartmental involvement with WCF and the imbalances of many three sub-dimensions of engagement based on Zheng & Yu (2018). However, not all students – and certainly not all writers – are as competent at editing as others according to Harmer (2007:110). Not all students are adept at making their errors work in their favor. Then, grammar correction should be abandoned because it has negative consequences, such as increasing tension, which hinders learning in writing it state by Truscott (1996).

The low-proficient students appeared to have difficulty processing the indirect corrective feedback, which was particularly connected to contents, in the majority of cases. The majority of them struggled to correct the issue in this area since they didn't know which section was weak or needed to be changed. They didn't have any specific information to help them process the input. Furthermore, much of the input in these two areas were not properly rectified due to a lack of competence in grammar and lexis. To put it another way, the majority of the low-

performing participants struggled to optimize their noticing technique when processing input based on Mufanti (2014).

In the meantime, students reacted to instructor input in a variety of ways. Because they have distinct understandings, students have diverse reactions to feedback. Students' impressions of in-classroom feedback, according to Gamlem and Smith (2013), can be divided into three categories. There are three categories of feedback: valence, relationships, and honest feedback, as well as feedback types. The valence of feedback referred to how students interpreted positive and negative feedback. When students see feedback as challenging due to a lack of trust or potential harm, such as unfavorable comments, the themes of relationships and honest feedback emerge. Meanwhile, there are four different sorts of feedback: grade giving, managing, reporting, and conversational feedback. The issue of feedback valence should be stressed since it is useful for lecturers to understand students' impressions of their feedback in both positive and negative ways, among other things.

When feedback delivers some approval of performance, students interpret it as positive feedback valence. Students will be inspired to learn after receiving feedback. Positive feedback has an impact on the quality of students' subsequent performances, and students' efforts can be regarded as an improvement (Gamlem & Smith, 2013). Furthermore, students who receive favorable feedback are more engaged in their studies. Meanwhile, students may interpret instructor evaluation as negative if it makes them feel less driven. Students saw teacher feedback as unfavorable when teachers urged them to write more and gave them a detailed analysis of their flaws, as Gamlem and Smith (2013) demonstrated in their study. In other words, when a teacher delivers negative feedback as a "thorn" (Gamlem & Smith, 2013, p. 159), students will be more agitated since it drives them to perform tasks they have not yet mastered. Therefore, based on the explanation above, this study aimed at describing the type of Written Corrective Feedback by the lecturer and the students' perception of lecturer WCF in a paragraph writing class. The following research questions guided this research:

1. What are the type of WCF that lecturer use in paragraph writing class?
2. What are the students' perceptions of their lecturer WCF in paragraph writing class?

METHOD

Research design

This study focused on analyzing the WCF of the lecturer in paragraph writing, which is provided by the third semester of English Department students in the Paragraph Writing class. This study applied a qualitative research design. A qualitative approach explores human experience holistically, observing behavior as it occurs naturally in a classroom, an entire school, a playground, or in an organization or community, and taking place in the field, in actual situations. It indicates that a qualitative approach is a study of behavior or a specific process that occurs in social life or in the environment, as well as the problems that will be studied, all of which are organically based on what happened According to Ary et al., (2010:424).

Participant

The participant of this research is 18 students (5 males and 13 females) and five out of them were interviewed from the third semester in English Department students in Muhammadiyah University of Ponorogo. These five students were chosen based on their writing scores. The researcher chooses English study program students because this study focused on lecturers' WCF on students writing and the English study program has a subject that focused on writing.

Data collection

For this study, there were two types of data. They were students' writing sample as a documentation and their responses about the feedback in the form of an interview. Both were regarded as qualitative data that were treated qualitatively. The researcher used students' writing drafts as the first data. The document should have received written feedback from the lecturer. The second data was students' responses in the interview section which contains several questions related to students' perspectives on WCF from a lecturer.

Data analysis

The researcher analyzed the data from Gay and Airasian (2000: 239), who claimed that the analysis of descriptive research data required four steps. There were reading/ memoing, description, classifying, and interpreting. The second data was analyzed by using thematic analysis by Brawn and Clarke (2006). The researcher analyzed the transcribed data and came up with two themes for the student's perception to the feedback.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

A. Type of lecturers' WCF based on students' paragraph writing

Collecting the students' paragraph writing assignments (asking permission) and assessing the lecturer's written feedback on each of the students' paragraph writing assignments are the stages to investigating the lecturer's written feedback in paragraph writing. The information came from the writings of the students. According to the data, the lecturer used WCF in the students' English paragraph writing included praise, criticism, and suggestion. When the lecturer delivers affirmation to the students' mistakes or errors, this is referred to as WCF. When students make a mistake and the lecturer corrects them, this is what happens. As a result, the students will be able to correct their errors and understand what went wrong. The next paragraphs explain details of the feedback:

a. Praise

Praise is communication about someone's good work or qualities. In the students' paragraph writing, the lecturer provided praise as feedback. It shows that the lecturer is pleased with the students' writing. The lecturer used terms like "good job," "well done," "good topic sentence," "excellent," and others to commend the students' writing.

These sentences were used by the lecturer to express that the lecturer was pleased with the students' work. It shows that the students' writing, particularly in English paragraph writing, fits the criteria for a good text. The students' writing has no big errors. As a result, the lecturer expresses satisfaction to the students by using one of these expressions.



b. Criticism

Criticism Negative feedback was once used to indicate that the students' work was still problematic. There are issues such as grammatical errors, misspelled words, and poorly arranged content. Lecturers criticize in a variety of ways, such as "it's a very long sentence," "wrong grammar," or "it's incorrect."

The lecturer uses these expressions to show the students that something is amiss with their writing or work. Besides grammatical errors, other issues include word choice, which can be

seen when the lecturer says "wrong word" or "confusing sentence," content, which can be seen when the lecturer says "it is not suitable with the text," and organization, which can be seen when the lecturer says "don't separate the paragraphs." As a result, when students receive criticism, it can be assumed that their work is not quite good.



ana maghfiroh 6 Okt 2020

errors in grammar:

- helpful for increased (to increase).
- successfully answering a question correctly (boros kata, sudah successfully, correctly)
- then complimenting him (butuh subject disini, siapa yg complimenting?)
- because humans are humans (do you mean "because students are human??")

c. Suggestion

The lecturer also used the suggestion. It is awarded to the students' work since there are still some problems with the students' work. There are issues such as grammatical errors, wrong spelling, and improperly arranged text. The lecturer makes suggestions for the student's work in different ways. The lecturer expresses with "You should write your topic sentence in one sentence with one full stop", "You can vary the attitude on your topic sentence (not only "are stylish, is exciting, is interesting") but also by using action verbs such as enhance, make, contribute, support, etc)" and "you can also use the modifier for exposing the subject."

Lecturers use suggestions to show a mistake, but criticism is different. It contains areas for improvement without directly criticizing or criticizing the students' work. Furthermore, the suggestion is preferable to criticism because it does not contain directly negative words that indicate that the student's work is still in need of improvement.



2 komentar pribadi



ana maghfiroh 22 Sep 2020

You can also vary your controlling sentence by using modifier or various action verb, not only by using "because..." for example "Dining out with families and friend is not only enjoyable and increase appetite, but also can maintain our good relationship".

B. Students' preference on lecturer WCF

Five out of 18 students were interviewed to discover students' views about the lecturer's WCF in their writing tasks. The aspect of the interview was explained below:

a. Students' positive responses of having feedback

The data is initially used to investigate learner perceptions of the importance of lecturer WCF. Students are asked to pick between a lecturer who provides WCF and one who does not. What, in their opinion, is the significance of lecturer WCF? In general, they all agree that WCF should be provided. However, their reasons and perceptions on the importance of WCF differ. The following information shows their perception on the importance of lecturer WCF:

(Data 1, Interview 1) : Yes. WCF given by my lecturer is used as a reference in my next writing.

(Data 2, Interview 3) : Yes. Every assignment that is collected, I always get feedback and I use that feedback to correct mistakes in assignments and to improve on next assignments.

(Data 3, Interview 5) : Yes. Feedback is very important, in my opinion, besides being a reference, it is also a form of attention from lecturers to students. With this feedback we can find out where the error is in my assignment. If there is feedback that is not clear, I usually ask the lecturer again to understand better what the error is.

(Data 4, Interview 2) : Yes. There will definitely be value feedback and also input about my writing. I usually read and understand this feedback for study material so that the next assignment can be better.

(Data 5, Interview 4) : Every time there is an assignment, the lecturer always gives me feedback. Feedback is very important in my opinion, because it can be used as a reference for the next assignment given by the lecturer.

b. The benefits of WCF that students get

The researcher learns about the benefits that students receive from the interview. In general, the researcher collects data that can be used to represent all of the students' perceptions.

(Data 1, Interview 2) : The feedback given by the lecturer is usually read and understood for learning materials so that the next assignment is better, evaluates my own ability to what extent I understand the systematics of writing and the topics given. It also adds motivation to always learn and practice in developing ideas for the next work.

(Data 2, Interview 4) : Feedback has several advantages for me: it can serve as a benchmark for my ability to understand the material being taught, it can help me identify my mistakes in doing assignments, it can motivate me to be more active in doing assignments, and it can serve as a form of appreciation from lecturers to students in doing assignments.

(Data 3, Interview 5) : Some of the benefits that I get, namely, I can find out where the error is in the writing that I do. I get ideas for the next assignment, usually writing already has a theme, but when I write it sometimes I get confused about the direction, so if I get feedback it can help me to develop ideas but still according to the specified theme. Feedback from lecturers also increases motivation in writing and is very helpful in doing the next assignment. I am very happy to get feedback from lecturers. In my opinion, all lecturers must apply feedback to student assignments.

(Data 3, Interview 1) : Feedback is very useful, the feedback tells me which part is wrong and needs to be corrected so that I can do my next writing correctly.

(Data 5, Interview 4) : There are many benefits from the feedback I get, including; can be a benchmark for my ability to the material that has been taught, help to tell where I went wrong in doing the task. The form of appreciation from lecturers to students, made me understand more about the material given by the lecturer, and helped me in doing the tasks that would be given in the future.

Discussion

1. Type of lecturers' WCF based on students' paragraph writing

Corrective feedback, such as praise, criticism, and suggestion, was used by the instructor, as stated in the findings section. This finding supported the four categories of feedback proposed by Ken Hyland, Fiona Hyland, and Leila: praise, criticism, suggestion, and corrective feedback. As a result, it may be concluded that the lecturer's feedback is supported by the theory.

The first type of feedback is Praise. Praise is a good comment. It is provided by the lecturer when the students can write descriptive text well. When a lecturer is pleased with a student's writing, he or she will give praise. There are no grammatical errors, the language is nicely organized, and the descriptive text's topic is clear. Praise can be defined as an indication of happiness with a student's work. Praise is credit given to a characteristic, attribute, talent, or work that is positively appraised by the person providing feedback. The examples of praise as feedback from the lecturer are such as; "good job", "good sentences", "excellent", "you made brilliant ideas on your topic sentence", "good paragraph", and "good enough".

The second type of feedback is criticism, which the lecturer also employed in the students' work. Criticism is defined as a negative comment made by a lecturer to point out an error in a student's work. When students commit mistakes and the lecturer provides feedback with unfavorable comments, the students receive criticism. When a student's sentence is incorrect, the lecturer may provide feedback in the form of criticism. The lecturer criticizes the sentence, indicating that something is wrong with it. As a result, students can enhance their writing by receiving feedback. The following are some examples of criticism used by the lecturer: "wrong grammar", "it's a very long sentence", "wrong grammar", or "it's incorrect". It's a negative remark or a phrase or sentence expressing discontent. These were the criticisms leveled by both lecturers.

The third feedback is the suggestion. The suggestion is similar to criticism, although it is slightly different. Students receive suggestions when they make a mistake and the lecturer suggests a revision for the mistake. The lecturer delivers instructions to assist the students in correcting their errors. As a result, the lecturer does not openly offer criticism but rather a recommendation for improvement. If the lecturer makes a suggestion, it also shows that the students' work is still incorrect. Here's a suggestion for realistic improvement action. The lecturer's suggestions include the following: "You should write your topic sentence in one sentence with one full stop", "You can vary the attitude on your topic sentence (not only "are stylish, is exciting, is interesting") but also by using action verbs such as enhance, make, contribute, support, etc)", "you can also use the modifier for exposing the subject.", you should use transitional expression (major or minor, such as first, second as a sign of your supporting details).

There have been several previous studies that are relevant to this one. There are four types of feedback, according to Uli, Sholahuddin, and Silver – Lee's research. Praise, criticism, suggestion, and corrective feedback are examples of different sorts of feedback. To summarize, a lecturer can use this form of criticism to assist students with their writing.

2. Students' preference on lecturer WCF

According to the preferences findings, students prefer WCF, which is followed by suggestion, praise, and criticism. The preference of the students is serial. Aside from that, the students' reactions to feedback are also positive. It is based on the students' interviews that the students can detect grammar errors, understand their error and rectify it, as well as repair earlier errors and avoid repeating them. According to the findings, students require comments to assist them in their writing, particularly in the area of grammar. Students appreciate corrected feedback for this reason. Besides helping children with revision, written feedback from lecturers can also assist students in becoming more inspired to write (Silver-Lee, 2007). It can also encourage students to improve their writing skills in the future. The findings reveal that corrective criticism is preferred by students when receiving written feedback from lecturers. However, there must be some justifications for why students prefer a particular type of written feedback from the lecturer. The students' reason is based on their previous experience receiving written feedback from the lecturer. Afterward, when students received lecturer criticism on their writing, they gained the benefit of being able to apply it to enhance their writing in the future.

Based on the interview, students agree that lecturer WCF is an important aspect of the learning process that should be included. There are various perceptions about the importance of lecturer WCF. In general, the researcher concludes that lecturer WCF is one strategy for improving students' writing abilities. WCF from lecturers is one of the things that students assume they require. It is comparable to the perception that mistakes are an unavoidable element of the learning process (Tornberg, 2005). The students believe that by receiving WCF from the lecturer, they will be able to identify their errors and avoid repeating them in the future. The error does not become a negative thing in the language program for second graders, but they are aware that errors are a part of the learning process. As a result, they never feel defeated or embarrassed when they make a mistake.

The contributions appeared from the practices of this WCF, based on the results of an interview with the students. Students claimed that by using the WCF technique, they can spot their errors while writing, increasing their self-awareness. The students' independence, on the other hand, is boosted by the WCF strategy.

CONCLUSION

WCF's contribution is not just to attract student's attention to their mistakes, but also to develop their self-awareness and encourage them to be more independent in their writing. Students' motivation can be boosted by highlighting their achievements in the form of a grade or praise, encouraging them to strive for higher grades in the future. There are several advantages in the practices of written correction feedback according to London (2003), such as feedbacks could influence the future achievement of the learning objective by enhancing the students' ability to learn and also increasing their ability to detect their own mistakes in the process. Students' motivation is also boosted by feedback that shows the behaviors that lead to effective learning outcomes. It also aids in the development of self-awareness. WCF is used to complement what is good in the writing as well as to repair writing errors (Mory, 2004; Cardelle & Corno, 1981). To put it another way, lecturers can use WCF to appreciate and reward their students for their hard work. WCF is used to help language learners avoid errors (such as grammatical, syntactic, and semantic errors) and improve their writing, as well as to warn lecturers about students' writing inadequacies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Alhamdulillah, thank you Allah, my family, my lecturer and those who have supported this research. I also would like to thank the students who generously shared their time and knowledge with us their perceptions of lecturer written corrective feedback in paragraph writing class.

REFERENCES

- Anggraini, D. (2018). students' perspective toward teacher's written corrective feedback on students' writing in paragraph writing class. *Universitas Jambi*.
- Amara, T. M. (2015). Learners' perceptions of teacher written feedback commentary in an ESL writing classroom. *International Journal of English language teaching*, 3(2), 38-53.
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.
- Astuti, W., Maghfiroh, A., & Palupi, R. E. A. (2020). Enhancing Students' writing Ability By Implementing Problem-Based Learning Method At The English Department Students In Muhammadiyah University Of Ponorogo In Academic Year 2019/2020. *EDUPEDIA*, 4(2), 155-161.
- Aulia, A. M. (2018). The Lecturers Written Corrective Feedback Practices In Essay Writing Class At English Department Of Iain Tulungagung.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 14(3), 191-205.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language teaching research*, 12(3), 409-431.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 12(3), 267-296.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here?(and what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of second language writing*, 13(1), 49-62.
- Gamlem, S. M., & Smith, K. (2013). Student perceptions of classroom feedback. *Assessment*

- in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 20(2), 150-169.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2000). *Student guide to accompany educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. Merrill.
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A Study of Students and Teachers' Preferences and Attitudes towards Correction of Classroom Written Errors in Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128-141.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* 4th edition. Harlow: England Pearson Education.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of second language writing*, 10(3), 185-212.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 1-19.
- Jeremy, H. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Essex: Pearson Longman.
- Karimi, S. H. (2016). Effects of Different Types of Teacher WCF on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(2), 216-229.
- Kisnanto, Y. P. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on higher education students' writing accuracy. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra UPI*, 16(2), 121-131.
- Lindqvist, A. (2017). The Use of WCF: A Survey of Written Response from Teachers to ESL Students in English A- Course Upper School
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Mahfoodh, O. H. A., & Pandian, A. (2011). A Qualitative Case Study of EFL Students' Affective Reactions to and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Written Feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 14-25.
- Mufanti, R. (2014, October). Students Noticing Of Corrective Feedback On Writing (Case study for low learner). In *Prosiding International 'The 61st TEFLIN International Conference 2014* (pp. 1332-1335). English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Sebelas Maret.
- Mufanti, R. (2016). Highly proficiency learners on noticing strategy towards corrective feedback. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 1(1).
- Mustafa, R. F. (2012). Feedback on the Feedback: Sociocultural Interpretation of Saudi ESL Learners' Opinions about Writing Feedback. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 3-15.
- Putri, N. V. W., & Munir, A. (2021). Students' perceptions of teacher feedback in EFL English class and their self-regulated learning after receiving feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 11(1), 42-60.
- Rachmawati, V., Maghfiroh, A., & Mufanti, R. (2017). Basic Questioning With Picture In Writing Class: Is It Effective?. *EDUPEDIA*, 1(1), 1-10.
- Rizki, A. F., Harmanto, B., & Indriastuti, N. R. (2018). Improving Students' Writing Skill By Using Stirred Word And S. *EDUPEDIA*, 2(1), 105-112.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 13, 133-164
- Sabarun, S. (2020). Direct Teacher Corrective Feedback in EFL Writing Class at Higher Education: What Students Perceive. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 9(1), 17-32.
- Sholahuddin, A. (2014). *Students' feedback In Paragraph Writing Class Of English Education Departement Uin Sunan Ampel Surabaya* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya).
- Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(1), 25-49.

- Soler, S. O. (2015). EFL students' attitude and preferences towards written corrective feedback. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*. University of Jaume I, Castelló de la Plana, Spain.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Utami, U. T. (2012). Improving students writing skill through teachers direct feedback in SMAN 1 Jogonalan. Yogyakarta. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback in English Compositions: Teachers' Practices and Students' Expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(2), 9