



\*Corresponding author: La Sunra,  
English Department, Universitas  
Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

E-mail: [lasunra@unm.ac.id](mailto:lasunra@unm.ac.id)

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# Teacher Corrective Feedback in Students' English Writing at SMAN 3 Selayar

Rauf Sakir, La Sunra\*, & Chairil Anwar Korompot

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia.

**Abstract:** This research aims to explore how teachers deliver corrective feedback on students' English writing in class XI 1 of SMAN 3 Selayar and identify the type of feedback most preferred by students. The findings revealed that English teachers applied three out of six corrective feedback strategies proposed by Rod Ellis, namely Direct Corrective Feedback, Indirect Corrective Feedback, and Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback. Furthermore, data from observation sheets and interviews with several students indicate that Direct Corrective Feedback is the most frequently received and appreciated type of feedback. This is because it enables students to analyze and correct their mistakes effectively while enhancing their understanding of English writing. Additionally, the study suggests that future research employ a longitudinal approach to assess the long-term impact of corrective feedback on students' English writing skills.

**Keywords:** Corrective Feedback, Written Corrective Feedback, English Writing.

## 1. Introduction

Corrective feedback holds significant importance in the educational process. It serves as a vital tool for closing the knowledge gaps between students' current understanding and their intended learning outcomes (Shute, 2008). Providing feedback that is both timely and meaningful can motivate students to engage in learning, assist them in identifying and resolving misunderstandings, and enhance their confidence and enthusiasm for learning (Epstein et al., 2010).

Currently, there is a very urgent thing that researchers get regarding corrective feedback, especially for student writing. It is still uncommon for teachers to provide their students with constructive criticism on their writing. This is based on the researcher experience and also the results of a brief interview with a student at SMAN 3 Selayar. Corrective feedback on writing is very important to be given by teachers to their students as a reflection on their writing. According to Swain (1995), it is essential for teachers to engage second language learners in productive skills, as producing output not only draws their attention to linguistic features but, when paired with feedback, also helps them recognize gaps and issues in their interlanguage (IL). By providing corrective feedback to students' writing, students will always be accustomed to correcting errors in writing or assignments given, so that they will produce much better writing products.

Consequently, research on the topic is essential. Based on the theories that have been found in previous writings, the researcher believes that corrective feedback will greatly affect the product or student writing. A teacher must give corrective feedback to students so that students can make improvements to their writing. This research seeks to uncover how teachers deliver written corrective feedback on students' writing and identify the type of feedback that students find most acceptable. Thus, a study on giving students constructive



criticism on their work and the feedback that students find most acceptable was judged required.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.2. *Definition of Feedback*

Feedback is an assessment or reaction to work completed. Within the educational setting, teachers provide feedback to their students based on their work. Feedback in education refers to information provided to students with the goal of influencing their behavior or thought processes to enhance learning outcomes. To boost student achievement, knowledge acquisition, skill development, and motivation, it is crucial for teachers to offer effective feedback. Various definitions of teacher feedback have been proposed in research. According to Shute and Valerie (2008), feedback is defined as information communicated to learners with the purpose of adjusting their thinking or behavior to improve learning quality. Similarly, Gielen et al. (2010) described feedback as a response to information about students' performance that supports their learning process. Carvalho et al., citing Hattie and Timperley, stated that feedback involves providing teachers with insights into all aspects of students' knowledge. Keh emphasized that feedback can be conveyed through various means, such as comments, questions, or suggestions. Likewise, Voerman et al. defined feedback as information given to teachers regarding students' performance and understanding, aligned with specific objectives, to facilitate learning improvement.

We can conclude that teacher feedback is any information, suggestions, or objections made by a teacher to his students' performance or work in order to produce improvements or evaluations, based on a number of definitions from various theories that have been proposed.

### 2.3. *Form of Feedback*

The feedback shall generally be classified in two main categories, oral and written. According to Kkali (2017), written feedback can be described as a response to students' performance or assignment by means of written comments or suggestions, which may contain strengths and weaknesses of the student. On the other hand, according to Ashrafi and Foozunfar (2018), feedback from a teacher, including interaction between students and teachers, is considered to be oral feedback. In addition, feedback is divided into three main types. According to Zheng et al. (2020), teacher feedback can be categorized into three types: Corrective Feedback, Motivational Feedback, and Behavioral Feedback.

### 2.4. *Corrective Feedback*

#### 2.4.1. *Definition*

Evaluative feedback, also known as "corrective feedback," can assist students in improving their language skills by guiding them toward more appropriate usage. Briefly speaking, corrective feedback is a formal or informal assessment of the learner's performance in another task by peers or teachers. Richards and Schmidt's (2013) definition of corrective feedback are as any information about the outcome of a behavior. Sheen and Ellis (2011) define corrective feedback as "the feedback learners receive on linguistic errors they make in oral or written production in a second language (L2)." Furthermore, Astia (2018) explained that teachers offer corrective feedback, or error correction, when students misuse the target language, aiming to help students enhance their interlanguage skills.

Based on many views about corrective feedback, it can be concluded that teachers give this kind of feedback to their students or to other students in order to correct errors in written and spoken language and support language development, evaluation, and progress.

#### 2.4.2. *Type of Corrective Feedback*

Both explicit and implicit correction can be used as a kind of corrective feedback (Ellis, 2009). In the explicit form of correction, a teacher corrects a student directly when they make a mistake; in the implicit form, a teacher corrects a student indirectly to help them make

corrections on their own without providing a grammatical explanation (Gass & Mackey, 2007). Accordingly, metalinguistic feedback and overt or explicit correction can be used to address explicit feedback types. Repeats, recasts, and requests for clarification fall under the category of implicit feedback types (Ellis, 2009).

Lyster, Saito et al. (2013), and Russell and Spada (2006) categorized corrective feedback into six types: recast, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, paralinguistic signals, and clarification requests.

On the other hand, Sheen and Ellis classified corrective feedback into two broader categories: oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback.

(a). Oral corrective feedback

Oral corrective feedback can be provided in two ways: offline, where feedback is given after the communicative event has concluded, or online, where feedback is given almost immediately after the learner makes an error. Corrections given orally might be input-providing, meaning it offers the correct form, or output-prompting, where the goal is to encourage the student to correct themselves. According to Sobhani and Tayebipous, vocal correction feedback considerably minimizes grammatical error (Sermsook et al., quotation).

(b). Written corrective feedback

The majority of the time, written corrective feedback entails offline that is, later corrections of the mistakes that pupils have made in written texts. Similar to verbal corrective feedback, this can include both output-prompting (also known as "indirect correction") and input-providing (also known as "direct correction") feedback. Giving students the right form or reformulating the entire text is known as direct correction; pointing out errors that have been made either in the text or in the margin is known as indirect correction. Metalinguistic information may or may not be included with both direct and indirect written remedial comments. However, in the context of writing, the distinction between explicit and implicit corrective feedback becomes less relevant, as all written corrective feedback must be explicit to ensure that students clearly understand they have been corrected.

## 2.5. *Students Writing*

### 2.5.1. *Definition*

The ability to produce in written form is called writing. It is also more difficult than it first appears to be, and even for native language speakers, it frequently appears to be the most difficult talent since it entails more than merely graphically representing speech; rather, it requires the formulation and organized presentation of ideas. There are several definitions for writing.

"A collection of tactile or visible indicators that are used to systematically represent linguistic units in order to record messages that can be retrieved by anybody who is familiar with the language in question and the rules that determine how its units are encoded in the writing system," is how Coulmas (1999) defines a writing system.

According to Hyland (2003), writing is viewed as an extension of grammar, serving as a method to evaluate students' ability to form cohesive sentences and strengthen language patterns through repeated practice.

Nunan, on the other hand, described writing as the mental process of generating ideas and considering how to articulate them into clear sentences and paragraphs for the reader.

The ability of pupils to articulate their ideas and thoughts on a subject in a sentence or paragraph using proper language and grammar is, in summary, known as student writing.

### 2.5.2. *Kinds of Writing*

Writing takes various forms and styles, each offering a way to express mental concepts. Stanley (2006), as cited by Nurhalifah (2017), identifies four types of writing exercises: guided writing/parallel sentences, free writing, composition writing, and guided free writing.

#### (a). Guided writing/parallel sentences

Students write a string of related sentences during guided writing. In writing, they have more latitude. Students can attempt to finish the exercises where the sentence fragments are provided and the completion pattern is defined.

#### (b). Directed toward unrestricted composition

Sentences can be written or arranged to exercise it. Students just copy and complete the phrases using the model that is provided.

#### (c). Free writing

Students have more freedom to express themselves when engaging in free writing. Although the topics are still predetermined and limited, students can use narrative, descriptive, or expository writing to convey their ideas. They can also express their thoughts through writing letters, essays, and research papers.

#### (d). Writing composition

Students need to organize words into grammatically correct sentences and create connections between them to produce written work that clearly communicates the writer's thoughts and opinions on a specific topic. The writing tasks in this study focus on both free composition and structured composition.

### 2.6. *Types of Corrective Feedback in Writing*

When giving pupils written corrective criticism on their writings, the teacher employs a number of strategies. Rod Ellis has classified written corrective feedback into six categories in his journal: direct, indirect, metalinguistic, feedback focus, electronic, and reformulation. The six categories are as follows:

#### (a). Direct corrective feedback

When a teacher provides direct feedback to students, they indicate the correct form of a word, phrase, or morpheme by crossing out the incorrect version and writing the correct form. This type of feedback makes it clear what is wrong and how it should be corrected, so students do not need to figure out the error themselves. The teacher gives the students the correct structure through direct feedback, often by adding missing words, phrases, or morphemes, removing unnecessary ones, and marking the correct form above the incorrect one.

One advantage of direct corrective feedback is that it offers students clear guidance on how to fix their mistakes, which is especially helpful when students are unable to self-correct due to not knowing the correct form. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), direct feedback is likely more effective than indirect feedback for students with lower proficiency levels. However, a drawback is that it requires less cognitive effort from the learner, meaning it may help students produce the correct form when rewriting their work but might not support long-term learning. Conversely, Sheen's (2007) study suggests that direct corrective feedback can be valuable in promoting the acquisition of specific grammatical features.

#### (b). Indirect corrective feedback

Indirect corrective feedback means offering feedback on a student's errors without directly supplying the correct form. This can be achieved by marking the error with a cross in the margin, underlining the mistake, or using symbols to point out omissions in the writing. Essentially, it involves deciding whether or not to indicate the precise location of the error.

Next, Nurhalifah quotes Kaweera & Usaha (2008) as saying, there are two kinds of indirect corrective feedback:

- (1). One form of indirect feedback is coded feedback, also referred to as error identification (Lee, 2004). This occurs when a teacher explicitly acknowledges that a mistake has been made, provides a succinct explanation without offering a correction, and then allows the student to correct the mistake independently (Ferris, 2002). A code sheet with error type codes and meanings was employed in this investigation. Students receive coded feedback from the teacher.
- (2). Uncoded feedback (indirect): The instructor simply highlights, underlines, circles, or places a checkmark in the margin to indicate the mistake (Lee, 2004). Because students self-correct by acknowledging their errors and using what they have learned to correct them, this feedback is more complex.

(c). Metalinguistic corrective feedback

One essential element of An important aspect of metalinguistic corrective feedback is offering students specific information about the types of errors they have made. Explicit feedback can be given in two main ways. Error codes are the most widely used method. These codes are abbreviations representing different types of errors, which can be placed directly over the mistake or in the margin. For example, "prep" may indicate a preposition error, "ww" for a spelling mistake, "t" for tense errors, and "art" for article mistakes. According to Rod Ellis, providing a metalinguistic explanation takes more time than using error codes because it requires the teacher to have sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to explain or correct various errors. This means that teachers must have a broad understanding of grammar to explain it in a way that students can grasp.

But according to research by Sheen, metalinguistic explanation can help students learn more efficiently throughout time and write more accurately in some areas.

(d). The focus of corrective feedback

When talking about corrective feedback, Agustin (2020) distinguishes between two kinds of feedback: focused feedback and unfocused feedback. While both kinds of feedback are useful in their own right, targeted corrective feedback works better. Students will find it easier to understand the form of errors in their writing and obtain the correct form when teachers provide focused corrective feedback because they typically only address one type of error. In contrast, the teacher chooses to correct every mistake made by every student in unfocused corrective feedback. Unfocused corrective feedback is less effective than focused corrective feedback, but it addresses a wider range of writing errors made by students. For this reason, even though it is not as effective in the short term at helping students acquire specific features, unfocused corrective feedback may end up being better in the long run.

(e). Electronic feedback

With this kind of remedial feedback, teachers will give students their critiques via electronic devices. The teacher can add brief metalinguistic remarks to the student's text by using electronic stores. These remarks may also be succinct remarks that address each mistake and include links to online resources that provide the proper format. Corrective feedback can be given in a way that eliminates the need for the teacher to decide what constitutes the proper form, among other benefits. Additionally, this method promotes student independence by letting them choose the correction that best fits their own textual intent.

(f). Reformulation

To "preserve as much of the author's ideas as possible while rephrasing them in their own words so that the writing sounds like it belongs to a native speaker," a native speaker rewrites the student's text (Cohen 1989). Students will be encouraged to think of ways to keep the essence of the original language while making it sound more like a native speaker. Reformulation involves two methods: "direct correction" and "revision," but it differs from

the usual approach in that the student's entire text is rewritten, and it is their responsibility to identify the changes.

### 3. Research Method and Materials

This research used descriptive qualitative methods by observing or exploring social events. This approach was utilized to show what English teachers do while giving their students writing feedback and what kind of input is most acceptable to SMAN 3 Selayar students in Grade XI. Lambert & Lambert (2012) argued that a qualitative descriptive approach should be used when a simple description of a phenomenon is needed. Researchers who want to know what was involved, who was involved, and where events happened will find great assistance with this method.

To "preserve as much of the author's ideas as possible while rephrasing them in their own words so that the writing sounds like it belongs to a native speaker," a native speaker rewrites the student's text (Cohen 1989). Students will be encouraged to think of ways to keep the essence of the original language while making it sound more like a native speaker. Reformulation involves two methods: "direct correction" and "revision," but it differs from the usual approach in that the student's entire text is rewritten, and it is their responsibility to identify the changes.

Sugiyono (2010) states that research instruments are tools that researchers select and use to gather data, making these activities more systematic and easier for them to do. In this research, researcher used three instruments, namely observation checklists to find out and describe the written corrective feedback that teachers use in correcting their students' writing, and what type that most accepted by the students, interview with teachers and also with students to add information about the research objectives to be achieved, and documentation with take pictures during classroom observations and interviews with teachers and students, and also take a picture about students' worksheet that given corrective feedback from the teacher.

Citing from Saleh (2017), it can be said that interactive data analysis methods, or analysis models started by Miles and Huberman, are widely used in qualitative research when conducting data analysis. They disclosed that the processes involved in the analysis of qualitative data are interactive and ongoing, resulting in the saturation of the data. In qualitative data analysis, there are three steps involved: data reduction, data display, and conclusions/verification.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Results

#### 4.1.1. Types of corrective feedback used by teachers on students' English writing

Here is a quick chat with the English teacher regarding the procedures for giving students written comments.

Extract 1 (JH, 9/17/2024)

"...Usually, I immediately mark where the mistake is, I immediately scribble it down and then some explanations are given."

Extract 2 (JH, 9/17/2024)

"...Usually, I only underline or circle certain parts without any error description"

Extract 3 (JH, 9/17/2024)

"...Yes, there are usually students' mistakes in grammar, there I give an error code"

From the answers above, English teachers never give feedback online or called electronic feedback and also rarely give feedback of the focus of feedback and reformulation feedback.

Following the observations, the researcher utilized Rod Ellis' typology of written corrective feedback to categorize the types of input teachers used to address students' errors in English writing. Ellis classifies corrective feedback into six categories: focused and unfocused corrective feedback, electronic feedback, meta-linguistic corrective feedback, direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, and reformulation. The researcher found that teachers applied three of these six types: meta-linguistic corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, and direct corrective feedback.

#### 4.1.1.1. *Direct Corrective Feedback*

The first type of feedback is direct corrective feedback. Based on the results of observations and observations, there were 17 corrections of student writing errors using this type of corrective feedback. According to Ellis, in this type of feedback, the teacher immediately crosses out the wrong word or phrase, then replaces it with the correct word or phrase beside or near the error. In this type of feedback, the teacher does not provide any other explanation other than the correct correction so that students can more easily understand their mistakes. The teacher uses two ways to make corrections. The first is by crossing out, underlining and crossing out the wrong word or phrase, then putting the correction next to and above the wrong word or phrase. Adding missing words to pupils' English sentences or works is the second way that English teachers give direct corrective feedback.

#### 4.1.1.2. *Indirect Corrective Feedback*

Indirect corrective feedback is another type of corrective feedback that English teachers use to assist students in improving their English writing. This kind of corrective feedback uses the same technique as direct corrective feedback, which is to circle and underline the incorrect words or phrases in the students' writing. But the difference is, in indirect corrective feedback the teacher does not provide corrections to the words or phrases that are marked with errors. The researcher found that teachers provide direct corrective feedback with the type of uncoded feedback, where Lee (2004) states that teachers only mark errors with a tick in the margin, circling, underlining, or highlighting them. In this study, the teacher used indirect corrective feedback to remedy 15 errors in the students' English writing. If a pupil writes anything incorrectly, the simplest method to rectify it is to provide them direct corrective comments. The learner fixes the mistake on his own after the teacher simply crosses out the word or phrase with an underline or circle.

#### 4.1.1.3. *Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback*

The next type of feedback found after conducting the research is metalinguistic corrective feedback. Ellis formulated that there are two ways to give feedback according to the metalinguistic type. Both an error code and a brief grammatical explanation are used to provide metalinguistic indications that point to an error. In this study, three students who received feedback using metalinguistic type corrected eight errors. The use of metalinguistic feedback type is very simple, but by providing a short error code, students will find it easier to do future writing, especially in paying attention to grammar, capitalization, and so on.

#### 4.1.2. *The type of corrective feedback most accepted by students*

After observing the types of feedback used by English teachers in correcting students' English writing, the researcher then included several statements in an observation sheet based on the type of feedback the students received from the teacher. In this case, nine students received direct feedback, seven received indirect corrective feedback, and three received metalinguistic corrective feedback. Of the student responses, 108 (52,17%) provide direct corrective feedback, 70 (33,86%) provide indirect corrective feedback, and 29 (14,01%) provide metalinguistic corrective feedback. The observation sheet contained 18 statements expressing gratitude, with various questions regarding students' opinions on the type of feedback they received. According to the responses, students favoured direct corrective feedback over other types. Teachers used three out of the six types of corrective feedback defined in Rod Ellis' theory, and students showed a clear preference for direct corrective feedback.

Indirect corrective feedback is the second type of corrective feedback that teachers use to address students' writing mistakes. In this study, the researcher found that the teacher provided indirect corrective feedback by highlighting and circling the errors without offering any further explanation or description of the mistake. This approach aligns with Ellis' (2009) theory, which suggests that feedback on students' writing errors is given without corrections and is limited to error codes. In this study, the teacher employed an uncoded feedback type of indirect corrective feedback, marking errors with a symbol in the margin, circling, underlining, or highlighting them.

Extract 1 (SS, 10/1/2024)

“After I got the correction with direct corrective feedback, I am more confident to be better in my writing.”

Extract 2 (AI, 10/1/2024)

“My motivation in writing and learning English increased after I got direct correction from my teacher”

Extract 3 (NH, 10/1/2024)

“I think direct corrective feedback is better because it is easier for me to fix my mistakes because there is a description of the fixes”

Extract 4 (NYN, 10/1/2024)

“I think metalinguistic feedback makes it easier for me to identify mistakes even if it's just capitalization”

Extract 5 (NZA, 10/1/2024)

"Yes, I think direct and metalinguistic feedback makes it easier for me to write English, because I know where my mistakes are"

Extract 6 (RSD, 10/1/2024)

“I think direct feedback is the most effective in helping my writing compared to other types of feedback, because the teacher gives a brief description of my mistakes”

Indirect corrective feedback is the second type of corrective feedback that teachers use to address students' writing mistakes. In this study, the researcher found that the teacher provided indirect corrective feedback by highlighting and circling the errors without offering any further explanation or description of the mistake. This approach aligns with Ellis' (2009) theory, which suggests that feedback on students' writing errors is given without corrections and is limited to error codes. In this study, the teacher employed an uncoded feedback type of indirect corrective feedback, marking errors with a symbol in the margin, circling, underlining, or highlighting them.

## 4.2. Discussions

### 4.2.1. Types of corrective feedback used by English teachers based on Rod Ellis' theory

Direct corrective feedback is the first kind of feedback that teachers use to help pupils with their English writing. Teachers give immediate corrective feedback in two methods, according to the study's findings: by striking through, underlining, and crossing out the incorrect form, then replacing it with the proper form above or next to the sentence.

By inserting the missing word in some sentences and placing it above or in front of the sentence, this method is consistent with Ellis' (2009) theory, as cited in Agustin (2020). According to this theory, when using this type of corrective feedback, the teacher shows students the correct form of a word, phrase, or morpheme by crossing out the incorrect form and providing the correct one. Typically, the teacher marks the correct form above or next to the incorrect one, removes unnecessary words, phrases, or morphemes, and inserts the missing elements. Ellis emphasizes that one of the benefits of direct corrective feedback is

that it offers students clear instructions on how to fix their errors. This is especially helpful for students who cannot correct their mistakes because they are unaware of the correct form.

Indirect corrective feedback is the second type of corrective feedback that teachers use to address students' writing mistakes. In this study, the researcher found that the teacher provided indirect corrective feedback by highlighting and circling the errors without offering any further explanation or description of the mistake. This approach aligns with Ellis' (2009) theory, which suggests that feedback on students' writing errors is given without corrections and is limited to error codes. In this study, the teacher employed an uncoded feedback type of indirect corrective feedback, marking errors with a symbol in the margin, circling, underlining, or highlighting them. This supports Lee's argument in Nurhalifah (2017), which states that the teacher only needs to identify an error by highlighting, underlining, circling, or placing a checkmark in the margin. By using indirect corrective feedback, students will learn by themselves in understanding the errors in their writing. Since students must fix their own errors, Agustin (2020) contends that employing indirect corrective feedback may encourage their learning autonomy.

Metalinguistic corrective feedback is the last kind of feedback that English teachers utilize to provide students constructive criticism on their English writing. The study discovered that the instructor used this kind of feedback by highlighting the mistake and then giving a grammatical explanation. The circled part is not one word, but only part of the word, namely the first letter of the word and then write the error code. It is suitable with written from Agustin (2020) suggests that another way to indicate students' errors is through metalinguistic explanation or a brief grammatical description. The instructor offers a grammatical description or explanation at the conclusion of the text that corresponds to the number of errors. Teachers specifically use this input to correct pupils' grammar. By using this type of feedback, students will always remember specific aspects of familiar grammar in their writing that received metalinguistic feedback. In other writings, feedback using metalinguistic feedback is applied in oral form. Similar to Rhomawati (2018), the teacher commented on the students' grammatically incorrect remarks. In terms of metalinguistic feedback, this undoubtedly enhances the theory of corrective feedback.

Basically, the feedback is a hint to the students in improving their writing. It is said in Rhomawati (2018) that corrective feedback can be as a guideline to students if students were incorrect in their writing. In providing corrective feedback, teachers use three types of feedback from Rod Ellis's six theories. Each of these three types has its own goals and benefits for the students, encouraging them to improve their work after receiving error correction and feedback from the English teacher.

#### 4.2.2. *The type of corrective feedback most accepted by students*

Based on the results from the observation sheets and interviews with students, it is clear that direct corrective feedback is the most acceptable type of feedback for the students in class XI 1 at SMAN 3 Selayar. To gather the students' opinions on the type of corrective feedback they found most acceptable, the researcher first completed the observation sheet, which contained several statements adapted from Marrs (2016). From the students' responses, the researcher concluded that direct corrective feedback was the most accepted type in terms of enhancing their writing motivation, grammar knowledge, understanding of their writing errors, and overall improvement in their English writing skills.

The researcher found that, among the six students interviewed, they reported that both direct corrective feedback and metalinguistic corrective feedback had a significant impact on boosting their motivation and confidence. They found these types of feedback especially helpful for improving their writing errors. This aligns with Marrs (2016), who states that the types of feedback that most influence student revisions are requests made in the margin and summary comments on grammar at the end of an assignment. Direct corrective feedback, in particular, was the most frequently received type of feedback, as students found it easier to make improvements with the brief error descriptions provided by the teacher. According to

Agustin (2020), this type of feedback is especially beneficial for students with low proficiency in English, such as those at the beginner level, as it helps them correct their writing mistakes directly. Some students also appreciate metalinguistic feedback, which aids them in understanding the grammar of their English writing. Sheen (2011), as cited in Agustin, suggests that direct written corrective feedback is particularly effective in providing correct forms and metalinguistic explanations, especially for specific grammatical elements.

## 5. Conclusions

Corrective feedback plays a crucial role in improving students' English writing skills, as evidenced by this descriptive study conducted at SMAN 3 Selayar. The study examined three types of corrective feedback employed by teachers, as outlined in Rod Ellis' theory: direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, and metalinguistic corrective feedback. Among 40 instances of error correction provided to 15 students in class XI 1, direct corrective feedback was the most commonly used (17 instances), followed by indirect corrective feedback (15 instances), and metalinguistic corrective feedback (8 instances).

Teachers delivered feedback by marking errors through crossing out, underlining, or circling, and sometimes included error codes or brief explanations. This approach enabled students to effectively identify and comprehend their writing errors, even though the provided descriptions were often limited.

The findings revealed that students regarded direct corrective feedback as the most preferred and beneficial type of feedback. It not only enhanced their motivation and confidence but also proved to be the most effective in helping them identify and correct their writing errors. This indicates that direct corrective feedback aligns closely with the students' needs and preferences, making it an indispensable tool for improving their English writing skills. Overall, English teachers at SMAN 3 Selayar successfully applied three of Rod Ellis' six feedback types, with direct corrective feedback standing out as the most influential in promoting students' language development and self-assurance.

## References

- Abduh, A., Sakkir, G., Rosmaladewi, R., & Andrew, M. (2022). Teachers' Perceptions of English Teaching Strategies in the Current Curriculum Change. *International Journal of Language Education*, 6(4), 437-444.
- Agustin, N. E. (2020). Types of Teacher's Corrective Feedback on Efl Students' Descriptive Writing: Case Study at Mts Wahid Hasyim Pati. Semarang: Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo.
- Ariyani, A., Muhayyang, M., Munir, M., & Sakkir, G. (2023). Students' voices: Poster session as an alternative way of teaching writing. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 97-103.
- Ashrafi, S. &. (2018). The effects of oral, written feedback types on EFL learners' written accuracy: The relevance of learners' perceptions. *Proceedings of the 2nd National Conference on English Language Studies: Applied Linguistics Perspectives on EFL*.
- Astia, M. (2018). Corrective Feedback in English Class. *IJOLTL: Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 111-122.
- Atmowardoyo, H., Sakkir, G., & Sakkir, R. I. (2023). The Characteristics of Good Language Learners in Indonesia EFL Context. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 565-569.
- Carolina Carvalho et al, “. F. (2014). Teacher Feedback: Educational Guidance in Different School Contexts. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219-223.
- Chen, B. D. (2017). Analysing productive learning behaviours for students using immediate corrective feedback in a blended learning environment. *Computers and Education*.
- Coulmas, F. (1999). *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Writing Systems*. Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.

- Cubukcu, F. A. (2020). Corrective feedback preferences of primary school and university students. *Revista Arbitrada Interdisciplinaria Koinonía*.
- Dewi, N. (2022, September). Pengertian Editing dan Peran Editor dalam Proses Editing. Retrieved from Kompasiana: <https://www.kompasiana.com/>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 8.
- Ellis, R. S. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning Volume 2*.
- Ellis, Y. S. (2011). *Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching*. New York: Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning. Routledge.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*, Second Edition. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Feryal Cubukcu & Aksak, K. (2020). Corrective feedback preferences of primary school and university students. *Revista Arbitrada Interdisciplinaria Koinonía*, 489.
- Gass, S. M. (2007). Input, interaction, and output in second language acquisition.
- Hadzic, S. M. (2016). *Oral and Written Teacher Feed-back in an English as a Foreign Language Classroom in Sweden*. Sweden: Linnaeus University.
- Herminus Efrando Pabur, N. V. (2018). A Perspective on Written Corrective Feedback. *Proceeding Universitas Negeri Manado*.
- Hudoyo, H. (1988). *Mathematics - Study and Teaching*. Jakarta: Depdikbud Dikti PPLTK.
- Humaira, S. D. (2022). Teacher's Feedback in Online Teaching-learning Process During Covid-19. *EduCurio Journal*, 125.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Iryana, & Kawasati, R. (2019). *Teknik Pengumpulan Data*. Sorong: Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Sorong.
- Kanyakorn Sermsook, e. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback on EFL Student Writers' Gramatical Improvement. *English Language Teaching*.
- Kaweera, C., & Usaha, S. (2008). The Impact of Different Types of Teacher Written Feedback. *KKU Res J (GS)*.
- Keh, L. (1990). Feedback in Writing Process : A Model and Methods for Implementation. *ELT Journal*.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills. *The Modern Language Journal*.
- Kristanto, V. H. (2018). *Metodologi Penelitian Pedoman Penulisan Karya Tulis Ilmiah (KTI)*. Yogyakarta: CV Budi Utama.
- Küçükali, E. (2017). The Effect of Oral vs . Written Feedback in EFL Writing. *Journal of Applies Linguistics and Language Research*.
- Lambert, V. A. (2013). Qualitative Descriptive Research: An Acceptable Design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, 255-256.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). *Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marrs, S. A. (2016). *Development of the Student Development of the Student Perceptions of Writing Feedback*. Virginia Commonwealth University.
- MISNAWATI, M., Sakkir, G., Puspita, N., Akbar, Z., & Yusriadi, Y. (2021). Student learning interest in COVID-19 pandemic age by blended e-learning (Asynchronous and synchronous).

- In Proceedings of the 11th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management (pp. 6330-6339). IEOM Society International.
- Muhayyang, M., Asriati, & Sakkir, G. (2023). *Dasar-Dasar Penelitian*. Bone: Penerbit CV Cendekiawan Indonesia Timur.
- Muthoharoh, A. (n.d.). *Feedback in Teaching Writing Descriptive Feedback*.
- Natalia F. P, G. C. (2022). The Effect of Corrective Feedbacks on L2 Students' Writing Performance. *Journal of Language*.
- Nawawi, H. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Bidang Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Nazmillah, H. D. (2022). A Study of Teachers' Strategies in Providing Feedback in English Writing Class. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching & Education*.
- Novilda, S. M. (2021). Written Corrective Feedback: Students' Perception and Preferences. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)* .
- Nurhaifah. (2017). *Written Corrective Feedback Applied by English Teacher at The Eighth Grade Students of Smpn 6 Palangka Raya*. Palangka Raya: State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya.
- Rhomawati, L. (2018). *Teacher Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing at Eleventh Grade Students of Smk Dian Kirana 1 Sragen*. Surakarta: Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Richards, J. C. (2013). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). *The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for the Acquisition of L2 Grammar: A Meta-Analysis of the Research*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sheen, Y. (2011). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Shute. (2008). *Focus on Formative Feedback*. Sage Journals.
- Slameto. (1988). *Evaluation of Slameto Education*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Sugiono. (2010). *Educational research methods : quantitative , qualitative and R&D approaches*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Swain. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 125-144.
- Van Beuingen, D. J. (2008). The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Written Accuracy. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 280.
- Zheng, Y. Z. (2020). Examining Students' Responses to Teacher Translation Feedback: Insights from the Perspective of Student Engagement. *Sage Journal*.