

Written Corrective Feedback Employed by Lecturer on Students' Writing

Rulik Setiani^{1*}, Sigit Suharjono²

^{1,2}Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: rulik.setiani@yahoo.com

Received: 17/04/2025 Revised: 30/05/2025 Accepted: 19/06/2025

ABSTRACT

Purpose – The study aims to identify the types of written corrective feedback and find out the types that the lecturer of students' writing frequently employs in her feedback or correction. The background of the study states that written corrective feedback is not only provided to students to develop, motivate, and revise, but also to help them write well.

Methodology – The researcher employed a qualitative descriptive research method. The instrument used was a document. 19 students' writing as documents was analysed.

Findings – the study shows that the lecturer used four types of written corrected feedback among 6 types. There were 1 direct corrective feedback, 332 indirect corrective feedback, 88 focused corrective feedback, and 6 unfocused corrective feedback. The researchers discovered that the lecturer was more likely to use indirect corrective feedback in giving feedback on students' writing.

Novelty – The study may provide practical recommendations for improving writing instruction by showing the effectiveness or challenges of particular feedback types used by lecturer.

Significance – The findings are beneficial to lecturer who teach writing skills, as there are many types of written corrective feedback. Lecturer should vary their feedback when making error corrections in students' written productions. For example, not only can most lecturer employ direct and indirect corrective feedback, but lectures can also employ other types of written corrective feedback, such as metalinguistics or reformulation feedback.

Keywords: Direct corrective feedback; Focused corrective feedback; Indirect corrective feedback; Unfocused corrective feedback; Written corrective feedback.

How to cite: Setiani, R., & Suharjono, S. (2025). Written Corrective Feedback Employed by Lecturer on Students' Writing. *International Journal of Contemporary Studies in Education*. 04(2), pp. 149-156, doi: <https://doi.org/10.56855/ijcse.v4i2.1626>



This is an open-access article under the CC BY license

1. Introduction

Writing skill is one of the most important language skills to be mastered in the language learning process, especially English. Brown (as cited in Budiarta, 2016) states that as one of the productive language skills, writing skill is very important in communication. Writing skill provide opportunities for everyone to communicate through their writing. As a productive skill, language learners are also trained to express their ideas in written form starting from sentences, paragraph, and essay. This becomes important in the development of information and communication technology that continues to advance because writing skill is always used to convey information both online and offline.

In contrast to speaking skill, writing is complex and difficult for students because students must balance several problems in writing such as in terms of grammar, vocabulary, content, and mechanics (use of punctuation, spelling, capitalization, and paragraphing in writing) and this is what makes students feel that writing is difficult. Therefore, writing is not a simple thing. When students write something, they don't just write but they have to pay attention to every aspect of writing both in terms of grammar, vocabulary, content, or mechanics (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, or paragraphing), so that their writing results is good that can be easily understood by readers of the content of their writing, and this is not something that can be done easily, because it must be done with a lot of practice that is done continuously so that the writing is perfect (Lee, 2019).

Universities and colleges are institutions where students are taught many skills, they are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Many skills that students need at university, and the most important is writing. Writing is not only the words you write on a piece of paper, but also the effective communication of complex ideas in the simplest form of words that any layman can understand. That is why it is the most important skill that students need in university life.

A good teaching and learning process in writing courses ideally is when the lecturer explains the stages in writing a paragraph the students pay serious attention to the explanation given by the lecturer, so that if there is something that is not understood students can ask the lecturer. then when the lecturer gives a writing exercise assignment which will be immediately assessed and given feedback by the lecturer, students can use this to ask if there are things that are not understood based on the feedback given by the lecturer, this will be beneficial for students so they can correct the mistakes made in writing, both in terms of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, capitalization and so on. Writing should not be an activity that is taken lightly in the world of education, even though basically writing is a combination of several letters into terms, words, and sentences, or a single unit of language meaning. Samaya & Suryadi (2020) said the benefits of writing in the world of education, writing must be conceptualized by having goals to be achieved in the learning process. In addition, writing must be arranged according to the topic or problem in expressing ideas. Through writing, meaning is conveyed in written form, then it is a process of organizing thoughts about written form to be able to spread inspiration to readers. for students in writing is something that needs to be done to fulfill the requirements in learning assignments.

Writing is a mandatory thing in education and cannot be avoided as an activity for students. Writing because writing activities can help students in making academic compositions, such as writing essays, writing for research reports, for journal research, and the like. Thus, in terms of students' needs, writing occupies the same role as other language skills. While writing is very important, it is a difficult subject. The reason is, writing is a blend of ideas, vocabulary, and grammar. According to Sary, (2019). As a teacher in learning English, providing corrective feedback on students' writing is a pedagogical experience that expects students to develop their writing and grammar skills. Based on this theory, it is said that the teacher has an important role in the students' writing process. It is expected that English students in writing can be understood by readers, in writing English students are required to write because it is one of the subjects that must be studied. Like it or not, foreigners are required to be able to write (Juniardi & Fuziah as cited in Budiana & Mahmud, 2020). To improve English writing results, the response from the teacher or lecturer has an important role in students' writing. One of the lecturer responses to student writing is to provide feedback. Feedback in this study is information conveyed to students to change their thinking or behavior in order to improve the quality of learning outcomes in improving students' writing skills. Feedback can also be defined as a process where the factors that create results can be modified, corrected, and strengthened which has an important role in producing students' writing. In addition, Andriyanti et al (2023) stated that writing allows people to communicate with one other through written language, and maintaining clarity is crucial. Developing effective writing abilities requires practice to better comprehend the themes in each piece of writing (Halawa et al, 2023).

The importance of providing feedback to students so that they can be motivated to improve their writing. Through this feedback, students can find out how far the material that has been taught can be mastered (Sari et al, 2002). Using feedback, students can also correct their own abilities, or in other terms as a means of correcting the progress of their own learning. The importance of feedback in classroom learning is also stated by Wicaksono (2018) namely "We consider feedback to be very important in helping groups and group members learn more about how they operate and about themselves individually. We also think that feedback should be given skillfully. Written corrective feedback is an improvement made to writing, so that students can find out mistakes made in their writing. Corrective feedback can affect writing, with corrective feedback students can improve their writing ideas in writing. Duong & Nguyen (2022) defines written corrective feedback (WCF) to be "correction of grammatical errors for the purpose of increasing students' writing skills accurately".

According to Lee (2019), corrective feedback (CF) refers to remarks regarding the appropriateness or accuracy of learners' output or understanding of a second language. Corrective feedback involves providing the student with every evidence that their use of language or written work is incorrect, including the numerous answers they get. The necessity of giving feedback for students in order that they will be inspired to improve their writing. This feedback allows a learner to determine how well they understand the content that has been

given. Students can use feedback to fix their own capacities, or, in other words, to correct the progression of their own learning (Yoshida, 2008).

Sheen & Ellis (2011), categorizes written corrective feedback into six types: direct feedback, indirect feedback, metalinguistic, Focused and unfocused, electronic feedback, and reformulation feedback. The first is direct feedback, as said Wicaksono (2018), the most explicit feedback design is direct correction. This kind of written corrective feedback provides the right response in addition to pointing out the mistake. According to Rahimi (2014), direct written corrective feedback is most effective when it gives proper form and metalinguistic reasoning, particularly for specific grammatical qualities. Based on corrected descriptions, direct feedback can have a very substantial influence on improving writing for students and they who are confused by their writing errors. The second is indirect feedback is underlining and the use of cursors to highlight omissions in the student's writing are examples of identifying and locating errors (Idul (2020), this is only a notice in the margins that an error or mistake has happened in one line of text. The third is metalinguistic, according to Sheen & Ellis (2011), subjects only give metalinguistic instructions to correct student errors. Because the teacher instructs the student on his errors, the student revises all of them in response to the criticism. All errors are produced by omissions and additions, and pupils instantly convert to the proper form depending on the teacher's instructions. The fourth is focused feedback means that the teacher corrects only one type of error, but unfocused feedback implies that the teacher can correct the majority of errors Rahimi (2021). The fifth Electronic feedback is an interesting technique for teachers to electronically check students' writing progress. In this style, the teacher can also supply hyperlinks or files to help students improve their writing. The teacher uses technological equipment to provide brief linguistic remarks on students' written work (Sheen & Ellis, 2011), and the last is reformulation feedback entails native speakers revising entire student texts to make the language appear as authentic as possible while preserving the original content. In this kind, the instructor makes modifications with the goal of students using the teacher's repair for improved student learning processes in future writing work.

2. Methods

A qualitative descriptive research design is employed in this study. Creswell (2014) define qualitative methodology as a research strategy that generates descriptive data from observed behaviour and written or spoken words from people. A researcher's queries are the focus of qualitative descriptive analysis. According to this inductive flow, qualitative descriptive research starts with an explanatory process or event from which a generalization may be made at the end, marking the process or event's conclusion. A straightforward qualitative inductive flow technique serves as the foundation for the research methodology. Descriptive analysis of the data will be done, and the results will be given in sentences.

2.1 Research Instrument

The research instrument is the method employed by the researcher to collect the essential data; it is also a critical phase in the research process. According to Nasution (2016) "research instruments" as "tools" are means that can be realized in objects, such as questionnaires,

checklists or interview guides, observation sheets, test questions (which are sometimes only considered "tests"), inventories, scales, document, and so on. The instrument that the researchers used is document, the document in this case was the students' writing result.

2.2 Data Collection Technique

The data of this study were taken from the fourth semester students' writing of the English Education Study Program of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi North Lampung, which consisted of 19 students.

2.3 Data Analysis Technique

According to Frankel (2021), in this study, to collect data use in descriptive qualitative research. The first, researchers reviewed all documents to get the type of written corrective feedback used by the lecturer; the second, the researchers identified the types of written corrective feedback on writing; the third, the researchers interpreted the research result based on each written corrective feedback.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

To get the results of the research data, researchers analyzed 19 students' writing data that had been given written corrective feedback by the lecturer on 2 June 2025. after the researchers analyzed, the researchers also calculated the total types of what the lecturer used. Researchers obtained the results of data analysis explained based on table following:

Table 1 - The Result of Written Corrective Feedback Employed by the Lecturer

| No. | Student | Types of Written Corrective Feedback | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------|-------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| | | Direct | Indirect | Metalinguistic | Focus | Unfocused | Electronic | Reformulation |
| 1. | AM | - | 4 | - | 5 | 1 | - | - |
| 2. | AA | - | 20 | - | 2 | - | - | - |
| 3. | AS | - | 27 | - | 5 | - | - | - |
| 4. | AO | - | 33 | - | 3 | 1 | - | - |
| 5. | DEPF | - | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| 6. | ES | - | 9 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| 7. | ERDI | - | 10 | - | 7 | - | - | - |
| 8. | MNA | - | 21 | - | 2 | 1 | - | - |
| 9. | ONM | - | 8 | - | - | 1 | - | - |
| 10. | R | 1 | 16 | - | 7 | - | - | - |
| 11. | SMP | - | 16 | - | 5 | - | - | - |
| 12. | YN | - | 34 | - | 15 | - | - | - |
| 13. | AL | - | 13 | - | 3 | - | - | - |
| 14. | ASSP | - | 30 | - | 9 | - | - | - |
| 15. | DL | - | 15 | - | 9 | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|---|-----|---|----|---|---|---|
| 16. | MAP | - | 28 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| 17. | MO | - | 8 | - | 5 | - | - | - |
| 18. | MMAF | - | 22 | - | 1 | - | - | - |
| 19. | NPD | - | 16 | - | 6 | - | - | - |
| Total | | 1 | 332 | - | 88 | 6 | - | - |

3.2 Discussion

Findings of this study show that lecturer employed four types of written corrected feedback among 6 other types. There were 1 direct corrective feedback, 332 indirect corrective feedback, 88 focused corrective feedback, and 6 unfocused corrective feedback. The researchers discovered that the lecturer was more likely to use indirect corrective feedback in giving feedback of students' writing. In line with the previous related research conducted by Muhayyang et al (2020) that corrective feedback provided by lecturer during the learning process plays a very effective role in stimulating and fostering students' learning motivation. This means that the feedback is positive because it motivates them to revise the errors pointed out, both directly and indirectly, and acts as a motivator, encouraging students to correct the errors pointed out. Thus, lecturer embody positive behavior in the form of neutral information regarding students' abilities, in the form of corrections, criticism, or explanations of errors made in completing assigned assignments. This is intended to improve performance and stimulate their learning motivation to perform and achieve maximum results in the teaching and learning process, particularly in writing skills. It is relevant with the previous research conducted by Wahyuningsih (2020) that corrective feedback is beneficial for identifying errors, there have been mistakes committed by students in their writing. Therefore, it must be corrected by the lecturer for students' writing to be clear and significant. Corrective feedback is essential for identifying errors in a student's writing performance in addition to corrections. Additionally, the corrective feedback offers improved revisions and mistake diagnostics.

Based on those four types of written corrective feedback, indirect feedback is the most commonly used by the lecturer to correct students' writing because indirect feedback may have a longer-term favourable impact on writing correctness (Li, 2010) stated but direct feedback is believed to be more beneficial for beginning level learners (Ferris, 2002), another reason is the lecturer expected their students to study their mistakes and correct them by themselves. Lecturer feedback practice is a reciprocal and dynamic process, introspective methods, such as stimulated-recall interviews or journal entries, can be used to explore their cognition of feedback practice.

4. Conclusions

Based on the research finding that the researchers concluded that the lecturer employed written corrective feedback to check and correct 16 students' writing from the fourth semester students of English Education Study Program of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi North Lampung in the academic year 2024/2025, the written corrective feedback used is direct indirect which consist of 1, 332 is indirect, 88 focus, and 6 is infocus. It can be concluded that

the lecturer did not use all types of written corrective feedback; she only used 4 from 6 types, and the most dominantly used by the lecturer to give the written corrective feedback is indirect corrective feedback. Based on the research results, the researcher intends to provide some suggestions to lecturer who teach writing skills. there are many types of written corrective feedback. Lecturer should vary their feedback when making error corrections in students' written productions. For example, not only can most lecturer employ direct and indirect corrective feedback, but teachers can also employ other types of written corrective feedback, such as metalinguistics or reformulation feedback.

Acknowledgments

The researchers convey their gratitude to the Rector of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi, the Dean of FKIP Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi, LPPM of Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi, and also the fourth semester English Education Study Program students who served as research subjects and all other participants who were unable to be named individually for their contributions to the successful completion of this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Andriyanti, F., Pratiwi, D., & Yunda, D. (2023). Improving Students Writing Skills through Canva Application at SMP Muhammadiyah Imogiri Yogyakarta. *International Journal of Contemporary Studies in Education*. Vol. 02 No. 02 (2023) 119-126.
- Bitchener, F., Muhayyang, M., & Ariyani, A. (2020). The Effect Of Lecturer's Corrective Feedback On Students Writing Motivation. *Proceeding of The International Conference on Science and Advanced Technology (ICSAT)*, 3, 556–563.
- Budiana, H., & Mahmud, M. (2020). Indirect Written Corrective Feedback (Wcf) in Teaching Writing. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 8(1), 60. <https://doi.org/10.33603/perspective.v8i1.3398>.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Approches Fourth Edition*. California: SAGE.
- Duong, T. M., & Nguyen, T. N. (2022). Providing written corrective feedback in IELTS writing task 2: EFL teachers' practices. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(1), 251–256. <https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2022.43.1.34>.
- Halawa, N., Zalukhu, L., Lahagu, M. L., & Laoli, J. (2023). Improving Students' Short Story Writing Skills: A Study on the Effects of Problem Based Learning with Image Media. *International Journal of Contemporary Studies in Education*. Vol. 2 No. 2 (2023) p. 137-148.
- Idul, A. H. D. R. (2020). Preferensi Peserta Didik Terhadap Umpan Balik Guru Pada Kemampuan Menulis Bahasa Inggris Di Sekolah Menengah Kawasan Teluk Tomini. *Jurnal KIBASP (Kajian Bahasa, Sastra Dan Pengajaran)*, 4(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31539/kibasp.v4i1.1509>.
- Lee, I. (2019). Teacher Written Corrective Feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching*, 52(4), 524–536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247>.
- Muhayyang, M., Ariyani, A., & Hasriani (2020). The Effect of Lecturer's Corrective Feedback on

- Students Writing Motivation. *Proceeding of The International Conference on Science and Advanced Technology (ICSAT)*.
- Nasution, H. F. (2016). Instrumen penelitian dan urgensinya dalam penelitian kuantitatif. *Al-Masharif: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Dan Keislaman*, 4(1), 59-75.
- Rahimi, M. (2021). A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(5), 687-710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819879182>
- Rulik Setiani. (2021). Peer Assessment Effect On Students' Writing Perfoemance. *Jurnal Elsa*, 19(1), 15-23.
- Ramadhani, N. I. (2021). An Error Analysis in Writing Cause and Effect Essay of the Fourth Semester Students in PGRI Wiranegara University. *Enreal: English Research and Literacy Journal*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Rass, R. A. (2015). Challenges Face Arab Students in Writing Well-Developed Paragraphs in English. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10), 49-59.
- Samaya, D., & Suryadi, E. (2020). *Improving Writing Skill of Research Proposal Through Mind Mapping of Economics Faculty Students of Tridinanti University Palembang*. 422(Icope 2019), 118-122. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200323.102>
- Sari, C. F., Suryaman, M., & Yanto, E. S. (2022). Students' Emotional Responses Toward Teacher'S Direct Written Corrective Feedback. *Eltin Journal : Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 10(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v10i1.p23-30>
- Sary, H. A. (2019). Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback and Students' Development In Paragraph Writing at The Second Semester of English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Kotabumi Academic YYear 2018/2019. *Griya Cendikia*, 6(2), 215-224.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 2, 593-610. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203836507.ch36>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2020) . The Role of Corrective Feedback on Academic Writing Performance: EFL Students' Perceptions. *Edulingua: Jurnal Linguistiks Terapan dan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, 7 (1), 14-21.
- Wicaksono, W. P. (2018). Types and Frequencies of Written Corrective Feedbacks in Adult ESL Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies (IJELS)*, 3(2), 60-67. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v3i2.1065>.
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2020) Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by University English Lecturers: A Teacher Cognition Perspective. *University International College, Macau University of Science and Technology*, 1-12.