

EXPLORING EFL STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ON TEACHERS' WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENCOURAGING STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS

Octaviani Putri Pertiwi¹, Ashadi²

Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Email: octavianiputri.2021@student.uny.ac.id¹, ashadi@uny.ac.id²

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Keywords: Written corrective feedback, academic writing, EFL learners, error correction, writing skills</p>	<p><i>Writing is often perceived as a challenging task, particularly for EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students who frequently struggle with confidence in their writing abilities. Although teacher feedback can be beneficial, it can sometimes exacerbate feelings of inadequacy. This study aims to explore several key areas: students' preferences for written corrective feedback (WCF), the impact of gender on these preferences, effective types of WCF to enhance learning, and how feedback can facilitate students' mastery of academic writing. The research highlights various complex skills involved in writing, such as planning, organization, coherence, and grammatical accuracy, which students often find problematic. Negative experiences with inadequate types of WCF have led to dissatisfaction among students, indicating a need for more effective feedback mechanisms. The study examines six WCF types: direct, indirect, focused, unfocused, metalinguistic, and reformulation feedback. Utilizing an explanatory mixed-method design, it combined quantitative data from a questionnaire completed by 211 English majors at two public universities in Yogyakarta, with qualitative data gathered from semi-structured interviews with four students. Analysis revealed a clear preference for direct WCF, which helps reduce confusion. A combination of direct and indirect feedback can enhance students' awareness of their writing errors. Interestingly, gender did not significantly influence WCF preferences. Ultimately, feedback tailored to students' needs, particularly through reformulation, proved to be the most effective for improving their writing skills.</i></p>

INTRODUCTION

Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) is complex. Due to the demand for global education, students are required to learn English and master the four skills. One skill to be discussed is writing skill. Writing is considered one of the most challenging skills in learning English. As stated by Derakhsan and Shirejeni (2020), several EFL students mentioned that rhetorical structures, words, organization, paragraph coherence, punctuation, spelling, and grammar are the difficult parts of writing. Errors in writing are accidental mistakes where the writer does not follow the systematic writing rules. As a human, errors in writing could occur because of ignorance, nescience, unconsciousness, and unawareness from the writer. Giving corrective feedback is one of the ways to repair the errors in the student's writing. The teacher gives written Corrective feedback (WCF) with the kind of types. When a teacher gives corrective feedback that indicates the learner implicitly or explicitly has an error in their output (Suzuki et al., 2019). It is widely known that corrective feedback is used when students make classroom language learning mistakes.

The students' beliefs revealed some dissatisfaction with written corrective feedback that was mentioned by McConlogue (2020); some reasons make students dissatisfied with feedback: students dissatisfied with the quantity of feedback because feedback was given to the group, not to the individual; feedback is not helpful for the next assignment; students do not understand the feedback given; students feel overburdened with the assignment; dependency on exams; the affective dimension; teacher use unsupported teaching assistants; the quality and consistency of feedback were not standard; and the diversity of assessment make student confuse. There are many strengths of implementing oral or written corrective feedback.

Students believe that corrective feedback provides the repair toward teacher teaching practice in the classroom. The study from (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010) revealed the students' perspective on their teacher's corrective feedback, which the teacher is expected to provide many corrective feedback on as many errors as possible and not only to the selected point; the teacher also needs to explain the error not only do the mark on the error. Teachers are responsible for their feedback, and they are forbidden to let their students confuse the feedback. The study from (Chen et al., 2016) revealed a positive perspective from students about WCF that indicates WCF can help identify recurring errors and provide further improvement in students' writing quality; English writing needs more accuracy and form than spoken language. Students expect that teachers feel responsible for giving them enough corrective feedback as their correction to improve their writing (Derakhasan & Shirejini, 2020).

Investigating students' written feedback type preferences increases teachers' awareness in responding to students' errors. Mostly, students struggle with their writing. The lack of teachers' awareness of students' needs differences can impact students' learning motivation. Selective and suitable error correction prevents students from being misunderstood. Then, teachers could learn and identify students' needs based on their influencing factors to apply appropriate written corrective feedback on students' writing. Individual language learning capacity highly contributes to students' various preferences. Differences in proficiency level, first language, motivation, and language aptitude mainly affect the effectiveness of different students' written corrective feedback preferences (Benson & DeKeyser, 2019). Furthermore, many factors that can influence and change students WCF preferences. Gender is one of the factors that interest to discuss. Gender aspects on students' WCF may be significant to survey to differentiate teachers' treatment while providing corrective feedback. Furthermore, gender can influence how students engage and communicate with their teachers. As a result, this aspect warrants more investigation. According to Jahbel (2020), many factors can influence students' preferences might include students' expectations, motivation, age, and gender.

A previous related study also found that the effect of error correction on increasing students' L2 writing skills had no significant effect on students' writing; the types of feedback also did not significantly affect accuracy (Bitchener, 2008). Students' perspectives about written corrective feedback can help teachers and researchers find the practical procedure for written corrective feedback, which can increase the development of teaching and learning foreign languages and improve future education. Teachers will know how to select the types of corrective feedback and avoid what students dislike based on their beliefs. Then, the study by (Zhang et al., 2021) stated that the participants were preferable for metalinguistic corrective feedback explanations for grammatical and orthographic errors.

This research important to conduct to inform and influence teachers about student's preferences and giving students an opportunity to act on the teachers' commentary. This research make student will receive proper feedback and faster their writing progress, quality, and quantity. However, many previous studies have been conducted to find the most effective types of WCF students prefer and used single method which closed-ended questionnaire to find students' preferences which the result were fix answer. Nevertheless, this study aims to upgrade the previous findings and find out the factors that can influence students' performance in writing that are related to the WCF students receive and try to break the boundaries in the previous study by mixing the method and used open-ended questions through interview to explore the variety from students' answers.

METHOD

This chapter defines the research design, research setting, research subject, research instruments, data collection techniques, research instruments, data analysis techniques, validity, and reliability. First, research design describes the theoretical foundation and approach used in the investigation. Second, research setting outlines the precise context where the research took place, including specifics about the location and the timeframe. Third, research subjects focus on the study's population and sample selection criteria. Fourth, data collection techniques and instrument discuss about the detailed information regarding the procedures used to collect data, together with descriptions of the devices utilized. Fifth, data analysis section elaborates on the processes used to analyze the collected data. Last, validity and reliability discuss to measure the rigor and credibility of this research.

This study intends in finding students' preferences for teachers' written corrective feedback. Based on those aims, a mixed-method research design used in this study. A mixed-method design was chosen to deepen the findings that need to be explored and to discover the EFL students' preferences for teacher's written corrective

feedback. As stated by (Leavy, 2017), Mixed-method research (MMR) refers to the collection, analysis, and integration of quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or project.

This research design can help researchers dig the answer and find new insight into students' complex needs. As stated by (Cohen, 2018), mixed-method research is more comprehensive to obtain than single methods approach and answer complex research questions. In this study, mixed- a mixed-method design is needed to integrate quantitative and qualitative data into one research. This type of study enabled me to understand complex phenomena qualitatively as well as to explain the phenomena through numbers, charts, and basic statistical analyses.

Specifically, I used an explanatory mix-method research design that consist of quantitative data then followed by qualitative data (Creswell, 2012). In this design, the first stage is collecting and analyzing quantitative data, followed by collecting qualitative data that builds on the initial quantitative results. The data priority of this design is quantitative data, followed by collecting qualitative data to refine the result of quantitative data. As stated by (Creswell & Creswell, 2017), explanatory sequential design is a method that involves two phases of data, which are quantitative as the first phase and followed up with qualitative phases based on the result of quantitative data analysis.

In the quantitative phase, information was gathered about the types of written corrective feedback as student preferences to encourage their academic writing performance. Then, the qualitative phase was conducted by in-depth conversations with students to collect their reasons or arguments about their preferences. The quantitative and qualitative data in the questionnaire and interview were elaborated on, and each data was strengthened.

The population used for this study consist of English language students in two public university in Yogyakarta who enrolled in academic writing class during even semester in 2023-2024 academic year. The total population was 441 students. This population used to gather the data for questionnaire as the main data in this study. In the quantitative phase, simple random sampling was chosen because each member of the research population has an equal chance of being chosen, and the selection of one individual does not affect the selection of others. According to (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Simple random sampling is the most common and reliable method for probability sampling from a population. Simple random sampling ensures that all individuals (or units, such as schools) have an equal chance of being selected from the population. Simple random sampling is intended to select individuals who are representative of the population. Bias in the population will be evenly distributed across those picked.

Population on this study were students who enrolled in Academic writing courses during 2023/2024 academic year. Researchers may include instances or individuals in their sample if they believe they are relevant to the study (Taherdoost, 2016). To determine the sample size, the researcher consider using slovin's formula. A suitable sample size for research is from 30 to 500 (Sugiyono, 2013). Slovin's formula is used to determine the minimal sample size required to estimate a statistic with a reasonable margin of error (Pannulla et al., 2023). The formula used is as follows:

$$n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$$
$$n = 441 / (1 + 441(0.05)^2)$$
$$n = 209.750$$

- 1) n = Sample size needed
- 2) n = Population size
- 3) e = Acceptable margin of error

To be conservative, the researcher rounds up to the nearest integer and include 209 individuals for the research sample.

For the qualitative phase, snowball sampling was used to specify the participants. Then, snowball sampling involves selecting a small number of persons based on specific traits. These individuals are then utilized as informants to identify. I used this sampling because this possible sampling to reach the participants individually. Only a few students who were consented to be participants of this study. Then, the participants of interview in this study consisting of 2 females and 2 males. One student was chosen by recommendation of their lecturer and then they recommended other available students as next participants. Similarly, (Johnson & Christensen, 2024) asserted that snowball sampling is the technique of asking each research participant to identify or suggest someone else who might participate. The following table is detailed information from the universities and the number of populations:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

Data Descriptions

Because of time limitations in collecting the data and restricted permission access to some universities, this research only administered the questionnaire at two public universities in Yogyakarta. The total participants in this research were 211 English language students from the English Language Department who enrolled in academic writing courses. Based on the data presented, 56%, or 118 participants, were female. Meanwhile, 44%, or 93 participants, were male. Table 1 below shows how female students dominated the participants in this research.

Table 1. Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	93	44.1	44.1	44.1
	Female	118	55.9	55.9	100.0
	Total	211	100.0	100.0	

In the second phase of this research, the interview section was conducted after distributing the questionnaire to 4 participants, two male and two female students, who participated in this study collected through snowball sampling technique. The snowball sampling approach is a technique for selecting data sources that are initially small but subsequently grow larger. This is because the tiny data sources need to produce sufficient data, thus looking for more informants to utilize as data sources.

Types of WCF that EFL learners prefer in encouraging them to improve academic writing skills

The main aim of this study was to explore the actual practices of students' written corrective feedback preferences regarding English language students in public universities in Yogyakarta. In more detail clarification, the researcher employed a student-written feedback preferences survey to answer the first, second, and fourth questions. In the first research question, this study focuses on finding students' written feedback preferences using a questionnaire in the first phase, followed by the interview phase. The total number of statements was 15, with the statement for student preferences from items 1 to 11. The statements were categorized into six categories: direct, indirect, focus, unfocused, metalinguistic, and reformulation written corrective feedback. The result was revealed using descriptive statistics that consist of minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values. The remark is explained as interpreting the mean value based on the Likert-scale interval. As illustrated in Table 9, it could be seen that standard deviation values show diversity in the respondents' answers to the given statements. The greater the standard deviation value, the more varied the respondents' answers for these statements. The total mean for all items is (M=3.05), which seemed to be a high score degree of out the four scale format. From the table, it could be revealed that statements cited between (M=3.28) and (M=4.00) were ranked as high scores.

Items	Statements	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
1	You want the lecturer to provide corrections by including examples directly in your writing.	2	4	3.45	.626	Very Good
2	You want to provide feedback in a way (cross out/underline/circle), but there	1	4	2.46	1.039	Poor

	is no written explanation or correction.					
3	You want the lecturer to give you error codes such as (? , x, w(wrong) as clues to correct errors in your writing.	1	4	3.12	.787	Good
4	You want the lecturer to pay attention to all identified errors.	1	4	3.26	.718	Good
5	You want your lecturer only to pay attention to certain types of errors.	1	4	2.45	.937	Poor
6	You want your lecturer to correct errors by rewriting the content or meaning of the text. .	1	4	3.20	.738	Good
7	You want the lecturer to only comment on the content in your writing.	1	4	2.76	.900	Good
8	You want the lecturer to provide feedback focusing on errors in nouns and verbs, auxiliary articles, or one particular sentence part.	1	4	3.04	.812	Good
9	You want the lecturer to respond on errors in the wrong order, missing/wrong words, or the overall structure of a sentence.	1	4	3.14	.778	Good
10	You want your lecturer to focus on unity, coherence, development, and clarity of ideas.	1	4	3.28	.700	Very Good
11	You want the lecturer to provide feedback and comments on every mistake you make.	1	4	3.45	.677	Very Good
Total				3.05		Good

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Preferences.

As the table shows, the students' responses from the result revealed the statements (2. You want to provide feedback in a way (cross out/underline/circle), but there is no written explanation or correction) (M= 2.46); this suggests that students tend to refuse to receive feedback in the form of indirect written corrective feedback because the feedback sign without explanation is confusing. Then, the statement (5. You want your lecturer only to pay attention to certain types of errors) (M=2.45) indicated that some students avoid receiving feedback only on specific parts or focused written corrective feedback in their writing. These two statements were recorded as the lowest score based on Likert-scale interval categories and remarked as "poor" categories, considered less efficient in improving students' writing skills.

Nonetheless, the table also shows the higher mean score from the three statements (1. You want the lecturer to provide corrections by including examples directly in your writing) (M=3.45), which obviously, the students expect teachers to supply direct error correction in students' writing task. Then, the statement (10. You want your

lecturer to focus on unity, coherence, development, and clarity of ideas) (M=3.28) indicated that most students prefer to receive corrective feedback on the content of their academic writing. The last high score statement was (11. You want the lecturer to provide feedback comments on every mistake you make) (M=3.45), which indicated the teacher should supply more correction on the whole mistake of students' writing or using unfocused written corrective feedback. These three statements were recorded as the highest score and remarked as "very good" based on the Likert-scale interval. Based on the result, the students prefer direct written feedback and unfocused written corrective feedback. These types of feedback become students' favourite feedback types because it could make it easier for them to understand mistakes in writing. Those kinds of types were trusted to help students improve their writing skills.

The quantitative data could be refined with the qualitative data. In the qualitative phase, the findings related to the student's preferences for teacher-written corrective feedback were collected through interviews with four students. In this section, the researcher gains the types of students' WCF preferences and the reason behind them. So, the aim was to gain deeper information about students' preferences based on their experiences. To get more insight into feedback, the excerpts from the interview showed students' preferences for teacher-written corrective feedback.

Based on the students' interviews, it can be concluded that students prefer to receive direct feedback on their writing. Direct or immediate feedback was favoured since it may help students recognize incorrect language use and find solutions to their language problems. Then, most of the responds was mentioned about circling or giving a sign to the target error and immediately giving the correct form behind them.

"It's probably the same as before. The lecturer should detail correcting the mistakes, such as how and what was wrong with my writing. Then, the lecturer can also explain how to fix it directly". (Student 1)

"It's marked like that. It's like giving a circle underlined to the error words and then providing the comment below them." (Student 2)

"I Prefer the teacher to put a circle, underline, or mark so that we as students can understand, oh, it turns out this part needs to be corrected, and this part is still wrong. Or maybe if the error is complex in one sentence or paragraph, specific notes can be given..." (Student 3)

"In my opinion, in order for me to understand, I should have been told that this was wrong, told where the error was..." (Student 4)

Additionally, most of the students prefer to receive indirect and combined direct feedback because they told teachers rarely supply them with direct correction forms or metalinguistic explanations. As Student 4 stated: "I don't like it when the lecturer crosses it out, keeps saying replace it. Even though we are not told what's wrong with us, we are going to change it. That's what I think is difficult". The other student mentioned clearly about feedback that teachers should provide during corrections to improve the quality of students writing that can combine between direct and indirect feedback. . ." My opinion, direct and indirect feedback can be combined... (Student 3)

Furthermore, the main result from the questionnaire and interviews revealed the same answer that indicated direct written corrective feedback is the appropriate and suitable written corrective feedback to support their academic writing journey at a higher education level.

Student's Gender Effects on Their Preferences for Corrective Feedback

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare EFL male and female students' preferences for six varieties of WCF. In this part, the researcher analyzed the data using t-test to compare students' preferences between male and female students. Furthermore, before conducting t-test independent, the researcher observed value distribution of the distribution using normality test. Normality tests determine if a data collection is well-modeled by a normal distribution and evaluate the likelihood that a random variable underlying the data set is normally distributed (Martin & Bridgmon, 2012). This test is performed to assess whether the data is regularly distributed, which is a prerequisite for comparative analysis. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used with SPSS software; data is considered normally distributed if the significance value (sig.) is greater than 0.05, and vice versa. The outcome of the normalcy test is as follows:

Table 3. Result of Normality Test
Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statisti			Statisti		
	c	df	Sig.	c	df	Sig.
Focused	.126	211	.000	.966	211	.000
Unfocused	.168	211	.000	.876	211	.000
Metalinguis tic	.198	211	.000	.899	211	.000

Direct	.332	211	.000	.732	211	.000
Indirect	.194	211	.000	.873	211	.000
Reformulat ion	.249	211	.000	.800	211	.000

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the output table above, the significance value for all data groups shows a significance value of $0.000 > 0.05$, meaning that all data is normally distributed.

Then, Homogeneity test was conducted as the other required test in analyzing t-test independent after normality test. The homogeneity test is a testing method in statistics to find out whether two or more samples from different populations have the same distribution of variance or characteristics. If the significance value (sig.) is greater than 0.05 then the variance of the two groups is homogeneous or the same, and vice versa. The table of homogeneity test results is as follows.

Table 4. Result of Homogeneity Test
Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Focused	5.612	1	209	.019
Unfocused	.298	1	209	.586
Metalinguis tic	2.996	1	209	.085
Direct	.885	1	209	.348
Indirect	.596	1	209	.441
Reformulat ion	.291	1	209	.590

Based on the output above, five homogeneous data groups were obtained and 1 data group, namely the focused group, was not homogeneous. If there is one variant whose results are not homogeneous, the independent t-test can still be carried out, but the decision is made based on the results table in the SPSS output "Equal variances not assumed".

The researcher compared the means of the student preferences questionnaire among six types and genders using a t-test. This test was carried out to compare two unpaired samples in this study to determine the average difference between data groups based on gender. The basis for decision making in this test is if the Sig (2-tailed) value in the "Equal variances assumed" section is <0.05 then it can be concluded that there is an average difference between the male and female data groups.

Table 5. Summary of Independent Sample T-test
Gender

Types of Feedback	Gender		Equal Variances Assumed
	Female	Male	
	Mean(Standard deviations)		
Focused	8.32 (1.95)	8.18 (1.58)	.562
Unfocused	10.04(1.42)	9.93 (1.62)	.607
Direct	3.46 (.647)	3.44 (.600)	.830
Indirect	2.57 (1.05)	2.33 (1.02)	.101
Metalinguistic	6.23 (1.14)	6.29 (1.32)	.758
Reformulation	3.22 (.712)	3.19 (.773)	.772

A first interpretation for Focused feedback, the female score is (M=8.32), and the male score is (M=8.18), where there was a difference of 0.14, with the male score being higher than the female. Based on the homogeneity test, focused feedback was not homogeny, the value added from equal variances not assumed, the value of significance is $0.562 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between focused preferences on male and female students. In unfocused feedback, the female score is (M=10.04), and the male score is (9.93), with a difference of 0.011, with the female score being higher than the male students. Based on the output above, the value of significance is $0.607 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between unfocused preferences on male and female students.

Furthermore, for direct feedback that the mean score for females is (M=3.46) and the mean score for male students is (M=3.44), where there was a difference of 0.02 with the mean score for female students being higher than male students. The value of significance is $0.830 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between direct preference on male and female students. For indirect feedback, the mean score for females was (M=2.57), and the mean score for male students was (M=2.33), with a significant difference of 0.24, with female scores higher than males. Based on the output from equal variances assumed the value of significance is $0.101 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between indirect preference on male and female students.

Next, the table shows, in the metalinguistic feedback, the female mean score was (M=6.23), and the male's score was (M=6.29), which was a difference of 0.06, with the male score higher than the female. Based on the output above, it can be seen Based on the output above, the value of focused significance is $0.574 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between focused preferences on male and female students. Last, in the reformulation feedback, the female score was (M=3.22), and the male score was (M=3.19). A difference of 0.03 between female and male students indicated that the female score was higher than the male students. Then, the value of significance is $0.772 > 0.05$ so it can be interpreted that there is no average difference between reformulation preferences on male and female students.

From the result showed, among the six types of unfocused feedback is become types with the high score mean. The result suggests that there is no significant differences of teacher written corrective feedback preferences between female and male student. The finding indicated that gender cannot influence university students about feedback preferences.

Types of WCF regarded as suitable for encouraging further writing improvement

To answer the third research question, which explored students' preferences on types of written corrective feedback in improving student writing for students further writing assignment. Further details about the students' preferences in the types of written corrective feedback that can enhance student further writing were also revealed through an interview session with four participants. In this section researcher revealed and compare the answer from the four participants about the effective feedback for their writing. There are two findings regarding students' preferences based on interviews. First, they argued that teachers should be focused on specific aspects during correcting their writing to avoid confusion. As stated in the comments below:

"Focusing on mistakes allows for more targeted improvement. "If the guidance is explicit and exhaustive, I'll be confused about what to do first" (Student 1).

"More details so we don't get confused. For example, error A could perhaps be explained further, such as where the error was. Maybe the lecturer could also advise on how to correct them." (Student 2)

At the same time, they expect not only getting feedback in the focusing are but also should be clear with direct form. This finding can help them to increase their writing skill. So, focused direct WCF is the feedback that they prefer as the effective feedback types for their writing improvement:

"In my point of view, maybe the feedback should be clear. For example, if there is a mistake, let us know whether it's crossed out in writing or directly verbally so that we understand where the mistake is and what needs to be corrected. If it's just a sign or code that this is wrong, we're still confused about where it went wrong". (Student 1)

Maybe the lecturer could also give advice on how it should be corrected the mistakes directly..." (Student 2),

Perhaps, all of their preferences answer is coming from their experiences toward writing learning because academic writing is obviously hard for to learn for most of students so to support their writing the teachers need to attend students' preferences. As stated by student 4: "In my opinion, academic writing courses are very difficult, because we have to know structure, unity, cohesion and so on..."

Surprisingly, one student mentioned the different answer about his feedback preferences. This one student better to receive feedback in the form of a revised version of their initial text in order to make sure the correct form and the students will get deeper understanding about the mistakes. This kind of feedback is called as reformulation written corrective feedback.

"Yes, for now maybe I would prefer teacher to replace mistake entirely. So, it was explained properly by the lecturer, oh this is like that..." (Student 4)

From the result of the whole interviews, most of the participants have the similarity about their preferences about teacher written corrective feedback as the effective types to improve students writing skills. Direct written corrective feedback is the main preferences among students. Then, the t-test mentioned there is no significance differences of student WCF preferences between female and male students. Similarly, the interviews result also revealed student 1 and 2 that consist of female and male students have similar answer about their preferences. They prefer for to receive direct feedback that focused on specific error. Then it can be concluded that the gender is not influence university students WCF preferences.

How WCF Help Them to Feedforward Their Academic Writing Improvement

In the last research question, the researcher found a high score in every statement from the way of feedback in engaging students in writing in academic writing courses. The respondents were asked with four statements represent how feedback help students in writing improvement as draw in this Table 6 below:

Table 6. Descriptive Statistic of Students Experiences about WCF

Items	Statements	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remark
1	You understand the comments/corrective feedback the lecturer gave in your assignment.	3.14	.696	Good
2	You can correct errors in your written work based on comments given by the lecturer.	3.32	.690	Very Good
3	feedback comments from your lecturer are easy to read and understand	3.12	.706	Good
4	Feedback comments from your lecturers have improved the quality of your writing.	3.52	.664	Very Good
Total		3,28		

As shown in the table, two statements have a high score with the remark "very good" for statement number (2. You can correct errors in your written work based on comments given by the lecturer) with mean score ($M=3.32$) and (4. Feedback comments from your lecturers have improved the quality of your writing) ($M=3.52$). Based in the result, students tend to give positive respond about feedback because through the existence from feedback they can correct the error, the reason why error exists, how to fix it, and automatically increase their academic writing quality. Furthermore, the students felt the positive influencing of feedback in case teachers could supply the understanding and satisfying feedback.

Considering of the existing feedback most contribute to gradually improve their writing skill. Then, students want teachers to focus on correcting their error. Feedback may help students to foster their argumentations skills in writing in case teacher provide with suitable feedback. Furthermore, among the elements of academic writing, the students needed feedback mostly on content and then the language feature.

"In my opinion, in academic writing, the content is important to be focused..." (Student 2).

"For those of us who are still learning academic writing, the teacher should first look at the content that needs to be corrected. After students have mastered the creation of content and other elements, they will move on to structure. I'm afraid that if the teacher corrects everything, we, students, will get even more confused" (Student 4)

Thus, to avoid the confusion, students want teachers to apply focused written corrective feedback that involves giving corrected feedback to the targeted errors after students revise the error then teacher continue to give the feedback to another element of error on students writing. The reason given by the third students as to why she wants the teachers giving feedback in the grammar error as the critical component in academic writing. From the respondent point of view grammar and appropriate word choice can increasingly improve students writing skill.

In my opinion, the first thing that needs to be fixed is grammar, which is a critical component. Then, choose the terms or word choices that we employ so that the rewritten work is better and more appropriate to be read, particularly by the public. (Student 3)

To conclude, the result of the interviews mentioned feedback can improve their writing quality in case the teachers' focused on correcting student writing start from their content, grammar, and the other elements in academic writing. Teachers should not give feedback to entire writing to avoid student's confusion and students could revise their mistake appropriately

Discussion

The discussion portion focused on the study's main purpose, which was to determine students' preferences for teacher-written corrective feedback and which types increase students' writing quality in academic writing courses. This debate centered on the preceding part's conclusions, which were linked to theories or pertinent studies.

Students' Preferences

The first sub-section discussed students' preferences for teachers' written corrective feedback. As revealed in the descriptive statistics of the students' preferences questionnaire, the findings showed that students prefer to get direct and unfocused feedback. The results from the interpretation of students' responses that they chose in the questionnaire section. The questionnaire results indicated that students preferred direct, focused, and unfocused feedback, which gained the mean ($M=3.45$, $M=3.28$, and $M=3.4$) representing both feedback types.

Students gave high ratings on the statement for direct feedback. The result of the study was supported by Suzuki (2019), who stated that this type of feedback consisted of targeted errors and that it was also replaced or provided with the correct form. The proper forms near embedding insert the word form or cross out the error. Ellis et al. (2008) stated that when feedback is directed towards the target error, learners may attend more to the feedback and learn from it. The other empirical study from (Rashtchi & Khoshnevisan, 2019) and (Mujtaba & Mubarik, 2022) showed that students preferred the direct form of feedback on error correction over indirect feedback to prevent confusion among students. The current finding of students' preferences on direct feedback is contradictory with the longitudinal experimental study from Kloss and Espinoza (2022, p.98); they revealed direct WCF is not effective because students did not reduce errors in the use of information structuring connector when corrected with these types of WCF.

Furthermore, Kurzer's study (2023) revealed that unfocused written corrective feedback might be effectively used in writing classrooms to improve accuracy via dynamic written corrective feedback, at least in short writing contexts. Aghanjanloo (2016) also stated in his study that focused corrective feedback, which provides the correct form for all linguistic errors, is the most effective technique for students because this type of feedback showed significant improvement in students' writing.

Then, the transcription of the data from participants' interviews showed that they preferred to choose direct + indirect feedback. Students are expected to receive the error sign or numb the error forms and follow with the correct explanations that support WCF, which involves providing learners with some form of explicit comment or codes on the errors they have made. These findings align with the study from Fhaezdyall (2022), The

overall impact suggests that indirect WCF was advantageous to both grammatical and non-grammatical structures, but direct WCF was primarily successful on non-grammatical components. As a result, it is advised to blend them.

They stated that direct feedback with sign error might be promising to be provided as part of the feedback to language learners writing to lead them to better learning outcomes. Combining direct and indirect feedback could raise students' consciousness and awareness about their errors in writing. Therefore, the combination between direct corrective feedback and indirect feedback explicitness influences immediate revision and development (Suzuki et al., 2019).

Thus, it is suggested that teachers use multiple types of feedback to improve students' writing accuracy and students' motivation to correct their writing. As stated by Shintani (Shintani et al., 2014), combining the feedback types can make feedback more explicit. These current findings of students' preferences could be guidelines for teachers in correcting students' writing. However, teachers should be wise in combining those types of feedback to prevent students' confusion. The result between the questionnaire and interview data indicated direct written corrective feedback is favourable feedback among students because they gain the correct form and can repair their writing directly. The other preferences are unfocused feedback and focused feedback. Combining direct feedback and indirect feedback could be implemented for teachers based on students' comments and explanations in the interview section. Besides, combining teachers' feedback types is influenced by their prior learning, training experiences, professional knowledges, beliefs in feedback, and actual teaching practices for second language writing (Wei & Cao, 2020).

a) The Influence of Gender on Students' Preferences for Teachers' Corrective Feedback

Independent sample t-test was used to compare male and female preferences. The findings showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the genders (males and females), as was supported by (Khorshidi & Rassaei, 2013; Knowles et al., 2014; Samuel et al., 2023); their study found that gender does not significantly impact learners' choices for corrective feedback or their perceptions. Furthermore, the result of the interview with four participants also proved that all of them answered the same preferences (direct feedback). The quantitative and qualitative results showed similar findings: there are no significant differences in students' preferences between genders. In line with the study by (Kahraman & Yalvac, 2015), gender did not significantly affect students' perceptions and preferences for the sort of feedback that can alter depending on the time of feedback. Then, the study by (Jahbel, 2020) also asserted that there were not statistically significance differences between male and female Libyan EFL students related to the choice through six types of written corrective feedback.

However, the result of this study does not match (Evans & Waring, 2011), who highlighted the cognitive style and gender impact on student feedback-seeking behaviors and preferences. Compared to the opposite, more studies find that gender does not influence students' feedback choices because from the interview results from this study it was also found that all students preferred one type of answer, namely direct feedback. Because the respondents consisted of female and male students, many previous studies examined the relationship of gender towards students' feedback preferences, but its existence is still limited. Furthermore, the hypothesis in this study was rejected because the result showed there are no significant differences. The possible reason for the rejected hypothesis in this research was probably that the respondents who answered the questionnaire were not serious, and the population of this research did not represent all of the EFL students in the university at Yogyakarta.

b) The Suitable Types of WCF for students further writing.

The third sub-section focused on discussing the students' preferences and the types that are effective for them in engaging their writing performance during academic writing courses. Two answers were concluded in this study: direct-focused written corrective feedback and reformulation feedback, which were the effective types for their further learning and were revealed in the interview transcription results. The participants stated that focused feedback in direct and clear instruction is useful because they can be focused on the specific aspect of their errors. This finding is in line with (Ellis et al., 2008); this is where targeted corrective feedback may be more beneficial because it allows students to look at several fixes for a single mistake, giving them the rich evidence they need to learn the correct form and comprehend why their writing was incorrect. The effectiveness of such feedback types also depends on the nature of the tasks. The responses from the interview session indicated that focused direct feedback is a suitable type that teachers can implement to encourage students to write further. This finding is in line with (Nemati et al., 2019) that stated participants who received focused direct WCF fared better than those who got focused indirect WCF. (Xu et al., 2011) defines focused direct WCF as Errors indicated by circling specific types of language constructs each time.

In the different research fields, (Valizadeh & Soltanpour, 2021) revealed the benefit of applying focused direct feedback to Elementary students. As a result, the elementary EFL students who received focused direct feedback may have focused on establishing control over previously internalized and stable elements in their interlanguage. In the case of focused WCF, the feedback was focused on the errors of the target forms; it has been proven to be more accurate than the unfocused WCF (Kim, 2019). The current studies found that focused

WCF was equally beneficial and favourable among students. However, unfocused WCF was not. Next, reformulation is mentioned as the findings during the interview session with the participants. The students want the teachers to give the correction to the entire piece of writing with the correct answer. This finding is particularly supported by Davari (2022), who states that reformulation has a positive impact on improving EFL learners' writing at different proficiency levels. This type of written feedback is helpful for learners, especially for beginner writers (Farsi, 2016).

c) Written Corrective Feedback to Feedforward Students' Academic Writing

Improvement. The questionnaire consists of the questions that asked about students' experience with teachers' feedback. Then, from the result of descriptive statistics, it was indicated that feedback highly impacts students' writing improvement. The written feedback has improved students' revision accuracy. The study by Ruegg (2014) revealed that teachers' feedback could increase learners' confidence in their L2 writing ability over the long term. Writing skill is one of the important processes for EFL students during their language learning. Teacher feedback is one of the factors that could increase students' writing, as many factors affect writing improvement, such as students' motivation, teaching style, learning frequency, etc. Students' writing improvement after getting teachers' feedback could increase gradually over time, which is called the learning process. The presence of teacher feedback could help students to improve and correct their writing. According to the study by Ghasemi (2021), the participants' accuracy varied over four writing times. In other words, there was no consistent and upward pattern of improvement from one occasion to the next. This is not surprising given that previous research indicates that two learners may perform well on one occasion but struggle with others.

Particularly, feedback could help students to feedforward their academic writing improvement if teachers focused on student's needs for written feedback such as focusing on the aspect or element in academic writing. In line with Singh (2016) stated that students often require comments on the logical structuring of material and ideas, as well as the transition between sentences, paragraphs, and sections. Teachers' feedback is part of the writing process. Through feedback, teachers can give instruction, and students can grow into good writers and learn from mistakes. As stated by Graham (2022), improving young writers' essential writing skills, including handwriting, spelling, typing, and sentence construction, minimizes cognitive overload and frees up mental resources for other crucial parts of writing.

To catch up, the influence of teacher-written corrective feedback is huge for student's future writing. Students lay on their teachers and expect clear feedback. As beginner writers, academic writing courses are hard for students. Teachers should be more patient and give focused feedback to avoid students' confusion than giving whole paper feedback was supported by Lee (2019); focusing on a small range of faults helps enhance pupils' writing accuracy. Even though applying focused feedback is complicated for some teachers, this kind of result can be teachers' consideration to implement in the next feedback. Providing learners with corrected feedback is a crucial step in the learning process. Corrective feedback from teachers can help students with a variety of issues, including fewer grammar errors, enhanced writing abilities, and easier composition writing (Sabarun, 2019). Therefore, teacher's feedback plays a role in the overall development of academic writing context. Teacher should be fulfilling the students' expectation toward their feedback preferences to feedforward students' further writing skills.

d) Research Limitations

This research has several limitations that need to be considered for future studies. First, the number of participants for this study was too small and due to accessibility of the participants and the limitation of time the current research only focused on public universities in Yogyakarta. Second, this study did not have engagement with other internal stakeholders such as lecturers, teacher, or head of departments. This study only focused on students as the object of the data. Perhaps, in-depth future research, those aspects could be included.

Third, the data for this study was collected solely through a questionnaire and interviews. Thus, additional research is recommended, including document analysis of students' writing, to gain a deeper understanding and particular data connected to teacher-written corrective comments. To summarize, this research is far from ideal, but its limitations can be handled and evaluated.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study generate several conclusions that will be explained in detail as follows. This study has provided insights into the need for proper feedback as university students' desire. This study concluded that learners prefer direct input over indirect feedback. Almost all students prefer receiving direct feedback on their writing to prevent confusion. The other feedback found in this study was focused and a combination of direct and indirect feedback. Overall, it can be argued that corrective teacher feedback is essential to EFL writing courses. According to related research and this study's findings, providing explicit comments (direct) on early drafts is

more effective. Then, the independent sample t-test results revealed no significant differences in feedback preferences between female and male students. All students have similar feedback preferences, and gender does not affect their answers. Furthermore, focused direct written corrective feedback is potentially effective feedback that facilitates students' further writing improvement and avoids more mistakes. Based on students' experiences receiving teacher feedback, it can be concluded that students feel satisfied with teachers' feedback because the feedback significantly improves their writing over time. It should need the process and time to increase their writing. Teachers should focus on correcting all important elements in academic writing to support students learning improvement. This includes correcting not only one element but also all the elements in writing. The presence of a teacher's written corrective has an important role in guiding learners to better writing accuracy.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2019). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 702–726.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102–118.
- Chen, T., Liu, L., Cui, J., Chen, X., & Wang, Y. (2016). Developmental trajectory of time perspective: From children to older adults. *PsyCh Journal*, 5(4), 245–255.
- Cohen, D. (2018). *The development of play*. Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: pendekatan kualitatif, kuantitatif, dan mixed*.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Davari, M., & Mall-Amiri, B. (2022). The effect of flipped classroom on EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency: A mixed-methods study. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, 10(4), 685–707.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353–371.
- Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2011). How can an understanding of cognitive style enable trainee teachers to have a better understanding of differentiation in the classroom? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 10, 149–169.
- Farsi, L. (2016). *Looking at reformulation task types in writing classrooms: theoretical and empirical perspective*. JIEB.
- Ghasemi, F. (2021). A motivational response to the inefficiency of teachers' practices towards students with learned helplessness. *Learning and Motivation*, 73, 101705.
- Graham, S. (2022). A walk through the landscape of writing: Insights from a program of writing research. *Educational Psychologist*, 57(2), 55–72.
- Jahbel, K. (2020). *University teachers' and students' preferences on the types of written corrective feedback*. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Jahbel, K., Latief, M. A., Cahyono, B. Y., & Abdalla, S. N. (2020). Exploring university students' preferences towards written corrective feedback in EFL context in Libya. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(12A), 7775–7782.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. B. (2024). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage publications.
- Kahraman, A., & Yalvac, F. (2015). EFL Turkish university students' preferences about teacher feedback and its importance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 73–80.
- Khorshidi, E., & Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of learners' gender on their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, 2(2), 71–83.
- Kim, J. H. (2019). Relative Effects of Direct Focused and Unfocused WCF on the Accuracy Development of Two Language Forms. *English Teaching*, 74(4), 29–50.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2014). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*. Routledge.
- Kurzer, K. (2023). Dynamic written corrective feedback: a scoping review. *Feedback Res Second Lang*, 1(1), 93–108.
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Handbook of arts-based research*. Guilford Publications.

- Martin, W. E., & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). *Quantitative and statistical research methods: From hypothesis to results*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mujtaba, M., & Mubarik, M. S. (2022). Talent management and organizational sustainability: role of sustainable behaviour. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(2), 389–407.
- Nemati, M., Alavi, S. M., & Mohebbi, H. (2019). Assessing the effect of focused direct and focused indirect written corrective feedback on explicit and implicit knowledge of language learners. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9, 1–18.
- Pannulla, T., Bobbit, J., Jacobs, J., Kelly, A., Scarpato, L., & Webb, D. L. (2023). Meal Move—A Program to Help Ensure Food Security. *Proceedings of the Northeast Business & Economics Association*, 184.
- Rashtchi, M., & Khoshnevisan, B. (2019). The developmental stages of teachers: A critical analysis. *Advances in Global Education and Research*, 3, 2–8.
- Ruegg, R. (2014). The effect of assessment of peer feedback on the quantity and quality of feedback given. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 3(1), 24–43.
- Sabarun, S. (2019). *The learners' perceived on direct teacher corrective feedback in efl essay writing class at English department of IAIN Palangka Raya*.
- Samuel, A., Abid, N., Azeem, A., & Bashir, R. (2023). Exploring gender-wise, sector-wise, and grade-wise difference among secondary school students' reading habits. *Int J Eval & Res Educ*, 12(2), 579–585.
- Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64(1), 103–131.
- Singh, M. K. M. (2016). Graduate Students' Needs and Preferences for Written Feedback on Academic Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(12), 79–88.
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*.
- Suzuki, W., Nassaji, H., & Sato, K. (2019). The effects of feedback explicitness and type of target structure on accuracy in revision and new pieces of writing. *System*, 81, 135–145.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management (IJARM)*, 5.
- Valizadeh, M., & Soltanpour, F. (2021). Focused direct corrective feedback: Effects on the elementary English learners' written syntactic complexity. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 132–150.
- Xu, L., Ma, P., & Su, X. (2011). Selective track fusion. *Neural Information Processing: 18th International Conference, ICONIP 2011, Shanghai, China, November 13-17, 2011, Proceedings, Part III 18*, 18–25.
- Zhang, C., Xie, Y., Bai, H., Yu, B., Li, W., & Gao, Y. (2021). A survey on federated learning. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 216, 106775.