

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ON WRITTEN AND ORAL FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASS

Ma'idatur Rofiqoh

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

maidaturrofiqoh16020084031@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Nur Chakim

English Education, Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Surabaya

nurchakim@unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Sebagai salah satu keterampilan dalam bahasa Inggris, menulis memainkan peran penting bagi siswa, terutama dalam lingkungan akademik. Sejalan dengan itu, terkadang siswa menemukan keterampilan menulis yang menantang untuk dipelajari, dan mungkin tidak mudah bagi guru untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis mereka. Akibatnya, umpan balik guru diperlukan untuk meningkatkan keterampilan menulis mereka. Untuk mengetahui keberhasilan umpan balik yang diterapkan, kita perlu tahu dari perspektif peserta didik. Oleh karena itu, artikel konseptual ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi perbedaan antara umpan balik tertulis dan lisan guru dalam tulisan berdasarkan persepsi siswa dan melihat jenis umpan balik guru mana yang terbaik dalam meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa, terlepas dari bentuk umpan balik, siswa telah meningkat secara tertulis dan bahwa tidak ada hubungan antara pilihan umpan balik dan kualitas revisi. Dengan demikian, mungkin perlu untuk membuat diskusi dan keprihatinan yang praktis dan bahkan dapat dilaksanakan antara siswa dan guru, bahwa input lisan dan tertulis digabungkan untuk meningkatkan menulis siswa yang lebih baik. Untuk membuat siswa dan guru merasa realistis dan bahkan layak dalam diskusi, umpan balik tertulis harus diikuti oleh umpan balik lisan.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik tertulis, umpan balik lisan, kelas writing.

Abstract

As one of the skills in English, writing plays an essential role for students, especially in the academic setting. In line with, sometimes students find writing skill challenging to learn, and it may not be easy for teachers to improve their writing ability. Consequently, teacher feedback is needed to enhance students' ability in writing. In order to consider the feedback quality implemented, we need to know from the learners' perspective. Therefore, this conceptual article aims to investigate the distinctive of both oral and written teacher's feedback in writing based on students' perceptions and see which teacher's feedback type is best in improving students' writing ability. The results show that, regardless of the feedback form, students' improvement in writing could have no relation between feedback choice and the quality of revisions. As such, it may be necessary to make practical and even workable discussions and concerns between students and teachers, that oral and written input can be combined to improve student writing better. By way of making the students and teacher feel realistic and even feasibly in the discussion, it is better to implement written feedback that followed by oral feedback.

Keywords: written feedback, oral feedback, writing class.

INTRODUCTION

Students must learn to write because it is very important. Reid (2012) says that writing is an important skill used to support other language learning skills in the education setting. Writing has also become an essential tool for

people in today's global culture, considered one of the technical skills to learn languages (Weigle, 2002). Therefore, considerable attention must be taken to develop students' writing skills in different fields, including education. Increasingly, academic programs are developed and implemented to enhance students' writing.

Improving student's skills in writing, however, may not be easy. Students may often find it challenging to write in English correctly and appropriately. Most students have difficulties expressing thoughts in writing. It can affect the organization, content, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. These factors create every effort to increase frustrating and challenging writing skills for students. Overcoming those problems needs a skilled teacher who can teach the students by using different strategies, including feedback.

The feedback process in teaching is also regarded as crucial in order to enable students to develop their skills in writing (Biber & Gray, 2011; Elftorp, 2007; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Peterson & McClay, 2010). Students need input from various sources, including teachers and peers. Teachers are expected to comment on the learning and teaching of students (Peterson & McClay, 2010). Likewise, Mahfoodh & Pandian (2011) support teachers' written feedback as one of the most critical components of the writing-centered ESL/EFL lessons as they have been seen as the best-balanced way to interact with each student. Therefore, written feedback from teachers is considered valuable and enjoyable for the learners (Ferris, 2003; Goldstein, 2004; G. Lee & Schallert, 2008). Zamel (1985) also believes that written feedback must be followed by oral feedback. Over time, Bitchener, Young, & Cameron (2005) discovered written feedback that followed by oral feedback tends to contribute in improving learner writing more effectively. To know the exact benefit and the success of teacher written and oral feedback, we need to know from students' perception.

The perception of students is a critical part of the learning process. The teacher feedback research has explored various aspects, including its explanation and impact, and the students' perception recently found that teacher feedback is one of the main areas (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014).

Several researchers already conducted some previous studies about perceptions by students for their written teacher feedback. Mahfoodh (2011), in his study, found that written feedback from the teacher is important and useful for improving the writing skills of the students. Also, in her study, Rosdiana (2017) found that written corrective feedback was considered helpful and was more appreciated. Students believe that teacher feedback on written work must be received to improve their writing skills. Furthermore, McLaughlin (2009) considered oral feedback to be straightforward and sought clarification when students had questions. Learners said that comments from the teacher were helpful in writing and revision, referring to grammar and word punctuation as written features that strengthened through oral feedback.

However, the majority of studies about students' perceptions towards teacher feedback in writing have focused on teacher written feedback or oral feedback only. Researches that focus on both of feedback forms have only been receiving a sparingly few attention

It can be inferred from previous research that students' perception towards teacher feedback in writing classroom may differ based on teacher's practice, each student's perception, and even the place where the research took place. Also, written feedback from the teacher is better followed by oral feedback for the students. Therefore, this paper aims to examine the distinctive of students' perceptions towards teacher-written and oral feedback in writing class.

PROBLEMS OF WRITING

In the academic and occupational life, though, writing plays an important role. Writing is typically used by a professor or teacher to assess students' comprehension. Austin and Haley (2004:23) stated that the results of education in learning writing are one of the most important values. In real life, writing is sophisticated and requires much practice to develop the skill (Nunan, 1991:91). Among other topics in English, writing is mostly avoided.

The common problem for the learners is that they get the idea and then should write it out. The process of passing concepts, thoughts and ideas to written a text, as Richards (1990:101) pointed out, is complicated. The author has to regularly edit and revise all steps of the writing process from the first draft to the final product while creating good writing. Also, the author should consider the components of writing.

As writing is the most challenging skill to learn, particular skill is needed that include expressing writer's opinions or thoughts efficiently and clearly. Such skills can be learned if only the students learn writing methods, for example how to make suggestions or comments about what they are going to write about; how to describe themselves in a sequence of sentences; how to arrange the words chronologically and accurately (Hongue, 2004).

DEFINING FEEDBACK

Feedback is described in many ways. Feedback can be interpreted in the sense of teaching and learning as any response by teachers to the students' performance, students' attitude or behavior, at least if attitude or behavior is influenced by performance. It is necessary to know that feedback is an integral part of the process of learning and not just an outcome of students' performance. In Berewot's quote (2001: 17), Gagne

(1961) argued that feedback was a bridge in the cycle of learning that fixes and renders the output noticeable permanently. It means that students need corrections, constructive feedback or even an acknowledgement from other people to measure the results they have achieved because they are already studying. In detail, Kauchack and Eggen (1989: 85) describe feedback that can be used to increase students' performance with every knowledge regarding current behavior. These two concepts of feedback indicate that once they have been provided with input on what they have learned, students will be able to improve their writings.

Ellis (2009: 3) describes feedback as a means of motivating students to learn and assess the reliability of language learning. Feedback can typically consist of constructive criticism and suggestions in favor of the language learning method, but it can also be behavior social interactions and encouragement such as "Good job!" (Hattie, 2011: 1).

FUNCTION OF FEEDBACK IN WRITING

Many published academics, Leki (1991) and Raimes (1983) agree that feedback helps students improve their writing skills effectively. As Sommer (1982) attempts to explain how feedback may lead to better writing, he states that feedback justifies doing something different in the next draft: deliberate commentaries provide reasons to rewrite without any comment from their teacher or their peers, students will continuously revise their writing narrowly and predictably. Without readers' feedback, students believe that their writing has conveyed its purpose and no need to revise their writing in its content. Hendrickson (1976) also notes that errors need to be fixed as students are generally unable to recognize many of their errors in their writing. Students need to be directed in defining different structures and types of their writing. If the errors are ignored in the early stages, it will be more challenging to deal with them later on.

The teacher needs to give suggestions, as Radeki and Swales (1988) and Leki (1991) showed that many students would like the teacher to correct their writing and are likely to be discomforted when the teacher does not. It can be assumed that many academics and researchers find feedback to be valuable and constructive in learners' writing. Therefore, feedback can be considered to help students learn and improve their written skills.

CATEGORIES OF FEEDBACK IN WRITING

Feedback in writing has two main categories: content and form. Fathman & Whalley, (2012), reported feedback on the form of grammar and mechanical mistakes, whereas

feedback on organizational, thought, and content feedback that has a level in detail.

In addition, Furneaux, Paran, & Fairfax (2007) have divided feedback into two different groups: surface feedback and content feedback. The surface-level feedback concerns the choice of words, spelling, grammar and punctuation. In order to correct the surface level alone, Wiliam (2003) encourages this feedback. Feedback on content and the arrangement of ideas, on the other side, are considered content level feedback which usually highlights the problem and suggests better writing on the potential (William, 2003). The students should use this feedback to include information from their comments in the other version of their writing.

FORMS OF FEEDBACK IN WRITING

Hyland & Hyland (2014) points out from the perception of students that feedback is widely regarded as crucial to writing progress. The feedback refers to either teacher or peers feedback, oral or written. According to Cohen (1990), forms of feedback divided into two: oral feedback and written feedback. Oral feedback that also known as an oral conference refers to instructor-learners personal consultation during composition assessment. The primary issue is that the teacher needs sufficient time to provide that feedback to the students.

In written feedback, students' work needs to be corrected by commenting, marking and correcting. Teachers often use circle, underline, or other signs to mark students' error. Written feedback is most effective in correcting the error of students in that they also give students constructive feedback and advice on enhancing their writing work. In line with this, feedback could be written or oral (Woolfolk, 1987: 539).

TEACHER FEEDBACK IN WRITING

Teacher feedback offers a useful method of communication to enhance students' learning. The teacher is the principal source of input in L2 writing classrooms, not least in school settings, where students learn to write at a relatively young age (I. Lee, 2017). Although most feedback work is carried out in colleges and universities, in which process-related writing is commonly performed, the awareness of teacher feedback remains limited in L2 school contexts. As noted from some researchers, Furneaux et al., (2007) and I. Lee (2004), the teachers' input mainly focuses on the language form and takes much less consideration of content, organization and style.

Students should receive different kind of teacher feedback – namely written feedback and oral feedback from their teacher – in order to cultivate student interest

and actively engage them. In teacher written feedback, students get comments either by marking words, circling, underlining, or other sign-in students' writing. Also, the teacher often comments directly on students' writing errors in order to improve their writing skills. As K. Hyland (2003) points out that most teachers feel that they need to write meaningful feedback on papers to provide readers with answers to students' acts, to enable them to develop their status as writers and to encourage their qualification.

In oral feedback, the teacher and students do personal face to face consultation during the assessment. Bruffee (1984) states that face to face interaction between teacher and student is universally acknowledged as an essential part of planning, writing or revision text in the context of first language acquisition.

THE ROLES OF TEACHER FEEDBACK

Hyland (2003) notes that teacher feedback, in particular in writing, is intended to include important details such as commentary on a form and content of a text, in order to enable students to learn and improve their writing. This plays a pedagogical role by displaying, forwarding, and improving their writing expectations for other works. Students should understand the norm of writing. The psychological job is to guide students to other writings, help them in increasing their writing ability and understanding the written meaning. Also, to understand and fulfil the community expectation regarding the basic of writing.

Moreover, feedback will only be useful if only students have awareness, desire, and intention to develop their writing. Unfortunately, it is reported in the research of E. Brown and Glover (2005) that some students had little interest in future assignments because of the feedback. Around this point, the input from the teacher should not only aim to close the distance between the intended object and the current situation. It should also provide the information needed to close this gap with enough explanations for students to use the information (feedback), as the lack of adequate explanations of feedback does not help to close the gap. However, the teacher should remember that feedback needs to be aimed at the right level for students as some of the feedback is useful in minimizing the differences between current and desired to understand (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

The students might be able to understand, participate, or engage the teacher feedback that given to developing the successful strategies if the feedback is given at the right students' level. Therefore, the teacher should provide feedback that clear, meaningful, purposeful, provide logical connections, and compatible with

students' prior knowledge in order to make the feedback is useful for the learners. The feedback should also have low task complexity, precise, consistent goals, and the low self-level threat for the students (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In this point, every feedback technique has a different impact or result in students with different levels of skills. As stated by Brookhart (2008) that there is no right or the best strategy compatible with all the students. Therefore, teachers should not provide feedback on all the students in their class using one or the same strategy because each individual has a different characteristic.

Next in the following section, students' perceptions are discussed in order to know the exact benefit of teacher written and oral feedback in writing class.

DEFINING PERCEPTION

Perception is a term that is closely associated with human psychology. In common, perception is described as a physical experience as a conscious feature of the world that demonstrates the capacity of a person to understand. Meanwhile, Unumuri (2009: 18) defined perceptions as the accordance of an individual's opinions and point of view. Also, Nelson and Quick (1997:83-84) describe perception as the experience of other's information. The problem is that people's views depend on the information quality and how information received is interpreted. This means that individuals with the same information as others may have in similar cases, but an individual or group may come up to different conclusions because of the differences ability in perceiving the information.

Reacted to the perceptions definitions above, Rao and Narayan (1998:329-330) underlined that perception is psychological mechanics and important cognitive human behavior which enable people to understand their environment. Perception is the process through which people select, organize, and interpret sensory stimuli to transform into meaningful information about their working environment.

Adediwura and Tayo (2007:165-167) elaborate on some perception theories by experts. They concluded that perception is the way people judge or value others in their everyday lives. In the cognitive context, they believe that the mechanism by which people assign meaning to experiences is perception. It means that perception appears in their sensory memories after people look for particular stimuli. However, perception is important because it impacts details in working memory. Experts reinforced the concept of perception as the individual's mechanism to understand others. Try to obtain information about other behavioral causes (Adediwura & Tayo 2007: 166-167).

Furthermore, Adediwura and Tayo (2007) illustrate that no idea from outside comes more easily into our consciousness, whether it be an expression, something we listen to, an object or a sight than it was thought up to some level. The perception, as it has related to other materials of the consciousness (memory), is influenced by the feeling from the outside. It can be inferred that perception cannot be done under vacuum; it depends on any background data which may explain the reaction. The present and past experience, the individual attitudes at a particular moment, the physical condition of the sensory organ, the human interest, the degree of concern and the interpretation of perceptions can energetically stimulate perception (Adedivura and Tayo 2007: 166).

Altman (2013) describes perception as the selection and consolidation of stimuli so that they can be interpreted. It is the vision of an individual about reality. Kreitner and Kinicki (2002) asserted a perception that allows us to interpret and understand the environment rationally and cognitively. Other argue that perception is a global response to a stimulus or a series of stimuli (Mozkowitz and Orgel, 1969). Perception is seen as the reaction to a stimulus or an environment. These reactions are then interpreted as meaningful stimulus information.

Warga (1983: 207) and Mahmud (1990: 41) note that perceptions are based on experience, and that interpretation is the act of reading in the human mind. That note proved by students' response toward written feedback given by the teacher. Cook (1994: 90) points out that the sensory data are select, organize, and interpret. Kreitner (1989: 126) notes that experience contributes to a shift in mood, motivation and behavior. In conclusion, the perception of individuals can produce this outcome.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION

Students' perceptions can be understood as students' ability to justify and distinguish between their own views and the experience they do in the class (McGoldrick and Caffrey 2009:2). Several remarks above suggest that the sensation is a sensor of the senses accompanied by stimulating stimulation, which is consciously or unconsciously transmitted to the human brain.

According to Walgito (2003: 54-55), there are two factors that influenced perceptions. First, external factors, as known as stimulus and traits. It creates a determination or unity, among other things: social and environmental. Second, internal factors. It is related to self-ability, which is derived from the connection to dimensions, emotional, intellectual, and physical.

Also, Setiyana (2012) mentioned the functional and structural factor that influence perception. First, functional factors or personal factors. This factor

influence perception related to the individual's stimuli that are created. Second, structural factors or situational factors. This is the external factors that influence an individual's current perception by its stimulus.

The following section, students' opinion about teacher feedback in writing class from prior research focusing on written and oral feedback will be adopted to analyze the distinctive of them and find one of the best from both of them.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASS

A variety of studies have investigated what to comment on in second language student writing for substantial examination. For example, research on content and grammar in comparative feedback. Kepner (1991) found that feedback that perceived by the students generates content-enhanced learning. She also found that the students who had received standardized reviews had no fewer errors. In an additional study, Leki (1991) asked 100 First-Year ESL students to complete the questionnaires to examine how structured and material input on positive and negative feedback is efficient and responsive. She found that it is desirable to correct mistakes in both form and contents because good writing is seen as mistake-free.

Move away from what is worth mentioning. Numerous studies have been conducted to analyze error correction to enhance students' writing. Issues can be indirectly solved informal feedback for L2 acquisition, if only errors are created and then corrected (Ellis, 1994). Likewise, Weaver (2006) studied how forty-four students perceived written feedback they got reflected a student-focused learning approach. In evaluating interviews, questionnaires and reviews, she considered teacher's comment to be helpful only if they are concise and descriptive, provide appropriate input, concentrates on positive points, and are linked to requirements for evaluation. Examining more than 1,600 marginal and final comments written by 47 university ESL students on 110 first drafts, Ferris (1997) found that marginal comments would be more immediate and open in identifying and evaluating errors for students, while end observations may be more useful for improving learning, as they sum up significant issues. Marginal comments are also viewed as more motivating because the reader is interested in the author's wording (Goldstein, 2004; K Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Besides, many studies have focused on how types of comments impact improvement and which forms are more productive or the most productive. For example, Treglia (2008) had interviewed two teachers and 14 students at a U.S. college group to explore how students

were reacting to teachers' comments about methods of mitigation and unmitigation. These studies showed that students received mixed and straightforward feedback, but favored the feedback in terms of appreciation, suggestions and choices. Alamis (2010) explored how 141 students perceived written feedback from teachers. In questionnaires and students' work, Alamis found praise more than criticism. This feedback on content should include suggestions rather than forms of questions, direct corrections and indirect corrections. However, this work is the product of opinion-based responses, and it is difficult to say that its findings were correct.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TEACHER ORAL FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASS

The effectiveness of oral feedback in optimizing student writing remains questionable (Ken Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Many researchers have looked at teacher interaction between the students, and have found that face to face interaction success depends on how interactive it is. For example, Hyland (2003) believed that when students are involved actively, conferencing is effective, asking questions, clarifying context, and arguing rather than merely accepting advice.

By comparison, in his qualitative study, Carnicelli (1980, as cited in Gulley, 2010) found that classroom conferences are best for classroom instruction. He also pointed out that the lecture could go wrong if the teacher does not listen to the student if the student feels nervous or if the student does not remember the teacher's comments. This research does not, however, have a design flaw in the absence of a monitoring group, so it is not possible to determine whether a conference, training or practice preference arises. In further research, Goldstein and Conrad (1990, as cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2006), observed that teacher advice would most likely be used actively and non-reflectively by second-language students with inhibitions of culture or informal communities to revisit their teaching. The co-investigators found that only students with proper conference meaning were successful in conducting a review.

Several scholars have also carried out a study to compare feedback from input in the form of recasts with feedback from the output. The distinction is in processes of elicitation, demand for clarity, error repetition and metalinguistic indications. Ammar and Spada (2006, as cited in Sheen, 2010) investigated the efficacy of recasts among six grade students over the development of possessive pronoun. They found that prompts helped only students with pre-test scores of less than 50%, while both refinements and speeds had less impact. These research,

however, included only corrective feedback that only focused on a language element. Thus, the effects of recasts and prompts may be complex to generalize because they may be different if specific linguistic properties are changed.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD TEACHER WRITTEN AND ORAL FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASS

Taken together, both the results of the teacher's written and oral comments were ambiguous and distinct from ideas, methods, and contexts in the written class. No previous work was conducted to determine the comparative efficacy of oral and written comments in improving student learning from perceptions of students.

Consequently, Leaph's (2020) quasi-experimental study aims to compare teachers' written and oral feedback in terms of expectations and performance amongst major English students. The students' questionnaire answers, semi-structured interviews, and paragraphs were used to collect data both before and after the two months of treatment, both from the written and oral feedback community. The study revealed that the group of oral feedback was more orally focused than the group's written feedback. The group provided oral feedback became closer to the teacher, more confident in writing, received comprehensive error-correction, and gain special teacher attention. On the other hand, it was easier for the written feedback group to clearly organize ideas, use words correctly, create rich written material and use linguistic features similar to different genres than the oral feedback group (see table 1). It implies that oral feedback was considered to be higher than written feedback but less effective.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for effective responses of oral feedback (OF) and written feedback (WF) groups

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
I still could not express my ideas more clearly. (RO)	OF	4.05	.780	3.089	18	.006
	WF	4.06	.416	5.664	17	.000
I made fewer grammatical errors.	OF	3.95	.705	2.766	18	.013
	WF	3.83	.924	1.531	17	.144
I still could not use vocabulary more appropriately.	OF	3.74	.733	1.407	18	.176*
	WF	4.06	.802	2.938	17	.009
I could	OF	4.32	.671	5.299	18	.000

organize my writing better.	WF	4.61	.502	9.397	17	.000
I still could not write with better content. (RO)	OF	4.00	.577	3.775	18	.001
	WF	4.33	.594	5.951	17	.000
I made fewer errors with punctuation.	OF	3.63	.831	.690	18	.499*
	WF	3.61	1.290	.366	17	.719*
I made few errors with spelling.	OF	3.53	1.219	.094	18	.926*
	WF	3.83	1.043	1.356	17	.193*
I still could not use vocabulary and grammar appropriately for each type of paragraph. (RO)	OF	3.95	.705	2.766	18	.013
	WF	4.22	.548	5.588	17	.000
I liked it because it helped improve the quality of my writing.	OF	4.47	.697	6.092	18	.000
	WF	4.06	.802	2.938	17	.009

* $p > .05$ (not significant)

Furthermore, the development of the oral feedback group did not differ substantially from that of the written feedback group. Both groups have performed well on a quantitative writing assessment. The written group provided a higher writing standard for language and organization only. At the same time, the group of oral feedback improved in micro-related aspects (i.e. grammar, vocabulary and mechanics, and spells) and macro-related aspects (i.e. content and organization). It shows that both feedback types have played different roles in writing less well divided between assessment criteria than oral feedback to improve all the five areas of student study.

CONCLUSION

In general, from all researches that have conducted, have shown that, regardless of the feedback type, students have made a written change and that there cannot be a correlation between feedback preferences and revision quality. As a consequence, oral and written input may be needed in order to improve students' writing further. In order for discussions and problems between the learner and the teacher to be realistic and even probable, oral

feedback should follow up with written feedback. Teachers should, however, align the task with its resources and time constraints and choose the comments form rather than with student preferences, with specific objectives (Ferris, 2003).

Ultimately, this study suggests that the quality of revision may correlate with feedback received based on the background and feedback quality. Comprehensive, understandable, unthreatening and meaningful to student-writers are needed for feedback, whether oral or written. Similarly, when communicating with the teacher reader and the input received, the learners should be alert and actively involved. Feedback integration performance depends mostly on feedback approaches that must be diversified or combined, and the internal coherence in every form of feedback. In other words, the feedback always has to be given with caution, with adequate and autonomous training, must be implemented as an additive feedback style employing review of useful learning tools (for example, grammar books, dictionaries).

Furthermore, based on the previous studies and the findings of the study, the researcher would like to propose a suggestion which is expected to bring a noteworthy contribution to both Indonesian English teachers and Indonesian researchers. English teachers are expected to implement teacher written feedback that combined with oral feedback in their class, especially in writing. For the researchers are suggested to explore further study in this particular area, as far as the researcher has researched, this similar study is still scant in Indonesia. Therefore, further studies are needed to discover and/or cross-check about students' perception on teacher written and oral feedback in writing class.

REFERENCES

- Altman, S., Valenzi, E., & Hodgetts, R. M. (2013). *Organizational behavior: Theory and practice*. Elsevier.
- Austin, T. Y., & Haley, M. H. (2004). *Content-based second language teaching and learning: An interactive approach*. Boston, US: Allyn & Bacon.
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2011). Grammatical change in the noun phrase: The influence of written language use. *English Language and Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674311000025>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Brown, E., & Glover, C. (2005). Refocusing written

- feedback. In 13th Improving Student Learning Symposium, Imperial College, London (pp. 5-7).
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). Feedback that fits. Engaging the whole child: Reflections on best practices in learning, teaching, and leadership, 166-175.
- Chiang, K. (2004). An investigation into students' preferences for and responses to teacher feedback and its implications for writing teachers. Hong Kong Teachers' Centre Journal, 3, 98-115.
- Elftorp, F. (2007). How to Improve Students' Writing and Speaking Skills. *How to Improve Students Writing and Speaking Ability*, 37.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
- Fathman, A. K., & Whalley, E. (2012). Teacher response to student writing: focus on form versus content. In *Second Language Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524551.016>
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. In *Response To Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201>
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and practice.
- Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45(1), 69-94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2007.003>
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 63-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.006>
- Hattie, J., & Gan, M. (2011). Instruction based on feedback. In *Handbook of research on learning and instruction* (pp. 263-285). Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hyland, F. (2003). *Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback*. 31, 217-230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6)
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues, 1-19.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). State of the art article: Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language Teaching*.
- Hyland, Ken. (2003). *Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process*. 12, 17-29. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00124-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00124-8)
- Hyland, Ken, & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Hyland, Ken, & Hyland, F. (2014). *Teaching: Feedback on second language students' writing State-of-the-art article Feedback on second language students' writing*. (May), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Konold, K. E., Miller, S. P., & Konold, K. B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to enhance student learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(6), 64-69.
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A., & Buelens, M. (2002). *Organizational behavior*. London, UK: McGraw Hill.
- Leaph, K. (2020). Using Oral and Written Feedback to Improve Student Writing: An Investigation from Cambodian University Students Perspectives. *Asian EFL Journal*, 24(3).
- Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing trust between teacher and students through feedback and revision cycles in an EFL writing classroom. *Written Communication*, 25(4), 506-537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308322301>
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285-312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001>
- Lee, I. (2017). Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts. In *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>
- Konold, K. E., Miller, S. P., & Konold, K. B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to enhance student learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(6), 64-69.
- Kreitner, R., Kinicki, A., & Buelens, M. (2002). *Organizational behavior*. London, UK: McGraw Hill.
- Leaph, K. (2020). Using Oral and Written Feedback to Improve Student Writing: An Investigation from Cambodian University Students Perspectives. *Asian EFL Journal*, 24(3).
- Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2011). *A Qualitative Case Study of EFL Students' Affective Reactions to and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Written Feedback*. 4(3), 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14>
- McLaughlin, B. F. (2009). Live conference feedback as

the primary mode of teacher response to freshman writing: Perceptions, patterns, and connections. George Mason University.

- Peterson, S. S., & McClay, J. (2010). Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 86–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.003>
- Reid, J. (2012). Advanced EAP writing and curriculum design: What do we need to know? In *On Second Language Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410600899-16>
- Rosdiana. (2017). STUDENTS' PERCEPTION TOWARD WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASSROOM. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR)*.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 203-234.
- Treglia, M. (2008). Feedback on Feedback: Exploring Student Responses to Teachers' Written Commentary. *Journal of Basic Writing*.
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(3), 379-394.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). Assessing Writing. In *Assessing Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511732997>