Abstract
This study is aimed at investigating students’ preferences toward teacher written feedback and how each type of teacher written feedback facilitate or hinder the students’ learning. There are three kinds of teacher written feedback to be investigated: (1) direct written feedback, (2) indirect written feedback, and (3) metalinguistic corrective feedback. The data were collected by distributing questionnaires which consist of open-ended and closed-ended questions. A total of 60 students participated in filling the questionnaires of this study. The findings show that almost all of the students preferred to direct written feedback. The reasons why they preferred direct written feedback were because they like to get explicit feedback that provides error corrections and they found that this feedback help them in writing revision. The second preferable feedback is metalinguistic corrective feedback which uses abbreviations codes. Interestingly, there was none of the students who prefer to indirect written feedback. They found that indirect written feedback hindered them when they revise their writing. The main point that made indirect written feedback hindered the students is the use of codes which make them confused and the absence of error corrections in it.
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INTRODUCTION

In EFL teaching and learning process, after students finish their writings, they usually get feedback. The term feedback can be defined as a useful suggestion, error correction, question, or comment from a reader to a writer which can be a reference for the writer to revise the writing in order to make it better (Keh, 1990 in Wen, 2013). Several types of feedback in writing classes can be peer feedback and teacher feedback. Teacher feedback can be in the form of
written or oral, written feedback is when the students get written feedback in their
printed writing assignments while oral feedback is when the students get oral
feedback about their writing. Oral feedback can be obtained through discussions
or face to face consultation between the students and the writing teachers.

Teacher feedback is needed in every student’s writing assignment because
it has some advantages for the students’ writing. Firstly, students can measure
their performance in writing whether they are good or not (Mi, 2009; Littleton,
2011 in Elshirbini & Elashri, 2013). Secondly, when the students find out that
their performance in writing is not good enough, feedback can be a guidance to
help them to make their writing better and to improve their writing performance
(Getchell, 2011 in Elshirbini & Elashri, 2013). Thirdly, aside from the potentials
of feedback for monitoring students’ progress in writing, through feedback, they
can learn to take a look at others’ opinion and consider the feedback for
improving their writing and also to adapt it to their writing (Asiri, 1996 in
Elshirbini & Elashri, 2013).

In response to the importance of the teacher feedback, some researchers
have conducted some studies on this issue. Lee (2005) conducted a study about
students’ attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions toward teacher feedback in writing
class. In this study, the students’ preferences toward two types of teacher feedback
are being analyzed. The feedbacks are: (1) mark the errors and provide corrections
and (2) mark the errors without provide any corrections. Interestingly, the results
show that more than a half of the students prefer to the first type of feedback but
they also believe that the second type of feedback might be useful for them.
Simpson (2006) explored about students’ attitude toward two types of feedback that emphasis on comments about content and suggestions for improvements and also feedback that emphasis on grammatical error corrections. This study was conducted for a whole semester and the findings indicate that students expect to get the combination of both types of feedback. This combination motivates them to complete their writing assignments because they get grammatical error corrections and positive comments coupled with suggestions in their writings. They also feel more confident in writing because of the motivating comment that they had received.

Another study (Zacharias, 2007) examined teacher and student attitude toward teacher feedback in writing class. The study is aimed to explore students’ attitudes toward teacher feedback. Based on the results, both teachers and students believe that teacher feedback is important in improving students’ writing. Additionally, the amount of the feedback gives a big influence in students’ feelings. Students feel excited toward teacher feedback but if the amount of feedback is “too much”, it will not be useful for them instead it will lower their writing motivation. Similar to Zacharias (2007) study, subjects in Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) study also feel excited and motivated when they get a “little” feedback.

Some former studies have provided some useful information about students’ attitudes toward teacher written feedback both positive and negative attitudes. However, there is a little information about students’ preferences toward particular types of teacher written feedback. Therefore, this study is aimed at
investigating students’ preference toward teacher written feedback in the writer’s context (i.e. English Teacher Education Program, Satya Wacana Christian University). This is done since in many writing assignments teachers usually give their feedback. In this way, students must have experienced how the feedback facilitate and/ or hinder their learning. To achieve the aim, this study will answer the following questions:

1. What are the students’ preferences toward types of teacher written feedback?
2. How does certain type of teacher written feedback can facilitate or hinder the students’ learning?

The findings of the study can be useful for writing teachers to know what students’ preferences on certain type of feedback are, so they can help students to improve their writing ability by considering students’ preferences.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This section presents the theoretical framework used in this study including the definition of the three types of teacher written feedback (i.e. direct written feedback, indirect written feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback) coupled with the examples, advantages and disadvantages of each type of feedback.

Feedback in EFL Student Writing

In EFL students writing, feedback can be classified according to the following (Elshirbini & Elashri, 2013):
1. the performer or the provider of feedback which consists of peer feedback, self feedback and teacher feedback;

2. the timing of the feedback that consists of delayed feedback and immediate feedback;

3. the form of feedback, including direct and indirect feedback;

4. the method of performance of feedback which consists of oral feedback and written feedback;

5. the concentration on a specific item in feedback including grammar, spelling and etc;

6. the stage of process writing feedback and the effect of feedback that consists of feedback in revising and editing stages.

However, in this study, the focus is only on the two types of feedback: the performer or the provider of feedback (i.e. teacher feedback) and the method of performance of feedback (i.e. written feedback).

**Types of Teacher Written Feedback**

Teacher written feedback is a written feedback given from teacher to students. It can be in form of comment, suggestion, error correction, or question that can be used by the students in revising their writings (Keh, 1990 in Wen, 2013). In this study, there are three types of teacher written feedback used which are direct written feedback, indirect written feedback, and metalinguistic corrective feedback.
A. Direct Written Feedback

The first type of feedback is direct written feedback. In this type of feedback, the writing teacher directly and explicitly gives the feedback on the students’ writing. As Ferris (2006) stated:

Direct feedback is defined as the provision of the correct linguistic form by the teacher to the students. Direct feedback may take various forms, including crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme; inserting a missing word or morpheme; or writing the correct word or form near the erroneous form (e.g., above it or in the margin). (p.83)

When a teacher finds some errors in the students’ writing, she will directly write the correction in the place where the errors occur. For example, write the correct verb and crossing out an incorrect spelling. If the students are required to do the revision of their writing, they will just simply copy and retype the ideas or corrections that they got from the teacher. The example of direct written feedback is illustrated in the Figure 1.

Figure 1: Example of direct written feedback as taken from one of Integrated Course (IC) students’ writing
Construction and Obstruction of Direct Written Feedback in Students’ Learning

Direct written feedback is believed to promote the following benefits (Ellis, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b in Beuningen, 2010; Chandler, 2003):

- it gives benefits for the beginner level of students who still need a guidance from the teacher or instructor to make a good writing;
- it provides students with explicit guidance and information needed about how to correct the errors that they made. If the teacher does not give the correction, the students might encounter some problem in revising their writing;
- it is the fastest and easiest feedback for the students to understand and make revision of their writings.

On the other hand, this can be potential for hinder learning due to the following things (Ellis, 2008):

- it does not train the students to be an independent learners because in revising, all they need to do is to copy and retype the error corrections, comment, or ideas that they got from the teacher;
- it may not contribute to long-term learning since the students simply copy the teacher ideas and contributions.

B. Indirect Written Feedback

The second type of the teacher written feedback is indirect written feedback. This type of feedback occurs when teacher marks students’ errors
by using some symbols such as circle, underline, square, arrow, and others without giving the corrections. Indirect written feedback requires the students to revise the errors that have been marked by the teacher on their own (Ferris, 2006: 83). Usually, the students have been explained the meaning of the symbols used by the teacher so that they know what they should do and how they should revise after they got the feedback. The example of indirect written feedback is illustrated in the Figure 2.

![Example of indirect written feedback](image-url)

**Figure 2: Example of indirect written feedback (Ellis, 2008)**

**Construction and Obstruction of Indirect Written Feedback in Students’ Learning**

As elaborated previously, the strengths of indirect written feedback are (Ferris, 2003, p.51-52):

- it trains the students to be independent learners because they have to correct their errors that have been marked by the teachers on their own;
- it helps the students to be more aware of the errors that they make so that they will not make the same mistakes in writing.
Apart from the strengths, there are some weaknesses of indirect written feedback (Ferris, 2003, p.52; Chandler, 2003), which are:

- it needs a long time for students to revise their writing because they have to consider the meaning of the symbols they got in their writing;
- it may cause confusion to the students by teacher’s way in circling, underlining, color-coding, or abbreviations attached to their errors;
- it may cause confusion, misunderstanding on whether their own correction is correct and accurate.

C. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

The third type of teacher written feedback is metalinguistic corrective feedback. Ellis (2008) said, “Metalinguistic corrective feedback involves providing students with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors they have made”. This kind of feedback typically uses error codes which mean that the teacher writes abbreviated labels (such as: art. = article, WW = Wrong Word, prep. = preposition) in the students writing where the error occurs. The labels can be placed over the errors location in the text or in the margin (Ellis, 2008). The examples of the teacher metalinguistic corrective feedback are illustrated in the Figure 3 and Figure 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>art.</th>
<th>WW art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog was going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Example of metalinguistic corrective feedback over the errors location (Ellis, 2008)
Construction and Obstruction of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback in Students’ Learning

- since the focus of this feedback is on the grammatical errors, it will be useful for the students to improve their writing ability especially in grammar;
- it trains the students to be independent learners because they are required to revise their errors by themselves.

Besides the advantages above, the disadvantages of metalinguistic corrective feedback are (Ellis, 2008):
- it is more time consuming for the students in revising their writing because the use of some abbreviation labels;
- it can cause another problems for the students while revising such as writing incorrect error corrections, confused toward the meaning of the abbreviation labels given, etc;
it requires the teacher who has a sufficient metalinguistic knowledge in order to be able to write clear and accurate explanations for a different kinds of error made by the students.

Among the three kinds of teacher written feedback, some experts have proven that metalinguistic corrective feedback is more effective than the other types of feedback. Ellis (2008) stated that both direct and metalinguistic feedback are effective in increasing accuracy of the students’ use of articles in subsequent writing that completed immediately after those type of feedback treatment. However, metalinguistic corrective feedback proved to be more effective than direct feedback in the long-term learning.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the methodology of the study including context of the study, participants, instrument of data collection, procedure of data collection, and procedure of data analysis.

Context of the Study

The study was conducted at the (ETEP) English Teacher Education Program, Faculty of Language and Literature, (SWCU) Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia. The reason of using this setting as the context of the study was because there were some writing courses offered to the ETEP students. For example, Guided Writing, Narrative and Descriptive Writing, Expository and Argumentative Writing, and Academic Writing. In these
six writing classes, students commonly got several types of written feedback from the writing teachers.

**Participant**

This study involved 60 students of the English Teacher Education Program who were from 2011 academic year. The reason why the writer chose the participants was because they had taken all of the writing classes as mentioned above so they had already experienced receiving several types of teacher written feedback in their writings.

**Instrument of Data Collection**

The instrument used to obtain the data was questionnaire (see APPENDIX). The use of questionnaire was aimed at gathering statistical and qualitative data from the participants about what particular types of feedback were preferred by the students and the reasons why they chose particular feedback. The questionnaire consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended questions. The closed-ended questions consisted of the three types of the teacher written feedback which were direct written feedback, indirect written feedback, and metalinguistic corrective feedback.

The participants were asked to choose which type of teacher written feedback they liked most. The statistical data of the students’ preferences was obtained from these closed-ended questions, which was to answer the first research question - What are the students’ preferences toward types of teacher written feedback? For the open-ended questions, the participants were asked to
write their reasons of why they chose particular type of feedback. The answers for these questions were considered as the qualitative data which were used to answer the second research question - How does certain type of teacher written feedback can facilitate or hinder the students?

**Procedure of Data Collection**

The data was collected through the following procedures. First, piloting the questionnaire before it was being distributed to the participants. According to McKay (2006) in Zacharias (2012:44), “the purpose of piloting a survey is to explore what potential problems may exist (e.g. clarity of the instructions, items that might be confusing or difficult to understand)”. In doing piloting process, the questionnaires should be given to approximately ¼ of the number of participants (Zacharias, 2012:44). The piloting questionnaire is also for testing whether the data obtained from the questionnaires were able to answer the research questions.

In terms of the number of participants for piloting, the questionnaires were given to 15 students of ETEP SWCU from 2010 academic year, which fulfills ¼ numbers of participants as suggested above. The results of the piloting showed that the questionnaire items were clear and easy to be understood. After finishing the piloting process, the questionnaires were distributed to the 60 participants in the Academic Writing classes. The participants had to answer the questions on the questionnaire in the classroom and then submit it soon after they have finished completing the questionnaire.
Procedure of Data Analysis

The statistical data from the closed-ended items were counted to get the percentage and to be presented in form of pie chart. It was aimed to know which type of feedback that the participants like most and subsequently which type of feedback that the participants like least. The qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions were analyzed through coding process. The data were classified into some initial themes that emerged from the answers. The data on the initial themes were developed into final theme in order to narrow down the themes. It was aimed to know whether the feedback that the participants had chosen facilitate or hinder them.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the finding of the study and its discussion. The findings are obtained from the students’ answers in the questionnaires in attempt to answer the research questions:

1. What are the students’ preferences toward types of teacher written feedback?
2. How does certain type of teacher written feedback can facilitate or hinder the students?

Students’ Preferences toward Types of Teacher Written Feedback

To answer research question number one, the statistical data obtained from the questionnaires are presented in the Figure 5 that describes the percentage of the students’ preferences toward three types of teacher written feedback.
Figure 5: Percentage of feedback that students like the most

In the Figure 5, it is clearly describes that the feedback which the students like the most is direct written feedback. It is provided by the number of 77% of the students who prefer this type of feedback. The second type of feedback that they like is metalinguistic corrective feedback which chosen by 23% of students. Interestingly, the number of difference between those who prefer direct written feedback and metalinguistic corrective feedback is huge (54%). This makes direct written feedback appear as the most preferable feedback of the ETEP 2011 academic year students.

Surprisingly, there is none of the students who choose teacher indirect written feedback as the feedback that they like the most. In other words, this feedback is considered as the feedback that the students like the least. As a matter of fact, Lalande (1982) as cited in Storch (2010) indicated that indirect feedback is more potential than direct feedback. However, in this study, the students seem to believe that they will gain more benefit from direct written feedback and metalinguistic corrective feedback.
The finding of this study is similar to some former studies (Chandler, 2003; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Lee, 2005) where direct written feedback is chosen as the most preferable feedback for the subjects due to some reasons.

**How Teacher Written Feedback Can Facilitate or Hinder Students’ Learning**

To answer the second research question which is about how certain type of teacher written feedback can facilitate or hinder the students, the qualitative data is analyzed and grouped into some themes of students’ statements. There are some excerpts that directly quoted the students’ statements without any editing.

**How Direct Written Feedback Can Facilitate or Hinder Students’ Learning**

The main reason of favoring this type of feedback has something to do with clarity. More than a half of the students’ statements indicate that this type of feedback is clear on what and how to revise. Below are how they express their preferences:

“It is clear what or where is our mistake, so that it is easier for us to revise or correct it” (Student 3).

“Because this kind of feedback give me clear instruction of what I have to do to correct my mistake” (Student 41).

“The clearest feedback I think. So students can directly know how to revise their writing” (Student 45).

“It is clear, which part should we revised what mistakes we have made” (Student 48).

Other students stated that direct written feedback is easy to understand,

“It’s easy to understand, the students will not get confused” (Student 22).

“It’s simpler than the other. So it will easy to understand” (Student 35).
“Easier to understand and it will help me revising my writing” (Student 38).

The students in the excerpts above state that teacher direct written feedback is clear, easy to understand and will not cause confusion when they revise their writings. Moreover, it provides explicit direction, for example, pointing out the feedback which being placed right on the errors so that they know what, which, where, and how to revise the errors that they have made. What the students have experienced as the advantages of teacher direct written feedback above is in line with Ellis (2008); Bitchener & Knoch (2010b) in Beuningen (2010) who said that one of the advantages of teacher direct written feedback is providing students with explicit guidance and information needed about how to correct the errors that they made.

Another reason of preferring to this type of feedback is about the effectiveness. Since direct written feedback is easy to understand and provides clear instruction, the students only need less time to revise their writings.

“Because writing needs to be as clear as possible, I prefer feedback type A [direct written feedback], especially because it save the time for correcting such grammatical error…” (Student 44).

Student’s statement in the excerpt above describe that it does not need a long time in revising their writing with direct written feedback in it because this type of feedback is clear and provide error corrections.

Apart from the standing points of direct written feedback, it is necessary to see how this feedback can hinder learning considering that there are some of the
students who do not like this type of feedback. There are two emerging themes underlying this. The first theme is that direct written feedback makes them become dependent learners,

“It is like not get a feedback but just letting the teacher correcting our work” (Student 15).

“It makes the students lazy, because the teacher revise it directly” (Student 4).

“Doesn’t make the students become “independent” in writing” (Student 8).

These students feel that they do not really do their part but the teacher does. This makes them reliant to their teacher.

Second reason is about how direct written feedback does not improve the students’ writing ability, as stated in the following excerpts:

“Students wouldn’t improve because they do not figure their mistakes out and just revise what the teacher said whether it is correct/ incorrect” (Student 6).

“Not effective for me to be a good writer” (Student 16).

It is interesting to see how their reasons get connected one and another. Based on the students’ reasons, direct written feedback does not train the students to be independent learners because it is just like letting the teacher correcting their work and like spoon feeding. This demotivates students and does not improve their writing ability. It is in line with Ellis (2008) statements about the disadvantages of direct written feedback. The first advantages is it does not train the students to be an independent learners because in revising, all they need to do is to copy and retype the error corrections, comments, or ideas that they got from the teacher.
Table 1

Advantages and Disadvantages of Direct Written Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear on what and how to revise</td>
<td>Makes students become dependent learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand</td>
<td>Does not improve writing ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective in terms of time needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 describes the summary of the advantages and disadvantages of direct written feedback based on the students’ statements that have been discussed on the previous paragraphs above.

**How Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback Can Facilitate or Hinder Students’ Learning**

There are 23% of the students who choose metalinguistic corrective feedback as their favorite feedback. Based on the reasons that they gave, there are two emerging themes that indicate their preferences. The first one is that metalinguistic corrective feedback develops thinking skill. This point is described as follows:

“This kind of feedback is very helpful for us to understand why and how our work is wrong so we can gain our understanding in grammar” (Student 27).

“The students can improve their own skills and senses if the feedback is given this way” (Student 43)

“I became more aware and be very careful in the next writing because I don’t want to see those symbols on my paper” (Student 56).
Based on the students’ statements above, metalinguistic corrective feedback develops some thinking skills such as understanding in grammar, awareness and carefulness in their next writings.

The second factor that can facilitate students’ learning is the way how metalinguistic corrective feedback can train them to be independent.

“By doing so, we will not always rely on our teacher to correct our mistake, so that we can learn by repairing the mistakes” (Student 4)

“...[metalinguistic corrective feedback]...can be more stimulate students so that they can revise their writings (not depend on someone else)...” (Student 8)

“...because I will know which my mistake is and without saying it directly I will try to analyze it.” (Student 17)

The reason why the students prefer metalinguistic corrective feedback is it trains them to be independent because they will not always rely on their teacher to correct their own mistakes and stimulates them to correct their own mistakes.

The idea that metalinguistic corrective feedback can train them to be independent and develop their thinking skills is in line with Ferris et al (2001) as cited in Ellis (2008) who argued that metalinguistic corrective feedback trains the students to be independent learners because they are required to revise their errors by themselves. Since the focus of this feedback is on the grammatical errors, this will be useful for the students to improve their writing ability especially in grammar. Based on the reasons given by the students, they thought that they will gain some benefits when they get metalinguistic corrective feedback in their writings.
Apart from the advantages of metalinguistic corrective feedback, some of the students find it disadvantageous. Their reasons are because this feedback is difficult to be understood, as stated:

“I don’t really understand what is the meaning of the feedback” (Student 13).

“Difficult to understand. (It is hard if we have not know how to read those symbols)” (Student 36).

Based on the excerpts above, the students stated that this type of feedback is difficult to be understood as this type of feedback using some abbreviations and they also do not know the meaning of this feedback.

Another reasons given by the students is about this feedback is confusing, below are the students’ statements that describe how metalinguistic corrective feedback is confusing.

“Most students will be confused to correct their writing because they have to find the correct words from the comment such as what preposition is appropriate” (Student 37).

According to the student, it is confusing to find the correction of some grammatical errors that they made such as what preposition is appropriate.

As for the last reason is about time consuming, one of the students stated:

“I need to learn about the code to correct my work. (Wasting time)” (Student 57).

The student in the excerpt above feels that it is wasting time to read and learn about the meaning of the codes used in the feedback in order to revise the writing.
From the excerpts of some of the students’ statements above, the students thought that they feel confused, hardly understand, and spend time when they get metalinguistic corrective feedback in their writings. The statements can be considered as the disadvantages of this type of feedback. It is suitable with Ellis (2008) statements that metalinguistic corrective feedback is more time consuming for the students in revising their writing because it uses some abbreviation labels and it may make the students to face other problems while revising such as write incorrect error corrections, confused toward the meaning of the abbreviation labels given, etc.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops thinking skills</td>
<td>Difficult to be understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains students become independent learners</td>
<td>Confusing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 is the summary of the advantages and disadvantages of metalinguistic corrective feedback. Based on the statements given by the students, there are three emerging themes that indicate the advantages of this feedback and two emerging themes for its disadvantages.

**How Indirect Written Feedback Can Facilitate or Hinder Students’ Learning**

The students choose indirect written feedback as the feedback that they like the least. There are four emerging themes based on the students’ statements. The first point that hinders the students’ learning is the fact that this feedback is
confusing. The students’ statements below demonstrate how indirect written feedback is confusing:

“Because only by looking at it I feel confused” (Student 5).

“It’s confusing. Looking for one x symbol makes me confused, and I can’t imagined if I found more x symbol” (Student 11).

“Because this kind of feedback make me confuse what should be do to revise my errors. Also, it isn’t stated what kind of informations which should be added” (Student 30).

In the excerpts of the students’ statements above, it is clearly described that the first factors which cause students’ confusion is the symbols used in the feedback. The second factor is indirect error corrections demand them to identify what the error is and what to revise. These reasons make them puzzled. This is in line with what Chandler (2003) have claimed that indirect feedback might fail because it provides students with insufficient information to resolve complex errors.

Additionally, second reasons given by the students indicate that this feedback is unclear, as stated by the students:

“Because it doesn’t make any clear instruction to me for doing the correction” (Student 41).

“Ambiguity, not clear enough. As a student, I expect to get right and clear feedback to get the right answer, not the confused feedback” (Student 59).

Based on the students’ statements, this feedback is unclear because it does not provide any clear instruction on what and how to revise the errors they made. Another reason, indirect written feedback is ambiguous and they expect to get the clear feedback not the one that used symbols and does not provide any error corrections.
The third point describes that this feedback is difficult to be understood, below are the excerpts:

“Difficult to understand” (Student 35).

“Difficult to understand and it will not help me in revising my writing” (Student 38).

It is very possible that the previous reasons which are confusing and unclear codes make this feedback difficult to be understood by the students and even they stated that it will not help them in revising their writings.

The last point indicates that this type of feedback is time consuming. As stated by the statement below:

“Because it needs more time to revise, and sometimes even to open grammar book” (Student 44).

There is only one of the students who stated that this type of feedback is time consuming. According to the student, it needs more time in revising writing with indirect written feedback in it.

Based on the students’ statements on the excerpts above, it can be drawn that the indirect written feedback is confusing, unclear, difficult to be understood, and time consuming because it uses some symbols and does not provide any error corrections. This is in line with Ferris (2003: 52) statements that the disadvantages of indirect written feedback are time consuming and confusing because students have to consider to the meaning of the symbols they got in their writing. It is confusing in dealing with circling, underlining, color-coding, or abbreviations attached to the error. The students’ reasons elaborate why they chose indirect
written feedback as the feedback that they like the least and all of them are about the disadvantages of indirect written feedback.

Interestingly, almost all of the students’ reasons to dislike indirect written feedback are perfectly matched to the reasons for favoring direct written feedback. They prefer to get a clear, easy to understand, and effective feedback rather than the feedback that unclear, difficult to understand, and time consuming. The findings show that none of the students choose indirect written feedback whereas it has advantages that might train them to be independent learners because they have to correct their errors that have been marked by the teachers on their own. Some researchers (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Beuningen, 2010; Lalande, 1982 in Storch, 2010; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005) also agree that indirect written feedback is more potential rather than direct written feedback for long-term students’ improvements.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to be understood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time consuming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 is the summary of the advantages and disadvantages of indirect written feedback based on the students’ statements that have been discussed on
the previous paragraphs. There are four emerging themes that indicate the disadvantages of indirect written feedback and in contrary there is none of its advantages.

CONCLUSION AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATION

The aim of this study is to investigate students’ preference toward certain type of teacher written feedback and how it can facilitate or hinder their learning. The findings of the study obtained from the questionnaire data illustrate that majority of the students prefer teacher direct written feedback in their writings. Their preferences are mostly affected by their positive attitudes toward this type of feedback. Based on their statements, direct written feedback can facilitate them in learning because firstly, this is the clearest feedback among the other types of feedback that they got. Secondly, in this type of feedback the students get explicit guidance and corrections of their mistakes so that they will not make any other mistakes in revising their writings. The last reason, since this type of feedback is clear and explicit, it does not waste the time when the students were revising their writings. However, this type of feedback makes them to be dependent learners and does not improve writing ability.

The second preferable type of feedback is metalinguistic corrective feedback. The students prefer this type of feedback because it can develop some thinking skills and train them to be independent learners. However, the uses of abbreviation symbols in this feedback sometimes make the students confused and
it is difficult to be understood. Moreover, this feedback only indicates the errors without providing any corrections.

On the contrary, there is none of the students who prefer to teacher indirect written feedback for some reasons. The first reason is the use of some codes in this type of feedback that make the students confused and hardly understand the meaning of the codes. The second reason, unlike direct written feedback, indirect written feedback does not provide any error corrections instead the teacher only marks the students’ error using codes. The last reasons, this type of feedback is time consuming whereas some former studies proved that this type of feedback is more potential to improve students’ writing ability.

The implication of the results of the study in teaching are first, writing teachers can provide direct written feedback to students writing since this is the most preferable feedback but they still have to consider to the disadvantages that might hinder the students. Second, teachers have to think carefully when they want to provide indirect written feedback since there is none of the students who prefer to this type of feedback despite its potential which might improve students’ writing ability. As an alternative choice, teacher might provide metalinguistic corrective feedback which able to enhance the students’ writing ability without using any confusing symbols and giving explicit corrections.

The findings of this study cannot be generalized to all of EFL university students because the subjects of this study are not in general and this study is conducted in a university only. Moreover, the study is only focus on students’
preferences and perspectives without considering the teachers’ preferences and perspectives. Further research is needed to find the preferences and perspectives of writing teachers. By finding the teachers’ preferences and perspectives, it will be easier to find what type of teacher written feedback that is more effective and suitable for the students in improving their writing ability.
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APPENDIX

Dear participants,

I am a student of English Department who is doing a research for my thesis. This research is conducted to explore students’ preferences toward teacher written feedback. Please be kindly to fill out this questionnaire bellow.

In this questionnaire, I provide some questions. For closed-ended questions, I provide some options that you can choose. For open-ended questions, feel free to answer based on your thinking. Your answer will not affect your grade. You may use English or Indonesian. Please answer this questionnaire as honestly as you can.

The following are feedback that usually given by the teacher in the student’s writing:

a. Teacher direct written feedback (identify the errors by giving the correction in the errors).
   Example:
   
   | is ing     | bicycle On |
   --- | --- |
   The man / stands at the corner of the street. He is repairing his bicycle. In the right side, Smith’s family are walking along the street. The man who wear a is ing jacket / stands in front of them.

b. Teacher indirect written feedback (identify the errors using some symbols without giving any correction).
   Example:
   
   A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with X having X X bone. When the dog was going X through X X bridge over X the X river he found X dog in the river.

   X = missing word
   X X = wrong word
c. Metalinguistic corrective feedback (identify the errors using abbreviated labels for different kinds of error).

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>art.</th>
<th>art.</th>
<th>WW art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: art. : Article; WW : Wrong Word; prep. : Preposition

1. Which type of feedback you like the most? Circle accordingly!
   a   b   c

   Reason:
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

2. Which type of feedback you like the least? Circle accordingly!
   a   b   c

   Reason:
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

Participant demographic info

NIM :
Gender : Male / Female (circle accordingly)

How long learning English :

😊 Thank you 😊