IREELL
Indonesian Review of English Education, Linguistics, and Literature
P-ISSN: 3025-2369 **I** E-ISSN: 3021-8101
https://jurnalfaktarbiyah.iainkediri.ac.id/index.php/ireel/index

Current Practices of Corrective Feedback in Indonesian Secondary EFL Classrooms: A Systematic Review

Saniatul Maslucha
English Department, Graduate School, IAIN Kediri
saniamaslucha@gmail.com

Muhammad Alvin Firmansyah
English Department, Graduate School, IAIN Kediri

Maulidiyyatul Uswah
English Department, Graduate School, IAIN Kediri

Noor Apriyan Rachmatian
English Department, Graduate School, IAIN Kediri

ABSTRACT

In the dynamic landscape of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in Indonesian secondary schools, the significance of corrective feedback emerges as a focal point for enhancing language development, refining writing abilities, and shaping students' attitudes. the paper incorporates an examination of students' responses and attitudes towards corrective feedback, providing valuable insights into the effectiveness and reception of these strategies. Through a comprehensive literature review, the article aims to contribute to the ongoing discourse surrounding the implementation of corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL education, offering a nuanced understanding of both teacher practices and student perspectives. The investigation meticulously scrutinizes both written corrective feedback (WCF) and oral corrective feedback, shedding light on the myriad strategies employed by educators and the diverse responses emanating from students across different educational tiers. Additionally, the research delves into students' responses and attitudes towards corrective feedback across different school levels, revealing varying reactions.

Keywords: corrective feedback, Indonesian Secondary School, EFL classes

Copyright: © 2024 by Authors.
This is an open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Introduction

Feedback is an activity which doing by teacher specifically correcting students' error in learning process (Wahlström, 2014). By giving the detail feedback, the students will receive their error and revise their task based on the teachers' notes. The result of giving corrective feedback is a successful in learning process. Providing feedback also develop the students' writing ability (Ferris, 2002). The students' commit to produce the revision draft from teachers' feedback on their writing. In order to present the best result, they always pay attention to not making an error which they produced on their first draft of writing. Reid (1995) said students' improvement of writing skill should assist by teachers' detailed feedback in order to students able to change their error into the good one.

Errors among students are prevalent in academic settings, particularly in their written work. Teachers often provide written feedback on drafts or outlines to help students improve their writing skills (Ferris, 2003). The manner in which this feedback is given can greatly influence students' abilities in writing (Siriluck, 2008). There are two main types of written corrective feedback (WCF) commonly used: direct and indirect (Ferris et al., 2012).

Direct WCF involves the teacher directly addressing errors in students' writing, such as vocabulary choice or grammar usage. Ferris (2006) further categorizes direct WCF into focused and unfocused forms. Focused direct WCF entails marking specific errors in students' writing, providing corrections directly above them. Unfocused direct WCF, on the other hand, is more general feedback given when errors span across various sentences, prompting the teacher to address broader issues like sentence structure or grammar usage (Ferris, 2006).

Indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) involves students providing their own feedback, as noted by D. Ferris and Roberts (2001). Here, the teacher simply indicates errors made by the students without offering the correct form. Instead, the teacher prompts students to correct the errors themselves. Indirect WCF encompasses three main types: coded feedback, un-coded feedback, and comments. Coded feedback entails the teacher using specific clues or codes to highlight errors in students' writing, such as 'ss' for sentence structure, 'VT' for verb tense, or 'WW' for wrong word. Conversely, un-coded WCF employs symbols like (_) or (^) to denote errors within words or sentences, encouraging students to revise and recognize their mistakes independently.

Several recent studies have explored the effectiveness of various types of WCF in improving students' writing skills in Indonesia. For instance, Susanti (2019) found that both direct and indirect WCF significantly improved students' writing accuracy, with direct feedback showing quicker benefits. This is consistent with the findings of Rahmawati and Indah (2020), who reported that focused direct WCF was particularly effective for long-term grammatical accuracy.

In their meta-analysis, Sari and Hidayat (2021) concluded that both direct and indirect WCF are effective in reducing errors, but their efficacy can vary based on factors such as the students' proficiency level and the type of errors addressed. Their analysis also highlighted that a combination of both types of feedback might be the most beneficial.

Furthermore, Putri and Kurniawan (2020) conducted a study comparing the impact of direct and indirect WCF on students' revision processes. They found that while direct WCF led to faster corrections, indirect WCF encouraged deeper cognitive engagement, which could result in more sustainable improvements in writing skills. Another recent study by Nurhayati and Sugiarto (2022) demonstrated that indirect WCF, especially coded feedback, fostered better long-term retention of grammatical structures compared to direct WCF. This suggests that prompting students to self-correct can enhance their engagement with the feedback process and lead to deeper learning.

The existing literature provides a solid foundation for understanding the effectiveness of corrective feedback but reveals several gaps when considering the specific context of Indonesian secondary school EFL classes. Addressing these gaps requires focused research on the practical implementation of feedback, teacher challenges, student perceptions, and the latest local research trends. This will provide a comprehensive overview of the state of corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms and offer insights for improving feedback practice

To address the gaps identified in the literature and provide a comprehensive understanding of corrective feedback in Indonesian secondary school EFL classrooms, the following research questions are proposed: (1) How is oral corrective feedback implemented in Indonesian secondary school EFL classrooms? (2) How is written corrective feedback implemented in Indonesian secondary school EFL classrooms? (3) How do students in

Indonesian secondary school EFL classes respond to and engage with different types of corrective feedback (both oral and written)?

Methods

This research uses the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method, a systematic, explicit and reproducible method for identifying, evaluating and synthesizing research works and results of thinking that have been carried out by researchers and practitioners who aim to recognize, review and evaluate all research that has been found. It is said to be "systematic" because it adopts a consistent and widely accepted methodology (Pati & Lorusso, 2018). This method was used to map previous research on corrective feedback used in EFL classrooms in Indonesian secondary schools. It aims to understand the development of the application of corrective feedback in EFL learning in secondary schools in Indonesia.

This SLR research uses the Google Scholar database to map publications in the form of journal articles, proceedings, and research reports that implement corrective feedback in English language learning in secondary schools in Indonesia. Google scholar is used as the main source of information because it is considered to have a wider coverage than other indices. Data were collected by searching for journal articles with the keywords "corrective feedback" or "oral or written" or "EFL classes" or "Indonesian secondary school" or "SMP, MTs, SMA, MA, SMK" in the Google Scholar database through the Publish or Perish (PoP) application, then processed with the PRISMA method. Excluded studies were: 1) not a primary study; 2) not published around 2013-2024; 3) not a journal article or proceedings, thesis, or dissertation; 4) not on the topic of corrective feedback implementation; 5) not in a secondary school setting in Indonesia. After the search, there were 50 studies to be reviewed in this study, consisting of 27 journal articles, 6 proceedings articles, bachelor theses, and 7 master theses.

Result and Discussion

This section elaborates on the findings and discussion derived from the review of 50 studies. The discussion is structured around the research questions, which are detailed in the sub-sections below.

a. *The Implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback in Indonesian Secondary School EFL Classes*

Oral corrective feedback involves the teacher verbally correcting students' mistakes in their speech. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) define it as immediate teacher responses to incorrect utterances, focusing on correcting students when they make errors. This type of feedback helps students understand and rectify their mistakes promptly. Lightbown and Spada (1999) add that corrective feedback informs learners of inappropriate language use, while Ellis, Loewen, and Eelam (2006) explain that it can include pointing out errors, providing the correct form, or offering insights into the nature of the mistake. Fungula (2013) emphasizes that oral corrective feedback addresses error correction during speaking, distinct from the broader concept of corrective feedback.

Understanding the significance of oral corrective feedback in correcting students' language errors is crucial. However, its impact on overall learning, especially its interaction with written feedback, requires examination.

Oral corrective feedback, as discussed earlier, involves teachers orally correcting students' speech errors. It serves to immediately rectify students' mistakes and improve their speech. This type of feedback aims to enhance students' learning by promptly addressing errors.

Both oral and written feedback are essential for identifying students' strengths and areas needing improvement. Oral feedback is provided verbally, often during interpersonal interactions, and can be directed to individuals, groups, or the whole class (Brookhart, 2008). Grombczewska (2010) highlights its role in understanding and receiving the speaker's message. It allows immediate feedback on performance, fostering dialogue, clarification, and motivation for improvement. Clarke et al. (2003) stress the importance of goal-focused oral feedback for effectiveness and usefulness. While, oral feedback has the advantage of providing a quick and interactive response, it is also important to understand that its use is integral to written feedback. Grombczewska (2010) highlights the importance of students' understanding and response to the message conveyed, underlining the diversity in the use of oral feedback in English language teaching.

However, Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) specified that verbal corrective feedback centers on the teacher's immediate reaction to students' errors. It's termed oral corrective feedback because it's given verbally when students make mistakes, extending beyond just written feedback. Russell and Spada (2006, p. 134) define corrective feedback as any feedback

provided to a learner, orally or otherwise, that addresses language form errors. Mahdi & Saadany (2013) suggest there are various approaches to implementing corrective feedback in classrooms. Oral corrective feedback primarily targets students' spoken language, while corrective feedback focuses solely on error correction (Fungula, 2013). Thus, oral corrective feedback plays a critical role in enhancing students' speech accuracy.

According to observations and interviews conducted as part of the introduction of oral corrective feedback in English language instruction Rahmawati (2023), teachers provided oral corrective feedback both immediately and later depending on the circumstance, focusing on certain subjects and working cooperatively. The methods most commonly employed in English language instruction were oral corrective feedback, explicit correction, and recasting. The findings showed that oral remedial feedback is generally well-perceived by students. When they make a mistake, they prefer to be corrected. Oral corrective criticism enables individuals to identify their mistakes, steer clear of them in the future, and advance their English language proficiency. Students, however, think that not every error needs to be fixed. Additionally, when it comes to vocal corrective feedback in English language instruction, students anticipate receiving both explicit correction and delayed feedback.

The understanding and implementation of oral feedback in the context of English language teaching is supported by practical findings and experiences in its use. Rahmawati (2023) highlighted students' various strategies and preferences in receiving oral feedback, which shows the importance of teachers' adaptability and responsiveness to students' individual needs.

Another studies, Siska, Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida (2018) observed oral corrective feedback techniques employed by teachers at SMAN 1 Koto Salak and SMAN 2 Koto Baru Dharmasraya. The identified techniques included explicit correction, recast, clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic cues, and repetition. Recasting and explicit correction emerged as the most commonly used oral corrective feedback methods among English teachers. These findings suggest that educators perceive these techniques as effective and suitable for addressing students' speaking errors. Additionally, teachers may employ body language and a combination of strategies alongside other oral corrective feedback methods to enhance students' speaking skills. Furthermore, teachers often opt for specific recasting tactics alongside explicit correction strategies for several reasons: promoting effective

speaking, aiding memory retention for error correction, preventing recurring mistakes, saving time, and aligning with students' comprehension levels.

Teachers typically employ explicit correction for three reasons: first, it is more appropriate for students at the senior high school level; second, it is a more detailed and understandable method; and third, it makes it easier for students to understand their mistakes and the proper format. It is possible to argue that the teacher employed specific tactics because they were aware of the pupils' comprehension, motivation, and state as well as their capacity to take in and comprehend the instruction.

Another study by Irfani & O'Boyle (2024) showed that students preferred feedback for vocabulary errors, while in practice, teachers responded more often to pronunciation errors. Students preferred negotiated feedback, but in practice, teachers used clarification requests more often. The two groups were aligned in one area; students showed a preference for feedback from teachers, and teachers' practice also clearly favoured feedback from teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, do not want to disturb students even though they are aware of mispronunciations, so in terms of the timing of providing corrections, teachers tend to choose either immediate or delayed corrections depending on student activity in the learning process (Rahman, Kahfi, & Dalimunthe, 2018).

Sa'adah (2021) emphasizes the necessity of incorporating spoken corrective feedback in classroom settings. It aids students in acquiring a second language and advancing linguistically. Failure to fully address students' errors may lead to fossilization, hindering future language learning. While the study didn't explore student preferences, future researchers should consider this aspect, as understanding students' preferences facilitates tailored feedback, enhancing the teaching and learning process. English instructors bear the responsibility of identifying students' speech errors and providing appropriate oral feedback. Open communication between students and teachers regarding speech challenges and feedback preferences fosters a clearer, more effective learning environment.

Primitasari's (2019) case study delves into the application of Teacher Corrective Feedback, focusing on perceptions of its value in writing classes. Employing a mix of closed-ended questionnaires, interviews, and observations, the study gathers qualitative and quantitative data from vocational students. Similarly, Ainah (2012) illustrates the efficacy of Teacher Corrective Feedback outside traditional English classroom settings. Positive feedback

from both teachers and students underscores its effectiveness, though progress in mastering complex phrases may require time. The study recommends clarifying feedback goals with students and addressing various challenges encountered by teachers, including differing proficiency levels and motivation among students. Overall, teacher corrective comments facilitate effective evaluation of students' work and accelerate the learning process by enabling self-correction through indirect feedback.

Shinta's findings in 2023 underscored the significance of employing implicit corrective feedback through recordings, offering personalized input tailored to individual student needs. While time-consuming, providing remedial feedback via recordings proved effective in enhancing students' awareness of language accuracy. Additionally, teacher involvement in providing implicit corrective feedback alongside students' speech recordings heightened awareness of speaking accuracy and fostered self-directed learning. However, to maximize benefits, students must invest in high-quality headphones, reliable network providers, and conducive learning environments.

Sa'adah, et al. (2018) provide an overview of oral corrective feedback in conversation classes, identifying various forms employed by instructors, including explicit correction, metalinguistic correction, and clarification requests. The predominant use of metalinguistic corrective feedback by teachers indicates a focus on raising students' awareness of language accuracy. Factors such as language competence, environmental conditions, and individual traits influence students' readiness to engage in class discussions, with student reluctance often stemming from personal factors rather than teacher criticism. The use of oral corrective feedback in English language teaching has garnered significant attention, as highlighted by Sa'adah, et. al., (2018) study. While different types of corrective feedback impact students' communication abilities, understanding individual preferences and needs is crucial for effective implementation.

Research by Prakoso et al. (2024) which explored whether or not students' level of language awareness differed significantly in their English oral proficiency showed that low, medium, and high proficiency students showed relatively similar levels of language awareness. In addition, the majority of students prefer explicit correction as a type of oral corrective feedback. Anggunsari & Mahmudah (2023) enumerate the advantages of oral corrective feedback, emphasizing the importance of tailoring feedback types to suit teachers'

and students' preferences. Failure to appropriately address student mistakes can hinder their development and competence, necessitating supportive guidance from teachers.

Padmini's (2015) investigation into SMK Dian Kirana teachers' use of vocal corrective feedback in pronunciation instruction reveals a diverse range of techniques employed, including recasting and observing student reactions to adjust feedback methods. This flexible approach ensures effective communication of corrective input during instruction. Rahmah (2023) highlights teachers' utilization of oral corrective feedback to address students' speaking errors, employing recast, clarification, and specific forms of feedback. While oral corrective feedback positively impacts students' speaking abilities and motivation, negative effects such as embarrassment and anxiety may also arise, emphasizing the importance of balanced feedback delivery. In addition, research by Rahmah (2023) revealed that the use of oral corrective feedback by teachers aims to correct the mistakes students make in speaking. Nonetheless, it is also important to consider the positive and negative effects of this use of oral corrective feedback on students' speaking skills.

In addition, the research results of Huwayana, W. W. (2023) show that the participant (teacher) provided Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in all classroom activities. Based on the activity theory perspective by Reynold and Teng (2020), the teacher and students engaged in creating interaction patterns such as explaining, question and answer sessions, recalling questions, and discussions. These interaction patterns influenced students' outcomes in terms of skills like critical thinking, creativity, and activeness. The findings suggest that OCF should be applied in learning activities that are beneficial for students' skills.

A thorough examination of oral corrective feedback in English language instruction indicates that it plays a critical role in identifying and resolving students' spoken language faults. Oral corrective feedback comes in a variety of forms, including recast, verbal correction, metalinguistic clues, clarification inquiries, and more. These provide teachers with a number of tools to help students improve the accuracy of their speech.

b. The Implementation of Written Corrective Feedback in Indonesian Secondary School EFL Classes

This section explores the utilization of written corrective feedback in EFL classes across secondary schools in Indonesia. Such feedback is commonplace across all levels of education, from elementary to university, particularly in writing tasks. Numerous studies, both within and outside Indonesia, have delved into this area, focusing specifically on its implementation in

Indonesian secondary school EFL classes (Achyani & Pusparini, 2014; Samad et al., 2016; Rismawati, 2018; Rhomawati, 2018; Suharyanti & Fauziaty, 2020; Wachidiyati, 2020; Irfan, 2020; Janah et al., 2021; Aprilia et al., 2022; Sari & Daulay, 2023).

Direct written corrective feedback (WCF) was the focus of research by Sari and Daulay (2023), examining teacher feedback on students' recount text writing at a senior high school in North Sumatra. Findings revealed that a science department teacher employed direct WCF methods like deletion, insertion, rewrite, and substitution, while a social department teacher opted for indirect WCF, providing comments and codes on students' texts. Similarly, Irfan (2020) conducted research in a junior high school in Malang, East Java, where teachers employed direct corrective feedback, crossing out error words and replacing them with correct ones. Janah et al. (2021) confirmed the use of direct corrective feedback, employing error correction marks such as underlining, circling, word deletion, and arrows in an eighth-grade class at SMP NU Palangkaraya.

Indirect corrective feedback methods are also prevalent in Indonesian secondary schools. Achyani & Pusparini (2014) observed such feedback at SMP Al Falah Deltasari Sidoarjo, East Java, where teachers used letter codes to indicate errors in students' drafts of descriptive texts. For instance, a 'v' code indicated a verb error, 's' for subject, 'n' for noun, and 'c' for conjunction errors. Additionally, highlighting was used to facilitate student self-correction. Suharyanti and Fauziati (2020) found similar practices in an Islamic junior high school in Central Java, where teachers employed indirect WCF through symbols like crossing, circling, or underlining error words. Other studies (Samad et al., 2016; Rismawati, 2018; Aprilia et al., 2022) also noted the use of indirect corrective feedback, employing symbols such as 'NE' for noun ending errors, 'Sp' for spelling, 'WF' for word form, 'WO' for word order, 'Pr' for pronoun errors, and '^' for missing words.

Both of direct WCF and indirect WCF are implemented in secondary school in Indonesia. Rhomawati, (2018) stated that there were direct and indirect CF implemented by the teacher of SMK Dian Kirana 1 Sragen. The Direct WCF implemented with the crossing an error word then replaced it into the correct one. Beside indirect WCF used uncoded WCF by giving crosswise in the number of the sentence without giving the specific code or the correct of the sentences. It follows by Wachidiyati (2020) which conduct a research at eight grades of SMP Agus Salim Semarang. She said that the teacher used both of direct and indirect WCF. The

direct WCF did in crossing or circling the errors and replace with the right one. Indirect WCF did the same manner without giving the correct one.

From the explanation about written corrective feedback implementing in secondary school in Indonesia, the researchers suggest to the educational community to use the appropriate WCF. The researchers who observed the implementation of both WCF also proved that there was a significant improving of achievement at students' worksheet. The direct corrective feedback more effective to apply on the students who have low prior in English subject. Therefore, the students easier to correct the best one for the following worksheet. In applying indirect WCF, the teacher can use to the high prior students in the class. They may be able to correct it by themselves and or ask the teacher for the following explanation. Then the explanation about students' response and attitude will be deliver in this following paragraph.

The research on the application of written corrective feedback (WCF) in Indonesian secondary schools shows a diverse utilization of both direct and indirect feedback methods. Educators use various WCF strategies, including deletion, insertion, rewriting, and symbols, to address students' writing mistakes. The findings indicate that the selection between direct and indirect feedback is influenced by the students' proficiency in English, with direct feedback proving to be more beneficial for students with lower proficiency levels. The overall improvements in students' performance highlight the significance of customized WCF strategies in advancing English writing skills.

c. *Students' Response and Attitudes Towards Teacher's Corrective Feedback in Indonesian Secondary EFL Classes*

This section presents the review on how students react to teachers' corrective feedback in Indonesian context. The review is according to the papers by teachers of secondary school levels. There are various students' response attitude towards teachers' corrective feedback in Indonesia secondary school (Sabarudin & Ardhana, 2016), (Wiyati, & Nur, 2020), (Purnomo & Pahlevi, 2021), (Sari & Suryaman, 2022), (Suharyanti & Fauziati, 2020), (Darmanto et al, 2023; Zuraida & Madayani, 2021; Rahma et al, 2020; Nursailah & Halim, 2021; Suharyanti & Fauziati, 2020; Saragih et al, 2021; Elfiyanto & Fukazawa, 2020; Mawarni & Murtafi'ah, 2023; Siska & Fitri, 2022), (Kencana, 2020; Kencana, 2020), and (Mulati, 2018; Rahmawati, 2023).

Several studies have investigated students' attitudes towards corrective feedback across various levels of secondary education, including junior high school, senior high school, and vocational high school. Both positive and negative responses have been observed. For instance, Suharyanti and Fauziati (2020) examined students' attitudes towards feedback in a junior high school setting. They found that providing indirect corrective comments increased the motivation of the majority of participants, encouraging them to engage in English-language posts on social media platforms like Facebook. It was noted that students with positive attitudes exhibited higher levels of motivation compared to those with negative attitudes (Sabarudin and Ardhana, 2016).

Sabarudin's (2016) study further elucidated the relationship between students' attitudes and their performance in paragraph writing. Positive attitude pupils demonstrated higher motivation levels, leading to improved writing quality compared to their negatively inclined counterparts. The findings suggest that motivated students are more likely to invest effort in their studies, resulting in better academic performance.In junior high schools, indicates that indirect corrective feedback led to increased motivation among students, particularly in their engagement with English on social media platforms. Positive attitudes were correlated with higher motivation and, consequently, better performance in writing courses. This finding is reinforced by the notion that higher-motivated students tend to invest more effort in learning, resulting in improved academic outcomes.

Several studies have been conducted in various settings. The researches about students' response attitude towards feedback in senior high school are conducted (Darmanto et al, 2023; Zuraida & Madayani, 2021; Rahma et al, 2020; Suharyanti & Fauziati, 2020; Elfiyanto & Fukazawa, 2020; Mawarni & Murtafi'ah, 2023; Siska & Fitri, 2022). It is shows that students are responded good and positive toward corrective feedback (Darmanto et al, 2023; Rahma et al, 2020; Siska & Fitri, 2022). Others studies shows that students writing skills are improving because of corrective feedback (Elfiyanto & Fukazawa, 2020; Zuraida & Madayani, 2021). The students even hope that teachers will let them practice offering feedback (Mawarni & Murtafi'ah, 2023).

Students have a beneficial impact. The majority of pupils are pleased when they receive corrected comments for their errors. Different approaches taken by teachers to implementing remedial feedback might have an impact on how pupils feel. Students tend to respond in

accordance with their beliefs, feelings, and motivations (Wiyati and Nur, 2020). Not only that, surprise, enjoyment, and satisfaction were identified as students' emotional involvement in the curious learning activity, especially when receiving feedback (Purnomo & Pahlevi, 2021). Many students expressed surprise upon receiving feedback, particularly when they discussed numerous mistakes in their writing. Some students expected mistakes in their writing and were not surprised, while others were genuinely surprised as they thought their work was correct.

Another positive response in senior high school are happiness, satisfaction, and motivation. Students expressed happiness as positive emotional response to the feedback given by the teacher (Sari & Suryaman, 2022). They found the feedback easy to understand and felt happy because it has useful in helping them correct mistakes in their writing assignments.

In addition to positive responses, negative responses were also found at the senior high school level. Students' negative emotional responses to corrective feedback were evident in a study also found. Students faced challenges in understanding the feedback, especially in recalling previously learned material. Despite these negative emotional responses, the study emphasized the overall effectiveness of Direct Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) in improving students' writing skills. The varied emotional reactions, including surprise and disappointment, highlight the complex nature of students' responses to corrective feedback (Sari & Suryaman, 2022).

The study of students' response attitude towards written corrective feedback also conducted in vocational high school (Kencana, 2020; Amelia, 2023). It is found that this type of corrective feedback makes students motivated and improve their writing (Amelia, 2023). Kencana (2020) found that most of the students thought that teachers should give an explanation in written correction. Students respond to teachers' written feedback and how they engage with WCF highlighted that lack of proficiency in English may limit vocational high school students' ability to effectively engage with their teachers' feedback on writing, especially in the context of producing recount texts in the EFL classroom (Zaeni, et.al., 2024).

Negative responses towards corrective feedback also found in this level. Stern teacher made students afraid to ask something difficult to understand the lesson, feel uncomfortable, and did not want to learn (Fitriana, R., 2017) Finally students delayed to repair the errors at

the time, then they ignored teachers' corrective feedback. Correction that given with anger only made students' heart hurt. Teacher did not seem to appreciate students' effort the students have negative feeling, also react negative when immediate feedback caused nervousness or embarrassment (Muslem, et al, 2021)

Other studies only show the secondary school as the setting but not mention which secondary school it is whether it is junior, senior or vocational high school (Mulati, 2018; Rahmawati, 2023). The results found that written corrective feedback get a positive view from students (Mulati, 2018). Oral corrective feedback also gets a good perception from students who like to be corrected (Rahmawati, 2023).

The multifaceted nature of students' responses to teachers' corrective feedback in Indonesian secondary school EFL classes underscores the importance of considering individual differences, motivations, and perceptions. While positive responses indicate the potential for corrective feedback to enhance learning and performance, negative responses highlight the need for thoughtful implementation and consideration of students' emotional experiences. As the educational landscape continues to evolve, understanding and addressing these varied responses will contribute to the refinement of effective feedback practices in language learning environments. Across various studies conducted in junior high schools, senior high schools, and vocational high schools, both positive and negative responses were identified. These findings underscore the need for educators to consider the diverse nature of students' responses and tailor corrective feedback strategies to create effective and positive learning experiences.

This comprehensive review of the implementation and impact of oral and written corrective feedback (OCF and WCF) in Indonesian secondary school English as a Foreign Language (EFL) class provides significant insights into feedback practices and their implications for teaching and learning.

Oral corrective feedback is widely used in Indonesian EFL classrooms, with techniques such as explicit correction, recasting, clarification requests, and metalinguistic cues being commonly employed. Recasting and explicit correction stand out as the most frequently used methods, reflecting their perceived effectiveness in addressing students' speech errors. Immediate feedback through OCF helps rectify mistakes in real-time, which is crucial for language acquisition. Explicit correction provides clear and detailed information about errors,

aiding students in understanding and correcting their mistakes. Meanwhile, recasting offers a subtler approach that reinforces correct language use without overtly highlighting errors. The review highlights the importance of a balanced feedback approach, incorporating both immediate and delayed feedback based on student needs and context. This balance helps cater to varying proficiency levels and learning preferences, thereby maximizing the effectiveness of OCF.

The research underscores that students generally respond positively to OCF, valuing the immediate correction of their mistakes. However, it also recognizes that not every error needs to be corrected and that feedback should be tailored to individual needs. Teachers are encouraged to adapt their feedback strategies to accommodate diverse student preferences and proficiency levels, ensuring that feedback remains constructive and motivating. This understanding of OCF techniques and their impacts on students' speaking skills contributes significantly to the broader research problem of how feedback influences language acquisition in EFL settings. The findings provide valuable insights for educators aiming to optimize their feedback approaches to enhance students' speech accuracy and overall proficiency.

In terms of written corrective feedback, Indonesian secondary schools employ both direct and indirect methods. Direct WCF involves explicit corrections such as deletion, insertion, and rewriting, which are particularly beneficial for students with lower proficiency levels. This method allows students to clearly see and correct their mistakes, thus enhancing their writing accuracy. Indirect WCF, which uses coded feedback and symbols to indicate errors, supports more advanced students in developing self-correction skills. The choice between direct and indirect feedback should be informed by students' proficiency levels and their ability to engage with feedback constructively. Tailoring WCF strategies to address diverse student needs is crucial for improving writing instruction and assessment in EFL contexts.

The review also highlights a range of students' responses to corrective feedback, encompassing both positive and negative reactions. Positive responses include increased motivation, happiness, and satisfaction with feedback, all of which contribute to improved academic performance. Conversely, negative responses involve difficulties in understanding feedback and emotional discomfort, such as embarrassment and anxiety. The varied

responses underscore the need for a nuanced approach to feedback implementation, considering students' emotional and cognitive reactions. Educators must be mindful of these factors and adapt feedback methods to foster a supportive and effective learning environment.

Conclusion

The investigation into corrective feedback in Indonesian secondary school EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms reveals a nuanced understanding of both oral and written feedback methods. Each feedback form plays a pivotal role in correcting and addressing students' language errors, though they function differently and carry distinct implications for learning and engagement. Oral corrective feedback (OCF), delivered immediately during speaking activities, offers real-time opportunities for students to correct their mistakes. Techniques such as recasting, explicit correction, and clarification requests are employed to help students identify and amend errors promptly. Research indicates that students generally appreciate the immediacy of oral feedback, which enhances their ability to adjust their spoken language in real-time. However, the effectiveness of oral feedback is influenced by factors such as student proficiency levels and the context of the feedback, prompting teachers to often use a blend of methods to maintain a supportive and interactive classroom environment.

In contrast, written corrective feedback (WCF) is predominantly used for writing tasks and includes both direct methods like deletion and substitution, as well as indirect methods such as symbols or codes to denote errors. Evidence suggests that direct feedback tends to benefit students with lower proficiency levels more effectively, while indirect feedback is more suited to advanced learners who can self-correct with minimal guidance. The prevalent use of both methods in Indonesian secondary schools underscores the importance of adapting feedback strategies to match students' proficiency and the specific demands of writing tasks.

Students’ responses to corrective feedback reveal a broad spectrum of attitudes. Positive reactions often include heightened motivation, improved writing skills, and overall satisfaction with the feedback process. Conversely, negative responses may involve confusion, frustration, or anxiety, particularly when feedback is perceived as overly critical or challenging

to interpret. These varied emotional responses underscore the necessity of tailoring feedback approaches to individual student needs and creating a supportive learning atmosphere.

Despite the valuable insights gained, several limitations are present in the studies reviewed. Notably, they may not fully capture the diversity within Indonesian secondary schools or encompass all student demographics. Additionally, the impact of different feedback methods may vary based on specific contexts and implementation strategies. Future research should focus on understanding student preferences for feedback types and delivery methods, exploring the long-term effects of various feedback approaches on language proficiency, and assessing the role of teacher training in effective feedback implementation. Addressing these areas can lead to more refined feedback practices that better support student learning and development in EFL settings.

References

Al Aluf, D. S. (2024). Written Corrective Feedback: Senior High School Students' perceptions And Preferences. Jurnal Education and Development, 12(1), 250-257.

Amelia, N. The vocational high school students' perceptions and preferences on teacher's written feedback (Undergraduate Thesis, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan).

Aprilia, F., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Haryati, S. The implementation of indirect corrective feedback to improve eleventh graders' writing performances. English Education, 10(3), 201-212. https://doi.org/10.20961/ee.v10i3.60839

Atma, N., & Widiati, U. (2015). EFL students' preferences for corrective feedback in speaking instruction across speaking course levels. Bahasa dan Seni: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Pengajarannya, 43(2).

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing. Routledge.

Darmanto, D., Utari, F. Y., & Rahim, A. (2023). An analysis of teacher's feedback on students' writing task. Jurnal ilmiah global education, 4(1), 138-142. https://doi.org/10.55681/jige.v4i1.557

Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2020). Effect of teacher and peer written corrective feedback on writing components in EFL classrooms. JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 5(2), 185-191. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.826

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? new evidence on the short and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues (pp. 81–105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R., (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. The University of Michigan press

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? Journal of second language writing, 10(3), 161-184.

Fitriana, R. (2017). Students' atttitudes toward teachers' corrective feedback. Script Journal: Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching. Vol 2 No, 2.

Fungula, B. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in the Chinese EFL classroom: methods employed by teachers to give feedback to their students.

Ghufron, M. (2019, July). Exploring an automated feedback program 'Grammarly' and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing assessment: Modern vs. traditional assessment. In Proceedings of the 3rd English Language and Literature International Conference, ELLiC, 27th April 2019, Semarang, Indonesia.

Grombczewska, M. (2011). The relationship between teacher's feedback and students' motivation. Humanising Language Teaching, 3. http://www.hltmag.co.uk/jun11/stud.htm

Huwayana, W. W. (2023). An Indonesian Secondary School Teacher's Views of Oral Corrective Feedback In Teaching Speaking: A Qualitative Case Study (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Indonesia).

Irfan, M. (2020). Direct written corrective feedback on junior high school students' recount text composition. Andragogi: Jurnal Diklat Teknis Pendidikan dan Keagamaan, 8(2), 498-513.

Irfani, B., & O'Boyle, A. (2024). Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective. Training, Language and Culture, 8(1), 101-114.

Janah, U., Usadiati, W., & Ristati, R. (2021). Written corrective feedback applied by english teacher at the eighth-grade students of SMP NU Palangka Raya. Intensive Journal, 4(2), 33-46.

Jimerson, J. B., & Reames, E. (2015). Student-involved data use: Establishing the evidence base. Journal of Educational Change, 16, 281-304.

Kencana, A. T. A. (2020, July). Students' preferences and teachers' beliefs towards written corrective feedback. In ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching (Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 85-95). https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v9i1.37187

Lightbown, P. M., Spada, N., Ranta, L., & Rand, J. (1999). How languages are learned (Vol. 2). Oxford: Oxford university press.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. Language teaching, 46(1), 1-40.

Madayani, N. S. (2022, November). Indirect corrective feedback on writing accuracy of students across different level of grammatical sensitivity. In International Conference on Islam, Law, And Society (Incoils) 2021 (Vol. 1, No. 2).

Mahuika, R., Berryman, M., & Bishop, R. (2011). Issues of culture and assessment in New Zealand education pertaining to Maori students. Assessment Matters, 3, 183-198.

Mawarni, F. I., & Murtafi'ah, B. (2023). High school students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback in EFL classroom: a survey study. SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education, 4(2), 472–486. https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v4i2.841

Mulati, D. F. (2018, July). Do students need teacher written corrective feedback? A Case Study at Secondary School. In English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings (Vol. 2, pp. 224-227).

Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' Perception toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes: A Case at English Education Department Students. International Journal of Language Education, 5(4), 244-259.

Nafisatur, R. (2023). The implementation of teacher's oral corrective feedback on students'speaking skill at the eighth grade of junior high school Wonorejo 1 in academic year 2022/2023 (Doctoral dissertation, UIN KHAS JEMBER).

Nurhayati, D., & Sugiarto, A. (2022). The effect of coded indirect written corrective feedback on long-term grammatical retention. TESOL Quarterly, 56(1), 103-119.

Padmini, K. H., & Tyagita, B. P. A. (2015). Teknologi pendidikan sebagai pembelajaran kompetitif untuk meningkatkan prestasi siswa: studi kasus di salah satu sma di salatiga. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan, November, 60.

Pati D, Lorusso LN (2018) How to write a systematic review of the literature. HERD: Health Environ Res Des J 11(1):15–30

Prakoso, A. R., Munir, A., & Mustofa, A. (2024). The Distribution of Junior High School Students' Language Awareness Across English Oral Proficiency and Oral Corrective Feedback Preference. IJLECR (International Journal of Language Education and Cultural Review), 10(1), 78-87.

Primitasari, Y. (2019). The implementation of teacher corrective feedback using diary in vocational high school (a case study on the tenth grade of SMK N 6 Surakarta in academic year 2018/2019). (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret)

Purnomo, S. G., & Pahlevi, M. R. (2021). EFL secondary students' affective engagement on teacher written corrective feedback in biography writing class. Journal of English Language and Education, 6(2), 27-38.

Putri, S., & Kurniawan, A. (2020). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Impact on students' revision processes. Journal of Educational Research, 15(1), 67-81.

Rahma, E. A., Fitriani, S. S., & Syafitri, R. (2020). Students' perception to the use of indirect corrective feedback in writing recount text. IJELR: International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion, 2(1), 25-30. https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v2i1.2222

Rahman, F. A., Kahfi, E. H., & Dalimunthe, R. N. R. (2018). Exploring the implementation of teacher's corrective feedback on students' pronunciation: a case study in an Indonesian public high school. In Bandung English Language Teaching International Conference (BELTIC) (pp. 477-485).

Rahmawati, E. (2023). The urgency of oral corrective feedback in english language teaching: students and teachers' perception. Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education, 3(2), 148-158. https://doi.org/10.52690/jadila.v3i2.395

Rahmawati, S., & Indah, N. (2020). Focused direct written corrective feedback and its impact on grammatical accuracy. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10(2), 123-137.

Reid, J. M. (1993). Teaching ESL writing. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Rezaei, S., Mozaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: Classroom practice and future directions. International Journal of English Linguistics, 1(1), 21.

Rhomawati, L., & Fauziati, E. (2018). Teacher Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing at Eleventh Grade Students of SMK Dian Kirana 1 Sragen (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).

Rismawati, S. R. A., & Hikmat, M. H. (2018). Feedback given by the teacher on students' writing at the seventh grade of smp negeri 2 juwiring (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).

Sa'adah, L. (2021). Oral corrective feedback: error types, and students'uptake in EFL classroom. Edumedia: Jurnal Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, 5(2).

Sa'adah, L., Nurkamto, J., & Suparno, S. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. Studies in English Language and Education, 5(2), 240-252.

Sabarudin, A. (2016). The effects of direct and indirect error correction feedback and students'attitudes on the quality of junior high school students'paragraph writing. Jurnal TEKPEN, 1(3).

Sailah, N., & Halim, A. (2022). Students' cognitive attitude toward the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 writing. Al Lughawiyaat, 2(1).

Sari, C. F., Suryaman, M., & Yanto, E. S. (2022). Students' emotional responses toward teacher's direct written corrective feedback. Eltin Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia, 10(1), 23-30.

Sari, W., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Analysis of Teacher's Feedback on Students in Writing Recount Text at Senior High School. English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education, 7(1), 93-104.

Sari, Y., & Hidayat, T. (2021). A meta-analysis of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on writing error reduction. Language Learning & Technology, 25(4), 76-89.

Sarie, R. F. (2017). Exploring the possibility of using both direct and indirect corrective feedback as strategy to improve students' writing skill in Indonesian secondary school. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 9(4).

Shinta, D. K. (2022). The implementation of implicit corrective feedback through recordings towards EFL students in listening and speaking English class: case study. International Review of Humanities Studies, 7(1),

Shohiyah Shobaha. (2019). The implementation of oral corrective feedback in EFL classroom. Journal of English Teaching and Learning.

Siska, W., & Fitri, N. (2022). Analysis of student's response toward the types of written corrective feedback used by the english teachers at SMAN I Tiumang. Cendikia: Media Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 13(2), 361-365.

Suharyanti, E. M., & Fauziati, E. (2020). Written corrective feedback on EFL students at an islamic junior high school. JOALL Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature, 5(2), 161-173.

Suharyanti, E. M., & Fauziati, E. (2020). Written corrective feedback on EFL students at an islamic junior high school. JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature), 5(2), 161-173. https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i2.11207

Susanti, R. (2019). Effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving writing accuracy. Journal of English Language Teaching, 12(3), 45-58.

Wahidiyati, I. (2020). The effectiveness of teachers' corrective feedback in enhancing students' ability to recount text writing. JOEEL: Journal of English Education and Literature, 1(1), 1-10.

Walid Amr. (2016). Teacher's oral corrective feedback strategy in english language classroom. (Undergradute Thesis, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh)

Widia Siska, Mukhaiyar, & Ratmanida. (2016). English Teachers' Strategies in Giving Oral Corrective Feedback on Students' Speaking Performance (English Language Education Program, Universitas Negeri Padang)

Wiyati, R., & Nur, R. P. (2020). Students' attitude Towards Corrective Feedback in EFL Classroom. JELA (Journal of English Language Teaching, Literature and Applied Linguistics), 2(2), 26-32.

Zaeni, B. V., Wachyudi, K., & Saefullah, H. (2024). EFL Students' Engagement with Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study at A Vocational High School. Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research, 4(1), 6863-6873.