



SNAP TO READ

## TYPES OF FEEDBACK USED BY THE STUDENTS IN INTERMEDIATE WRITING CLASS

Hendra Alamsyah, Rina Listia, Fatchul Mu'in

Universitas Lambung Mangkurat

[rina\\_listia.ulm.ac.id](mailto:rina_listia.ulm.ac.id)

First received: May 28, 2021

Final proof received: June 17, 2021

### Abstract:

*Writing is the most complicated skill among other language skills. In the writing activity, the students have to invent ideas and organize them into sentences and paragraphs that will be clear for readers. Feedback is crucial to give significant improvement to student's writings. Peers and maybe various can provide feedback. This study's objective was to describe the types of feedback used by students of the Intermediate Writing Class in writing an argumentative paragraph. Descriptive qualitative was the design of research. The subjects of this research are A1 and A4 Intermediate Writing course students of the English language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University. The data were collected through observation and document analysis. The data were then analyzed through three steps: familiarizing and organizing, coding, and interpreting and representing. The result was found that the students used several feedback types, namely written feedback as responding and written feedback as correcting. Written feedback as correcting used by the students consists of direct feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and unfocused feedback. From some of the metalinguistic feedback that some students used, they were using the grammatical description. Some of the metalinguistic feedback that some students used was the metalinguistic explanation (grammatical description). There was no metalinguistic feedback of the error code. There was only one student who used unfocused feedback. In conclusion, the students used four feedback types: written feedback as responding, written feedback as*

*correcting, or written corrective feedback consisting of direct feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and unfocused feedback. Written feedback as responding is the feedback that the students used most while doing peer feedback. The students need to look for more information and explanation or feedback from the teachers and their friends and give feedback while doing peer feedback properly to not only use one type of feedback.*

**Keywords:** *Peer feedback, Type of feedback*

In a classroom, teachers are often guiding the students, teaching and giving them instructions. On the other hand, students are also responsible for their own learning. However, the teacher's guidance and feedback are always necessary for the students to learn and develop further. According to Pirhonen (2016), feedback in education came from the assumption that feedback is fundamentally crucial for learning something. Without feedback, it will not be easy to know who needs improvement.

Feedback can be provided in several ways. According to Pirhonen (2016), students might give three feedback types: oral feedback, written, and corrective feedback. In general, the teacher is the person who usually provides feedback, but it does not always happen and the only dominant kind of feedback. There are different ways to convey feedback in class, which is called peer feedback. One of the main advantages of peer feedback is that students can exchange ideas more easily.

Feedback needs to be given to students, especially for writing skill in the English course. Writing is essential for communicating in the target language. It is fascinating for us to learn to write. According to Coulmas (2003), writing has been with people for a long time, and it is more meaningful nowadays. However, it is not as easy to learn as people think. To write good writing, students must follow the rules of the target language.

Further, in writing, some students still make mistakes and errors within their writing, especially writing paragraphs. It is hard for them in their writing skills to produce a good writing product in terms of content, spelling, grammar, mechanics, and standard language/style. Considering this condition,

students who are still in the beginner stage face many writing difficulties, especially in writing an argumentative paragraph. Therefore, teachers can help them focus on their writing process with some steps called editing and revising. In this step, the students need to pay attention to it. In this process-writing methodology, readers' response or feedback is a students' contributing factor in the revision process (Ho & Duong, 2014).

Several theories regarding this type of feedback, primarily written feedback in writing skills, are similar. The feedback is categorized in written feedback as responding and written feedback as correcting or written corrective feedback (Harmer, 2007; Pirhonen, 2016). Responding refers to the type of written feedback related to the writing content and outline, not just accuracy. The correctors discuss their workmate's writings rather than adjudicate them. It is rendered without indicating any grammatical errors or other errors that need to be corrected and changed more like the target language—conversely, written corrective feedback for correcting. It focuses on pointing out mistakes in various ways, pointing out something wrong in student work.

There are several types of written corrective feedback that students might give in doing peer feedback. According to Ellis (2008), the written corrective is divided into six main sub-type: direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focused/unfocused, electronic, and reformulation. Direct corrective feedback is the teacher or student's feedback as a corrector shows and finds mistakes and errors they made and gives them the correct form. Indirect feedback is a little different from direct feedback. In this feedback, the corrector or reader shows some errors to their workmates, but they did not correct them explicitly. Metalinguistic corrective feedback involves explicitly commenting on students about the nature of the mistakes they have made. Focused feedback is the feedback that the corrector concentrates only on one or just several of students' errors, for example, only on the article. It is different from unfocused feedback. Unfocused feedback is the feedback that the corrector is not only focusing on one type of error. Electronic feedback allows correctors

to correct writing forms using electronic devices, such as smartphones, computers, notebooks, Google, etc. The correctors pinpoint student errors and usually provide multiple hyperlinks to concordant files that provide correct writing procedures. The final type of feedback is reformulation. The idea for reformulation involved native speakers rewriting student texts in such a way as to preserve as much of the author's ideas as possible to make the work sound like native writing. After receiving feedback, students can respond to it. The students need to pay attention and revise their writing products. Students may or may not be allowed to correct corrections after peer feedback or after receiving lecturers' feedback.

This study focused on obtaining information about peer feedback. The researcher is interested in analyzing the types of feedback used by students while doing peer feedback. According to Yusof Manan, & Alias (2012), peer feedback or peer review is a didactic strategy that could help decrease the writing teacher's assignment without affecting the students learning process. It means that students can be more confident because they are free to express and negotiate their ideas with other students in the same class, reducing students' anxiety in the writing process.

Therefore, the researcher is interested in finding out the types of feedback Intermediate Writing students used, especially in writing an argumentative paragraph at the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University. Another reason why the researcher chose Intermediate Writing Class is its accessibility.

The researcher found some studies related to this study. The first study was conducted by Surakka (2007), in which she analyzed the corrective feedback and learner uptake of students in EFL classes. She uses both qualitative and quantitative method designs. The results of this study indicated that various feedback movements appear while learning English. The corrective feedback moves found in current data as well as in previous research include recast, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, clarification request, and repetition. The second study has

been conducted by Pramudita (2017). The researcher analyzed the students' feedback types in Paragraph Writing class A at the English Education Study Program of Sanata Dharma University. In addition, researchers also examined the types of feedback that best-improved students' writing skills. This research is qualitative. The results showed that there were forty-four direct feedback students used in peer feedback activities. Indirect student feedback is thirty-three feedbacks, and there are two metalinguistic feedbacks that students in peer feedback activities used. Then, all respondents stated that direct feedback is the type of feedback that most helps them improve their writing. The third study was conducted by Sembiring (2017). The researcher analyzed the types of peer feedback and student responses to peer feedback in the English class at SMK N 1 Cangkringan. The participants of this study were twenty-seven students. This research is used in qualitative research. In conclusion, students used two types of feedback, namely, direct feedback and indirect feedback. Most students used direct feedback. All students revised their writing products after receiving peer feedback. For revision, error correction was used primarily by students for the response. Based on the background of the study above, which describes the reason why interested in this research. The research question is formulated as: "What are the types of feedback used by students of Intermediate Writing class while doing peer feedback?"

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

Descriptive qualitative was the method of this research, and the approach is using grounded theory. Its purposes are to describe and receive information on the types of feedback that Intermediate Writing students used while doing peer feedback in writing an argumentative paragraph at the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin. According to Ary, , Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh (2010: 29), qualitative researchers' objective is to understand a phenomenon

by focusing on the whole picture rather than breaking it down into variables. Before analyzing the type of feedback, observations were made to obtain information about the Intermediate Writings class. After that, researchers used document analysis to analyze data from students whether the type of feedback they used matched the criteria of Pirhonen (2016) and Ellis (2008).

### **Research setting**

The setting of the study refers to the place and time to conduct the study. This study will be conducted at Intermediate Writing class, the academic year 2019/2020, at the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan.

### **Research Subjects**

Based on the research, the subjects are A1 and A4 students of Intermediate Writing class in the academic year 2019/2020 at the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan.

### **Research Instrument**

The research instrument is intended to analyze types of feedback used by A1 and A4 students of Intermediate Writing class, the academic year 2019/2020 at the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University. The instruments of this research are document analysis form and observation sheet. In administering the writing prompt, the researcher used expert validation. The theories used for analyzing the types of feedback, especially in written feedback, were adapted made by Pirhonen and Ellis.

Types of feedback according to Pirhonen 2016

No	Types of Feedback*	Definition and Criteria
1	Written Feedback as Responding	The learners receive this type of feedback after writing. Responding refers to the type of written feedback related to the writing content and outline, not just accuracy. It is rendered without indicating any grammatical errors or other errors that need to be corrected and changed more like the target language
2	Written feedback as correcting/ Written Corrective Feedback	It focuses on pointing out mistakes in various ways, pointing out something wrong in student work. Some changes or corrections should be allowed to correct or make their work more like the target language.

Source: Harmer (2007)

Written Corrective feedback Strategies	Definition and Criteria
Direct Feedback	Direct corrective feedback is the teacher or student's feedback as a corrector shows and finds mistakes and errors they made and gives them the correct form.
Indirect Feedback	Indirect feedback is a little different from direct feedback. In this feedback, the corrector or reader shows some errors to their colleagues, but they did not correct them explicitly.

Metalinguistic feedback	In metalinguistic feedback, the correctors provide some kind of metalinguistic clue to the students' error, especially in writing. Metalinguistic corrective feedback involves explicitly commenting on students about the nature of the mistakes they have made. In the latter case, the exact location of the error may or may not be displayed. In the first, students have to work on the necessary corrections from the instructions given, while in the next, students need first to find the mistakes and then work on the corrections.
Reformulation	In this feedback, it could be the reconstruction of a sentence. The idea for reformulation involved native speakers rewriting student texts in such a way as to preserve as much of the author's ideas as possible to make the work sound like native writing.
Focused and unfocused feedback	Focused feedback is the feedback that the corrector concentrates only on one or just several of students' errors, for example, only on the article. It is different from unfocused feedback. Unfocused feedback is the feedback that the corrector is not only focusing on one type of error.
Electronic feedback	Electronic feedback allows correctors to correct writing forms using electronic devices, such as smartphones, computers, laptops, Google, etc. Correctors pinpoint student errors and usually provide multiple hyperlinks to concordant files that provide correct writing procedures.

Source: Ellis (2008)



### **Research Procedure**

At the beginning of this study, permission by the lecturer is necessary. The whole intended study is explained to the lecturer to get approved. This study was held in the third semester of the English Language Education Study Program of Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, in A1 and A4 Intermediate Writing class.

The study was held in three meetings for each class. The researcher started to observe with an observation sheet and took notes of what happened in the class while the participants were writing the argumentative paragraph in whole meetings. Next, when the researcher found the peer feedback students used, whether written or written corrective feedback, were shown up, the researcher used the analysis form to categorize it from students' draft. Finally, the researcher analyzed all of the data to get some evidence of credibility.

### **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Findings**

Based on the researcher's observation sheet and notes, peer feedback only showed in the second meeting of Intermediate Writing Class A1, and it did not show in the Intermediate Writing Class A4. It was the first time the students in Intermediate Writing Class A1 did the peer feedback activity. The lecturer explained the students' role and how they should do in the peer feedback activity using e-learning named Padlet. The lecturer asked the students to give comments and suggestions written in Padlet. In doing peer feedback, the students could use many types of feedback.

Table 1. Types of feedback used by the students

No	Feedback type	Number of feedbacks	Number of students who give the feedback
1	Written feedback as responding	21	21
2	Written feedback as correcting: Direct feedback	3	3
3	Metalinguistic feedback	4	4
4	Unfocused feedback	1	1
Total		29 feedbacks	21 students

### ***Written Feedback as Responding***

All the students used written feedback as responding while they were doing peer feedback.

Figure 1. The corrector praised the writer's outline

Report from Andrew Panji Damai

In my opinion, the argumentative paragraphs made by Harnel are good. He made two points of view between the strengths and weaknesses caused by the industrial revolution 4.0 plus some supporting evidence from experts to strengthen each point of view. He even made conclusions about this problem. I thought of how he would connect the writing ideas and grammar already correct. Overall I think that this argumentative paragraph can convince readers.

Figure 2. The corrector praised and gave suggestions to the writer's outline

Report from Julia Dwi Ariani:

I think Halissa paragraf is good. At the first paragraph, she give a statement that in industry 4.0 it has an impact on life. She also give a statement about the positive impact of Industry 4.0 and corroborate it with the opinions she has. In negative impacts, she also give her opinion and strengthen it with a statement of existing data. In the second paragraph is also good, she explain people must have a skill that machine can't do and she is mention 10 skill people must has in industry 4.0. And in the last paragraph, she provide a variety of job solutions that they can take from industry 4.0's benefits. And at the end sentence, she concluded it well. However my advice is, if you want to give a reason, you can use a variety of conjunction. So you don't have to always use "because", but you can use "since, so that, in order and ect.". And than at the first paragraph, Before you give an example, maybe you can add more sentence to blend the previous sentence with the next sentence, like "It's not only has an impact on people, but also has an impact on the company"

Written feedback in response occurs when the feedback giver discusses the learner's writing rather than judging it. It was delivered without showing any grammatical errors or other errors that need to be corrected and need to be changed more like the target language.

### ***Written Feedback as Correcting***

#### ***Direct feedback***

The researcher found three students used written corrective feedback that has been identified as direct feedback.

Figure 3. Located the error and gave the correct form

Report from Salsadilla Mercuriza:

I think Kamila has already made a good argumentative paragraph. She can make a different way to face the industrial revolution 4.0 . She can compare between the traditional market and online shop. She also give a statement about the benefits of online shop and combine it with her opinion. But, there is little bit a correction, "online shop have" it should be "online shop has".

Figure 4. Located the error and gave the correct form

Report from Adela Aprilia (1810117320030)

I think Rahmita has already created a good argumentative paragraph. Because, she shows that some impact artificial intelligence in industrial revolution 4.0 which there are positive and negative impact. She choose to stand in positive impact, and she adds the fact to make her argument more strongly. By the way, there is a correction a little, the use of word "favor" is inappropriate. Use the word "prefer" or "support" instead.

Figure 5. Located the error and gave the correct form

Report from M. Ikhsan Setiadi ( 1810117210028) :

In my opinion this argumentative paragraph is quite good, because he make a great thought about demographic bonus, and he put the fact about demographic by using percentage, also he compare Indonesia with the other country based on the real data. I think Riza made it to make this argumentative paragraph because he can persuade and convince the readers in his writings. Then, from me for the correction is the sentence "the nightmare will happen". It should be passive voice "The nightmare will be happened".

The type of written corrective direct feedback occurred when the teacher or student's feedback as a corrector shows and finds mistakes and errors they made and gives them the correct form.

### *Metalinguistic feedback*

Metalinguistic feedback was also used by some students when they did peer feedback at Padlet. Metalinguistic feedback has two types of comments: grammatical descriptions and error codes (Ellis, 2008). However, in this study, the researcher found only four metalinguistic explanations (grammatical descriptions).

Figure 6. Gave a clue where was the error and the grammatical explanation

Report from Fajerin Ilhami ( 1810117310007 )  
A good argumentative paragraph must present two different sides, the existence of facts and opinions, and the paragraph must be coherence and unity. Based on this, in my opinion, this paragraph is a good paragraph. This paragraph has presented two different sides, namely, how is the difference between the millennial generation in the 4.0 era and the previous era, quoting from Matthew Nevard. Then, in this paragraph, there are also facts and opinions of the author. In this paragraph, the author is also consistent in using pronouns. This paragraph also only discusses one main idea, namely about the millennial generation in the 4.0 revolution era, which shows that this paragraph is unity. In addition, the author also wrote a solution for the millennium that faced the 4.0 revolution era. However, in my opinion, there is a slightly not smooth transition from paragraph one to paragraph two, which in my opinion the writer must use a few linking words.



Figure 7. The corrector gave a clue through the grammatical explanation, but the exact location of the error was unknown

Comment by Issi Dea Berkatnu (1810117110014) :

In my opinion, this paragraph is qualified to be a good argumentative paragraph, because in this paragraph, already has an opinion or view of a problem, has factual data, and there is a comparison of existing problems. This paragraph talks about the problem of Indonesia as a developing country which is still lagging behind compared to other countries in terms of educational facilities and the use of technology (uneven facilities). This paragraph is based on the opinion of one person, Mohammad Nasir, and also comparison between countries have accurate data which is use to convince the reader. Beside that, the correction from me is the punctuation especially the comma. Where to put it in compound-complex sentences some of it still wrong.

Figure 8. The corrector gave a clue where was the error and the grammatical explanation

Commented by Muhammad Fahrurazi :

Haris created a good argumentative paragraph. Because he show his argument with the facts that made the argument became stronger. But in the supporting sentence of the second paragraph Haris describe his purpose choosing this topic that I think it is unnecessary. Because it would make the paragraph incoherence. Meanwhile the topic is discussing about the negative impacts of revolution industry 4.0.

Figure 9. The corrector gave a clue where was the error and the grammatical explanation

Report from Kamila Rizqa Devisasmita :

In my opinion Salsa has already made good argumentative paragraph. She talked about the benefit of the industry revolution 4.0 and that impact to our next generation and it makes our country changes to be better. But, there is a correction about the use of Proper Noun. The writer was not consistent to write the Industrial Revolution 4.0. Need to write it with capital for each the beginning of the words from the beginning until the end of the paragraph.

### *Unfocused feedback*

The researcher found only one written corrective feedback that has been identified as unfocused feedback. Type of written corrective unfocused feedback occurred when the corrector is not only focusing on one type of students' error.

Figure 10. Different errors were found in the corrector's comments.

aspects. One of the bad aspects is that the passage contains some grammatical mistakes. For instance, the writer used "many section" (without "s") instead of "many sections" (with "s") in his writing. Also, there are some mistakes in using punctuations. For example, he wrote a transition signal "so" without a comma after it. Another example is that he wrote "According to..." without a comma as well. Also, the third sentence and so forth of the first paragraph does not have coherence with previous sentences, those are the first sentence of the first paragraph and the second sentence of the first paragraph.

## **DISCUSSION**

All A1 Intermediate Writing graders used written feedback when they did peer feedback. There are several examples of written feedback.

Researchers classify this feedback as written feedback because it fits the definitions and criteria based on Pirhonen (2016). After working on a writing assignment, the feedback got some comments and suggestions for better writing that did not just focus on accurate grammar. The written input was categorized as a response, not a corrective. The researcher found some comments on the first feedback, as seen in Figure 1. and did not find the instruction or sign of necessity to his peer to revise his writing. The word seemed like he enjoyed reading his pair work. He also explained his reason why he gave his peer's work with a positive comment. Subsequently, on the second feedback, as seen in Figure 2., the corrector gave positive comments and suggestions of the optional for variety word choice of conjunction to the writer's work without a sign of necessity to revise the writing of errors indicated.

Those feedback examples above fit with the definition of written feedback as the responding, based on what Harmer said in Pirhonen (2016). Responding refers to the type of written feedback related to the writing content and outline, not just accuracy. It is rendered without indicating any grammatical errors or other errors that need to be corrected and changed more like the target language. It means that as long as there is no instruction to change or there is a need to revise the writing based on errors or errors in marking, the feedback is considered written feedback as responding, not written corrective.

Conversely, based on Harmer, said in Pirhonen (2016). The written corrective feedback for correcting focuses on pointing out the errors in various ways, thus indicating something wrong in students' work. The first type of corrective feedback that shown up is direct feedback. For the first feedback, as seen in Figure 3., the corrector indicated a grammar correction. It was about the use of simple perfect tense where if it is the subject is singular, use "has" instead and the corrector directly to write that correction on his/her peer's work. He corrected his pair work without giving more explanation and just mentioned the error and changed it. Next, the second feedback seen in



Figure 4. was about the diction or word choice. The correctors indicated an inappropriate word to use and gave the correct word choice and appropriate diction to his/her peer's work.

Similarly, with the first feedback, the corrector indicated a grammatical error of tenses on the last feedback, as seen in Figure 5. He found that his peer's sentence needed to change to be a passive voice. But, in this feedback, the researcher found this feedback is false feedback. "The nightmare will be happened" would be grammatically incorrect. The writer might have meant "The nightmare happened," which would mean something in the past happened, or "The nightmare will happen," which implies that something has not occurred yet, but will occur in the future. It could be written on the future continuous (will be happening) that is used to describe the situations that will occur in the future in the normal course of events. The writer's context was correct in that he used the active voice of future tense. All those feedbacks include in the definition of direct feedback criteria. Following Ellis's Theory (2008), direct feedback is when the students, as the corrector, show and find mistakes and errors they made and give them the correct form.

Some students' next type of feedback in doing peer feedback on the Padlet is metalinguistic feedback. In accordance with Ellis's Theory (2008), when the students or the correctors provide some kind of metalinguistic clue to the students' error, especially in writing, it includes in the definition of metalinguistic feedback criteria. Metalinguistic corrective feedback involves providing learners with comments about the nature of the errors they have made explicitly. There are some examples of metalinguistic feedback have found. Some of the metalinguistic feedback that some students used was using the metalinguistic explanation (grammatical description). There was no metalinguistic feedback of the error code. In the grammatical description, the corrector gives the correct format of the error only in grammatical form. Like the examples seen in Figure 6. until Figure 9., students only explained and did not give the correct format on the feedback. It still occurred as metalinguistic feedback. According to Ellis (2008), the error's exact location

may or may not be shown in the latter case. In the former, the student has to work out the correction needed from the clue provided, while in the latter, the student needs first to locate the error and then work out the correction.

As likes the first feedback in Figure 6., the corrector gave a clue and indicated the writer's errors. After he gave a hint for the errors, they gave some explanations too. The corrector found the error that is related to less use of the conjunction. So, he told the writer that the transition words from one paragraph to another are not well connected. Next, on the second feedback, as seen in Figure 7., the corrector also gave a clue for the error. The clue is about the use of punctuation each the writer used for the compound-complex sentences. This feedback led the writer to work out the correction needed from the indication provided. Next, on the third feedback, as seen in Figure 8., he told the errors' exact location and explained why they should be fixed. There was an unnecessary supporting sentence that did not connect with the main topic. Last, as seen in Figure 9., the corrector indicated proper noun error on the fourth feedback. He gave a clue and gave a metalinguistic explanation of writing the suitable proper noun without providing the exact correct form on his feedback.

The last type of feedback used by some students in doing peer feedback on the Padlet is unfocused feedback. The researcher found only one example of feedback that matches the criteria of unfocused feedback. As seen in Figure 10., the corrector mentioned his peer's first error in the feedback example. He gave a clue was about the quantifier of countable nouns. If it is countable nouns, the noun will always be plural. The second error, the corrector correction is about conjunctive adverbs, which are both of them were different errors pointed out by the corrector. He said if the writer uses the conjunctive adverbs, he had to use a comma after it. The last correction for the third error is about the coherence of the paragraph. He gave the instruction there was another error. With that explanation, the correctors explicitly gave the information and convinced the writers why it should be corrected. In accordance with Ellis's Theory (2008), Unfocused feedback

is the feedback that the corrector is not only focusing on one type of error.

Similarly, to determine the types of feedback that students used in the A4 Intermediate Writing Class, the researcher needed to observe the students in the class and analyze their writing on the Padlet. Still, there is something different phenomenon in the second meeting. Based on the observation result, there is no peer feedback in this class even though it has the same lecturer as the previous class. There is a reason which the researcher got from the observation sheet and from the small notes to find the reason why the peer feedback did not show up in the A4 Intermediate Writing Class. From the first meeting until the third meeting, there was no clear instruction from the lecturer to do the peer feedback. The students only got feedback from the lecturer orally. The lecturer organized only using teacher feedback in this class because the insufficient time to do peer feedback in class was caused by the lecturer's delay in entering the class in the second meeting. The lecturer came late to the class because there was another thing that he needed to do.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the researcher found that several types of feedback used by the students Intermediate Writing class. The researcher presented that the students used four types of feedback: written feedback as responding, written feedback as correcting, or written corrective feedback that consist of direct feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and unfocused feedback. The students did not use the focused feedback and reformulation feedback in the grammatical feedback part while using written feedback. Written feedback as responding is the feedback that the students used most while doing peer feedback. Metalinguistic feedback that some students used was the metalinguistic explanation (grammatical description). There was no metalinguistic feedback of the error code. For the last written corrective feedback, there was only one student who used unfocused feedback.

## REFERENCES

- Al-Roomy, M. (2016). Developing students' EFL writing skills by enhancing their oral interactions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(5), 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v5n.5p.24>
- Ary, C. K. S. D., Jacobs, L. C., & Asghar, R. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). Nelson Education, Ltd.
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer Feedback in Learning English Writing: Advantages and Disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(4), 91. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v3i4.4314>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). Feedback: The Long View— Does Feedback Improve Learning? In *How to Give Effective Feedback To Your Students* (2nd ed., pp. 1–27). ASCD. <https://lccn.loc.gov/2016045329>
- Coulmas, F. (2003). *Writing System an Introduction to Their Linguistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Fatimah, S., & Suharto, G. (2017). Using Peer Feedback Technique to Improve Students' Writing Skills: A Quasi-Experimental Study Among Secondary Students. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)*, 1(2), 40–48.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Ho, P. V. P., & Duong, N. T. T. (2014). The Effectiveness of Peer Feedback on Graduate Academic Writing at Ho Chi Minh City Open University. *Journal of Science Ho Chi Minh City Open University*, 2(10), 35–48.
- John, L. (2008). *College Writing Skills with Readings* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing (ESL & Applied Linguistics Professional Series)*. <http://www.amazon.com/>

Teaching-Reading-Writing-Linguistics-Professional/dp/041598968X

Paulus, T. M. (1999). The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80117-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80117-9)

Pirhonen, N. (2016). Students' Perception about the Use of Oral Feedback in EFL Classrooms (Issue May). University of Jyväskylä.

Pramudita, A. S. E. (2017). Types of Peer Feedback Used by The Students in a Paragraph Writing Class. *Sanata Dharma*.

Rezazadeh, S., Ashrafi, S., & Foozunfar, M. (2018). The Effects of Oral, Written Feedback Types on EFL learners' Written Accuracy: The Relevance of Learners' Perceptions. *Proceedings of the 2nd National Conference on English Language Studies: Applied Linguistics Perspectives on EFL*, May, 2–20.

Sembiring, G. S. B. (2017). Students' Responses to Peer Feedback on Written Recount Texts in English Class at SMK 1 Cangkringan. *Sanata Dharma*.

Surakka, K. (2007). *Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in a Classroom*. University of Jyväskylä.

Yusof, J., Manan, N. A. A., & Alias, A. A. (2012). Guided Peer Feedback on Academic Writing Tasks using Facebook Notes: An Exploratory Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 216–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.324>