

# CONTEMPORARY PRACTICES OF INDIRECT WRITTEN FEEDBACK IN HIGH SCHOOL CONTEXT

<sup>1</sup>Yessi Widyasari, <sup>2</sup>Yella Dezas Perdani, <sup>3</sup>Gita Rahmi

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Language, Postgraduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education,

<sup>2</sup>Computer Science Department, Faculty of Humanities, Bina Nusantara University,

<sup>3</sup>Communication Science Program, Faculty of Communication Science, Universitas Gunadarma

<sup>1</sup>yessiwidyasari.yws@gmail.com; <sup>2</sup>ydezasp@gmail.com; <sup>3</sup>gitarahmi89@gmail.com

## Abstract

*Indirect written feedback is crucial to be conducted since errors are unavoidable in the process of writing. However, many studies have been undertaken in university contexts. Thus, this qualitative case study was carried out to examine a teacher's indirect written feedback practices in senior high school context. The data were obtained from observations, document analysis, and semi-structured interviews through purposive sampling. The findings revealed that coded feedback was mainly used, supplemented by uncoded feedback and commentary. These imply that the coding system is effective in guiding the students to be problem solvers and independent writers. However, the teacher's inconsistency in giving codes emerged because of the use of a large number of codes. Thus, it is suggested to reduce the number of codes and provide sufficient activity to increase students' understanding of the codes. The results of the study are significant to help teachers adjust appropriate methods to teach writing. The results also give long-term benefits for the development of students' writing ability. For further research, it is important to analyze the effect of indirect written feedback strategies on the students' revisions as well as students' preferences on these strategies.*

**Keywords:** *coded feedback, commentary, indirect written feedback strategies, uncoded feedback*

## INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, particularly in senior high school contexts, the importance of writing skills has been exposed as it is included in the 2013 National Curriculum of Indonesia. As explained in the curriculum, one of the expected competencies in learning English, especially for senior high school levels, is to enable students to write interpersonal, transactional, and functional texts in coherent and cohesive ways (Kemendikbud, 2016). However, writing activity is very difficult for some students, especially for senior high school students at one senior high school in Bandung, because they produce many errors when writing

compositions. This is because English is not their mother tongue. It is proved by the preliminary interview with the English teacher in that school.

In this regard, the students need help to recognize the errors and revise them independently which further leads to long-term benefits in the next writing activity. Thus, teachers' written feedback is crucial to take place as one of the teachers' roles in the classroom is as feedback providers.

Regarding this, teachers are considered to be the more knowledgeable people who can guide the students in their writing process. Teacher intervention is beneficial to bridge the gaps and develop

strategies for finding, correcting, and avoiding errors. Therefore, students will get a better understanding of what they have to do to produce meaningful writing.

The effectiveness of teachers' written feedback has been proved by some previous studies (e.g., Ene, 2016; Chen, 2018; Westmacott, 2017; Park, 2018; Rizkiani et al., 2020; and Kim & Kim, 2020). For example, Maarof, et al. (2011), who investigated the role of teacher, peer, and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing, reported that students perceived teacher feedback as more effective in improving the quality of their writing rather than the use of peer and self-feedback.

Indirect feedback, as one type of written feedback, deals with indicating students' errors without providing the correct forms (Rizkiani et al., 2020) as an attempt to encourage them to be problem solvers and be responsible for their progress. This implicit feedback has been viewed to be more effective as reported by earlier studies (Rizkiani et al., 2020) compared to the direct one. For instance, a study revealed that indirect written feedback was effective to develop students' autonomy and long-term learning improvement, but it should be implemented carefully so that students will not get confused about how to deal with the codes, the symbols, and the comments.

Regarding this, it is beneficial to employ indirect written feedback for at least four reasons. First, it engages students in

guided learning which means that students are assisted to find the sources of errors through the codes and symbols provided by teachers. Meanwhile, problem-solving means that students are urged to find the correct forms of errors themselves by interpreting the clues given. In this regard, learning takes place. Second, indirect feedback guides students to be self-editors in which they evaluate their writing by correcting the errors and learning from their mistakes. Third, indirect feedback allows students to have long-term benefits (Than & Manochphinyo, 2017) because they are actively involved in "finding, correcting, and eventually avoiding errors" which avoid them to make the same mistake in the future. Fourth, the use of comments as one type of indirect feedback indicates that teachers are enthusiastic about students' writing and whole-hearted to let them know both their strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, comments are beneficial to encourage students to work more seriously on their essays since they know that their teachers take a lot of care of them.

Putting the advantages above into consideration, the present study, thus, examines the types of indirect written feedback strategies employed by the teacher when responding to students' writing. The use of indirect feedback has been discussed by some researchers (e.g., Wicaksono, 2017; Rizkiani et al., 2020). However, these studies were undertaken in university contexts.

Therefore, the present study attempts to investigate the same case in another context, which is the senior high school context. The research question is "what types of indirect written feedback are employed by the teacher when responding to students' writing?" The objective of this study is to identify the types of written feedback strategies given by a teacher at one senior high school in Bandung, West Java.

The results of this study are expected to be significant both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the results will contribute to the enrichment of literature related to indirect written feedback strategies. Practically, the results will help teachers identify the students' strengths and

weaknesses and adjust the method of teaching writing based on the analysis. Moreover, the results will enable students to be independent writers as they can recognize, internalize, and revise the errors themselves which contributes to long-life learning.

Indirect written feedback can be classified into three categories, including coded feedback, uncoded feedback, and commentary. Coded feedback is a strategy of providing indirect feedback by using codes, which are mostly in the form of abbreviations. There are a variety of codes based on the error categories suggested by Ferris (2011), which were also used in the present study, as presented in the table below.

**Table 1. Types of coded feedback**

Error Type	Codes
Word choice	WC
Verb tense	VT
Verb form	VF
Word form	WF
Subject-verb agreement	SV
Articles	Art
Noun ending	N
Pronouns	Pr
Run-on	RO
Fragment	Frag
Punctuation	Punc
Spelling	Sp
Sentence structure	SS
Informal	Inf
Idiom	ID

(Source: Ferris, 2011)

Uncoded feedback is a strategy of giving indirect feedback by using symbols “as copyeditors and printers do” (Ferris, 2011, p. 101). For example, symbol brackets ‘[ ]’ are used to indicate missing words requiring students to insert words in the brackets.

Then, commentary is a strategy of providing comments on students’ compositions related to what they have done and what they should do to improve it. In this study, the commentary is included in indirect feedback since it does not provide students with the direct correction of their errors.

Based on the purposes, teacher commentary can be classified into three. These include *directives*, *grammar or mechanics comments*, and *positive comments*. Firstly, *directives* are more concerned with content and organization which suggest students make a particular change in their writing.

Directives are divided into three: *asking for information*, *making a suggestion or request*, and *giving information*. *Asking for information* requires students to provide more information in their compositions. *Making suggestions or requests* may appear either in the margin or at the end of essays which are in the form of statements or questions. *Giving information* means that teachers implicitly tell students what should be included in their writing.

Secondly, *grammar or mechanics comments* deal with the formal features of

writing dealing with grammar, mechanics (spelling, punctuation, typing, leaving adequate margins), or other classroom management issues. Thirdly, *positive comments* may appear in the forms of praise which are used to encourage students to improve their writing.

## METHODS

This study employed a qualitative case study design which was aimed at gaining an in-depth understanding (Haradhan, 2018) of teacher's indirect written feedback strategies at one senior high school in Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The research site was chosen because it was relevant to the context of conducting the study which is senior high school context. Moreover, there was easy access to the site since both teacher and students were cooperative; therefore, there was no difficulty in clarifying the obscure information.

The participants, who are one English teacher and nine twelfth-grade students, were selected through purposive sampling. The teacher, who has been teaching English for approximately 24 years, was chosen because she provided written feedback in her class. Nine students, whose names were pseudonyms, were chosen because they were recommended by the teacher as they were able to provide the sufficient important information needed in this study. They were between 17-19 years of age while English is a foreign language for them.

Data collection techniques include classroom observations, document analysis, and semi-structured interviews with the teacher and students, which were intended to triangulate and clarify the inferences. The data were gathered over a nine-meeting period.

Classroom observations were conducted as they allowed for collecting data that could not be covered by the other data collection methods (Santos et al., 2016). Observations were undertaken three times a week to record classroom activities. The teacher's talks during each lesson were videotaped and subsequently transcribed. The researcher took a role as a non-participant observer since she was not involved in the classroom interaction (Ciesielska et al., 2018).

The documents analyzed in this study were discussion texts composed by the students. They were used because the teacher taught this text type while the study was conducted. The students were free to select the topic, but it should be controversial, interesting, understandable, and familiar for them.

There were five procedures in the writing class. First, the teacher provided in-class writing. Second, in the next meeting, the students handed in their compositions. Third, the teacher gave out-class indirect written feedback. Fourth, in the next meeting, the teacher handed the papers back to the

students. Fifth, the students were asked to revise their compositions in the classroom. If they did not finish the revision yet, they were allowed to continue it at home.

Semi-structured interviews were employed because they allowed for the possibility to compare the participants' answers. Furthermore, they were flexible for going more in-depth based on the direction of the interviews which could obtain more important information from the participants (O'Keeffe, et al., 2016). Each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes. The interviews were conducted in *Bahasa Indonesia* to allow participants to elaborate their explanations as it is their native language. The interview data were audiotaped, transcribed, condensed, and translated into English.

The inductive analysis of the data was conducted simultaneously during the study, encompassing the data from students' texts, classroom observations, and teacher and students' interviews. It was used to find out categories and patterns emerging from the data.

The data from the students' drafts were analyzed in two steps. The first step was collecting the students' texts. The second step was analyzing the data based on the types of indirect feedback strategies that are coded feedback, uncoded feedback, and commentary.

The categories of feedback strategies were obtained from those suggested by Ferris (2011) as shown in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. Types of indirect feedback strategies**

Coded Feedback	Uncoded Feedback	Commentary
Verb tense (VT)	Bracket	Directives
Word form (WF)	Underlining symbol	<i>Asking for information</i>
Word choice (WC)	Circle	<i>Making a suggestion/request</i>
Spelling (SP)		<i>Giving Information</i>
Punctuation (Punc)		Grammar/mechanics comments
Verb Form(VF)		Positive comments
Subject-Verb Agreement (SV)		
Articles (Art)		
Noun Ending (N)		
Pronouns (Pr)		
Run-on (RO)		
Fragment (Frag)		
Sentence structure (SS)		
Informal (Inf)		
Idiom (ID)		

(Source: Ferris, 2011)

The analysis of the data from interviews was done through five steps. These include transcription, condensation, code, category, and theme (Erlingsson & Brysiewicz, 2017) based on the categories of indirect feedback strategies above.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the data analysis, it was found that the teacher mainly used coded feedback in her indirect feedback practices, followed by uncoded feedback and commentary, as shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Teacher's use of indirect feedback strategies**

Types of Indirect Strategy	Amount	Examples of Written Feedback
<b>Coded Feedback</b>		
Verb Tense	8	T If their children got a lower score,...
Wrong Form	2	That become an embarasemen WF (must be spelling)
Wrong Word	2	WW In the positive said of this issue said by the government.
Spelling	2	SP ...there are three kinds of accesment...
Punctuation	3	This statement is supported by Marty M. Natalegawa who is a minister of foreign affair P
Total of coded feedback	17	
<b>Uncoded Feedback</b>		
Bracket	3	...but they don't have ( ) attitude and moral...
Underlining symbol	11	At usually people just look at...

Circle	2	The <b>used</b> of uniform is concerned with...
Total of uncoded feedback	16	
Commentary		
Asking for information	2	Do you have supporting data from other source to support your arguments?
Making a suggestion/request	3	Split your sentences to make them clear and understandable
Total of commentary	5	
Total of all feedback	38	

The table shows that the teacher put a high emphasis on coded feedback in her feedback practice. Among 38 points of the indirect feedback, 17 points were coded feedback, 16 points were uncoded feedback, and 5 points were commentary. The findings would be explained below.

#### Coded Feedback on Students' Writing

The data analysis revealed that coded feedback was mostly employed by the teacher through the use of abbreviations. One of the examples can be seen from the data from students' text below.

**There are the kinds of ~~accessment~~.**

(SP)

Here, the teacher wrote the code *Sp* on the word *accessment* to point out the spelling error in the sentence *there are the kinds of accessment*. In this regard, the student wrote *accessment* while it should be *assessment*.

Consistent with the results of the students' texts, the data from classroom observation also shows that the teacher used the coding system, particularly to indicate errors in the linguistic features, as revealed in:

Teacher : I have provided feedback on your errors. If there is *WW*, it means *Wrong Word*. For example, when you say '*there should vote*', what is your intention?

Student : *They*

Teacher : When I gave you *WF* for *Wrong Form*. *T* means *Wrong Tense*, then *P* for *Punctuation*, including *capitalization*. *I* mean *Unclear Ideas*. Then, *V* refers to *Verb*, it is easy to remember. *Con* for *Concord*. For example, what is the correct form of '*it need...*'

Student : *Needs*

(observation #6)

Based on the excerpt, the teacher explained to the students that she would use abbreviations to respond to their writing. She further described that the code *WW* was used to indicate *wrong word*, *WF* to indicate

*wrong form*, *T* to indicate *Tense*, *P* to indicate *punctuation* including *capitalization*, *Con* to indicate *concord*, and *I* to indicate *ideas*, *V* to indicate *Verb*, and *Con* to indicate *concord*. She also provided examples to check

students' understanding. She asked students about their intention in the sentence '*there should vote*'. The students could identify and correct the error by saying that the word *there* should be changed into *they*. Moreover, she asked students whether they could find the

error in *it need*.... The students answered that the error was *need* and the correct form was *needs*.

The data from students' interviews also revealed that the teacher employed the coding system as explained in the following excerpt:

Student 5 : The teacher gave codes at that time

Interviewer : What kind of codes?

Student5 : There are many of them, *T* for *Tense*, *P* for *Pronunciation*, *eh* for *Punctuation*, then, *WF* for *Word Form*, and *WW* for *Wrong Words*

Student 8 : Yes. Codes are used

Student 9 : Usually, the teacher gives codes, such as *P*.

Here, the students argued that the teacher provided eight types of codes on their drafts. These included *T* to indicate *Tense*, *P* to indicate *Punctuation*, *WS* to indicate *Wrong Structure*, *Sp* to indicate *Spelling*, *WF* to indicate *Wrong Form*, *Con* to indicate *Concord*, *WW* to indicate *Wrong Word*, and *I*

to indicate *Ideas*.

On the other hand, it was also found that the coding system brings two negative effects. First, the teacher was inconsistent in writing the abbreviations as revealed by the data from the teacher's interview below:

Teacher : I've just given codes in a recent time. I am still not accustomed to. I read the books of Hyland, Hellen, Tricia Hage. Then, I also read journals. It seems that I was not consistent (in giving the codes). For the written feedback, I still need for learning how to give good feedback.  
So far, my written feedback was not so good

In the excerpt, the teacher admitted that she lacked experience in using codes. She explained that she was not consistent with using them because she used them in a recent time and she was not accustomed to doing it. The teacher also expressed that she was in the process of learning how to use codes appropriately by reading books of Hyland, Hellen, and Tricia Hage, and journals. The inconsistent use of codes was

also found in the data from the students' texts below:

***That become an embarassemen thing WF***

The example shows that there was a spelling error as underlined by the teacher in the sentence *That become an embarassemen thing*. The student wrote *embarassemen* while it should be *embarassing*. In this case, the teacher should write *Sp* for the spelling error instead of writing *WF*.



Second, there was difficulty in remembering a large number of codes as expressed below:

Student 2: ...I did not understand them (the codes). 'What is WW?' Then, 'What is WS'. Fortunately, they were explained by the teacher, but...after that I forget them (the codes) again... because there are many codes to remember. Actually, I cannot really remember the codes. They consist of two letters. That's all.

Student 3 :...it is beneficial to use codes, but it should be familiarized from the very beginning.

Here, student 2 explained that she had difficulty in remembering the codes since there were too many codes given by the teacher. She expressed that she did not understand the code *WW* and *WS*. In this regard, student 3 suggested the teacher familiarize the terms from the very beginning since she found the coding system was beneficial.

#### **Uncoded Feedback on Students' Writing**

Based on the data analysis, it was found that uncoded feedback was the second strategy used by the teacher. It was applied through the use of symbols including brackets, question marks, underlining symbols, circles, and cross symbols. One of the examples can be seen

Teacher: I also circled it, gave questions marks... something like that. I give underlining symbols when I did not understand what exactly she wanted to say, but the sentence structure was correct. If I gave question marks, it means that I did not understand.

As the excerpt noted, the teacher used circles, question marks, and underlining symbols. She further explained that she provided the underlining symbol on the composition she did not understand, although the sentence structure was correct. Meanwhile,

from the data from the students' texts below:

Because *every citizen have* their own right and...

The example shows that the teacher used an underlining symbol to indicate the student's error in subject-verb agreement. The student made an inappropriate form of noun *citizen* by writing *citizens*, while it was preceded by the word *every*. In this regard, she should use the third plural noun for the word *citizens* if *every* precedes it. Therefore, she should write *citizen*. Moreover, because of subject-verb agreement, the word *have* should be in the form of *has*. Therefore, the correct form of the sentence should be *every citizen has*. It was also found from the data from teacher interview, as in:

the question marks were given when the teacher could not grasp the ideas delivered.

The data from classroom observation reveal that the teacher also used brackets in addition to the symbols explained above, as stated below:

Teacher: If there are brackets ( ) means that *you miss something*. It can be words or phrases. If I write (?), it means that *I don't understand. What do you mean?* So, it means unclear. You have to rewrite. The sentence should be revised.

(Observation #6)

In this regard, the teacher explained to the students that she used brackets ( ) to indicate that the students missed something in their writing. It could be words or phrases. Meanwhile, when she put question marks (?), she wanted to indicate her confusion about

the unclear ideas. Thus, the teacher suggested them rewrite and revise their writing.

In accordance with the results from students' texts, classroom observation, and teacher's interview, the results of students' interview also portray the same thing, as in:

Student 2: .... questions marks are given. If there are missing words, we are given brackets, then cross marks, or brackets without any words between them, meaning that something should be in the brackets.

Student 9: Underlined.... for those which are not well connected, underlined or...question marks were given

Student 8: Yes, circled

The students admitted that the teacher wrote symbols, including question marks, brackets, cross marks, underlining symbols, and circles on their drafts. Student 2 argued that the teacher used question marks, brackets, and cross marks. She said that brackets were used when there were missing words there. Meanwhile, she explained that brackets without any words indicated that there should be information in the brackets.

*asking for information and making a suggestion/request.*

In this regard, the teacher's feedback was in the form of a question that was intended to ask for information and clarification in order to know the student's focus on the title she had chosen. The teacher asked which part of the education system that would be discussed by the student. Specifically, the teacher asked for clarification whether the term *quality* would focus on the intelligence or national exam.

### **Commentary on Students' Writing**

Based on the data analysis, it was found that two types of *commentary* were employed by the teacher. These included

The data from teacher interview also revealed that the teacher used commentary on the students' drafts, as expressed below:

Teacher: for a long paragraph with unclear ideas, it should be in comments. I usually asked them to split the sentence into some sentences.

...sometimes, I also wrote, for example, 'pay attention to plural forms', 'pay attention to the agreement between this this this'.

In the first excerpt, the teacher described that she gave written comments on the error in the students' ideas. She also asked them to split a long paragraph with unclear ideas. Moreover, she also used command on their compositions related to the grammatical features, such as *pay attention to*

*plural forms* and *pay attention to the agreement between this this this*.

Moreover, the data from the student interviews described that the teacher's comments were also intended to *give suggestions*, as expressed in:

Student 1: the title, for example, we were afraid that the ideas did not match with the title. So, the teacher wrote *what do you mean by this title*.

Interviewer: Was there any comments from your teacher?

Student 2: yes, there was... on my friend's paper, such as avoid mentioning *forbid too often*

Here, student 1 explained that the teacher asked her to specify the topic she had chosen by giving a question *what do you mean by this title?* In the other words, the teacher intended to ask for information. Meanwhile, student 2 argued that the teacher asked her friend to avoid redundancy by writing *avoid mentioning 'forbid' too often*. In this regard, the teacher aimed at giving suggestion to the students.

The current study showed that coded feedback was mainly used by the teacher, followed by uncoded feedback and commentary. This is in line with a research finding of a study conducted by Rizkiani et al. (2020) which reported that coded feedback gave a positive influence in improving the quality of students' writing. In this regard, coded feedback gave short and long-term learning for the students, especially in

grammatical structure, as it included "noticing and understanding" which further bridged their known and unknown interlanguage. In addition, coded feedback was also a good option because it specifically indicated the error types and was easy to understand if it was taught clearly by the teacher.

This finding suggests that teacher's coded feedback is effective to be applied in terms of guided learning, problem-solving, encouraging the students to be self-editors, and helping them avoid the same mistakes in their second drafts.

Regarding this, there are two rationales which encourage the teacher to use the coding system. First, giving codes is time-saving and efficient (Ferris, 2011) as there is a possibility to mark a number of the students' compositions in a short time.

Second, by giving codes, the students are allowed to identify and develop their understanding of what type of errors they have made which helps them internalize the new knowledge they have possessed.

In addition, the finding that the students had difficulty in understanding the codes reveal that feedback is ineffective when the students had inadequate skills to comprehend it. In this regard, the codes were confusing for students. It has resulted from the students' unfamiliarity with the codes since they do not have much background knowledge of the abbreviations provided by the teacher.

Furthermore, the finding shows that the teacher was inconsistent in using particular codes. The inconsistent use of codes has resulted from two causes. First, it is caused by the teacher's lack of ability and experience in implementing the feedback, particularly the codes. This is also confirmed by the teacher in the interview session that she was not accustomed to using the codes since she applied them in a recent time. Second, there is a large number of codes that lead students to forget them easily as confirmed by the students in the interview session.

On the contrary, the use of codes also give negative effects because of its inappropriate implementation which sometimes failed to help students learn effectively. Then, students' motivation should be considered by the teacher before giving certain types of

feedback. To cope with this, the teacher needs to find strategies for using the codes effectively. There are at least two strategies to overcome this problem.

First, the teacher needs to reduce the number of the codes at the beginning. When the teacher convinces that the students are familiar with and understand the given codes, she may add other abbreviations. If the teacher continues giving many codes, there is a possibility that the students perceive the codes as disadvantageous.

Second, the teacher needs to ensure that the students are ready for the feedback practices by explicitly teach them the meaning and use of the codes. The teacher should ensure that they recognize the feedback and apply the feedback appropriately in their revisions. This can be done by having a diagnostic pretest and practice on grammar rules as an attempt to identify the students' understanding of the codes.

For example, the teacher can give a classroom practice for recognizing all the codes. In this regard, after explaining the meaning of each code, the teacher provides an example of a composition containing errors in which codes have been given on the errors. After that, the teacher asks the students to categorize the errors based on the meanings of the codes given. Moreover, the teacher can ask the students to provide the correct forms of the errors. By having the practice, the students will have an insight into the meaning of the codes given by the teacher

and what are the intended correct forms for the errors.

Third, the teacher needs to consistently implement the codes from the very beginning of the writing class to facilitate long-term accuracy of the students' writing. When the consistent codes are given, the students will be able to develop their accuracy in writing.

The current finding that the teacher also used uncoded feedback, especially symbols that correction symbols were effective to guide students in self-correction. In this regard, there are three factors that urge the teacher to use symbols. First, symbols are the easiest ways of providing feedback since the teacher does not have to follow a certain rule as found in codes. Second, the use of symbols saves her time and energy (Ferris, 2011). Third, the teacher intends to lead the students to think of their errors and become aware of the error patterns that further leads to long-term learning improvement.

However, the finding that the student sometimes failed to correct the error given through symbols has resulted from their difficulty in understanding the meaning of the symbols. Thus, this leads to be time-consuming for the students as they need to memorize and analyze the meaning of the symbols carefully (Ferris, 2011).

Furthermore, the finding that the teacher used commentary in responding to students' writing supports the findings of previous studies (Irwin, 2018). The use of

comments implies that the teacher wants to guide the students to think further as an attempt to lead them to produce meaningful writing. Moreover, the use of comments suggests that the teacher provides "reader response" information on the students' texts (Ferris et al., 1997). This practice, as maintained by Coffin et al. (2003), encourages students to work more seriously on their essays since they know that their teachers take a lot of care of them. Thus, this will help students to be problem solvers and independent writers and editors.

Moreover, the finding that the teacher used *asking for information* and *making suggestions or requests* indicates that the teacher uses *directives*, as one type of commentary, in her feedback practice. This implies that the teacher is more concerned with the content and organization of the composition. This also suggests that the teacher wants the student to clarify her intention and provide further information to make their writing more understandable. However, this is different from the results of a study conducted by Srirakarn (2018) which revealed that the teacher's comments were most effective in correcting errors on forms, such as tenses, grammar, and structure.

Overall, the current study showed that coded and uncoded feedback was used by the teacher to respond to errors in the linguistic features while commentary was provided when she intended to focus on the content of students' writing.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated teacher's indirect strategies when giving written feedback on students' writing, encompassing coded feedback, uncoded feedback, and commentary. From the findings, it can be concluded that coded feedback was mainly used by the teacher in correcting the students' errors. Generally, the use of indirect feedback strategies was considered beneficial in encouraging students to be problem solvers and independent. However, it was disadvantageous as the teacher was not consistent in using the codes and the students had difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of many the codes. Thus, the teacher is suggested to reduce the number of codes and ensure that the students understand the use and the meanings of abbreviations by giving sufficient activity. Therefore, it will facilitate the long-term benefit of learning.

In the current study, the researcher focused on analyzing the types of indirect written feedback strategies given by the teacher on students' compositions. Those strategies might have impacted the revision of the students' writing. Thus, for further research, it is important to analyze the effect of indirect written feedback strategies on the students' revisions as well as students' preferences on these strategies. Moreover, as the limited involved participants in this study, it is beneficial to conduct research with the same topic in the larger size of participants as an

attempt to triangulate the findings of this research.

## REFERENCES

- Chen, W. (2018). The effects of corrective feedback strategies on English majors' writing. *English Language Teaching, English Language Teaching, 11(11)*, 55–64. <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n11p55>
- Ciesielska, M., Bostrom, K. ., & Ohlander, M. (2018). Observation methods. *Qualitative Methodologies in Organization Studies (Pp. 33-52)*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3_2)
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lilis, T. M., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. Routledge.
- Ene, E. (2016). Rubrics and corrective feedback in ESL writing: A longitudinal case study of an L2 writer. *Assessing Writing, 30(4)*, 217–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.06.003>
- Erlingsson, C., & Brysiewicz, P. (2017). A hands-on guide to doing content analysis. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine, 7(3)*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2017.08.001>

- Ferris, D. R. (2011a). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. The University of Michigan.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011b). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. The University of Michigan.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), 155–182. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(97\)90032-1](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(97)90032-1)
- Haradhan, M. (2018). *Qualitative research methodology in social sciences and related subjects*. <https://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/85654/>
- Irwin, B. (2018). Written corrective feedback: student preferences and teacher feedback practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.22492/ijll.3.2.02>
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2016). *Silabus Bahasa Inggris Kemdikbud*. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/37142125/Silabus\\_inggris\\_kemendikbud](https://www.academia.edu/37142125/Silabus_inggris_kemendikbud)
- Kim, V., & Kim, J. (2020). Roles of teacher feedback in promoting effective English-medium instruction of a business subject. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.3.9.889>
- Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Li. (2011). Role of teacher, peer, and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 15(29–35). <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.390.1221&rep=rep1&type=pdf%0A>
- O'Keeffe, J., Mijic, A., Brozovic, N., & Sinha, R. (2016). The use of semi-structured interviews for the characterisation of farmer irrigation practices. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 20(5). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-20-1911-2016>
- Park, J. (2018). Effectiveness of teacher and peer feedback: through the lens of Korean tertiary writing classroom. *The Journal of Asia TEFL. The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 429–444. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.11.429>
- Rizkiani, S., Bhuana, G. P., & Rizqiya, R. . (2020). Coded vs uncoded corrective feedback in teaching writing descriptive text. *Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 8(1), 55–66. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v8i1.p%p>
- Santos, P. R. ., Araujo, L. F. S., & Bellato, R. (2016). The observation field on research. *Escola Anna Nery*, 20(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5935>

- /1414-8145.20160055
- Strirakarn, N. O. (2018). A comparison of teacher's and senior students' feedback: Student attitudes and their writing improvement. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 329–348. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.1.329>
- Than, K. ., & Manochphinyo, A. (2017). Improving grammatical accuracy in Thai learners' writing: comparing direct and indirect written corrective feedback. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(3), 430–442. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2017.14.3.4.430>
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 22(2), 17–32. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>
- Wicaksono, W. . (2017). Types and frequencies of written corrective feedback in adult ESL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(2), 60–67. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24071/ijels.v3i2.1065.g846>