



## An Analysis of the Types of Feedback Provided by the Lecturers: Students' Perceived

Cut Intan Meutia<sup>1</sup> , Fadhillah Wiandari<sup>\*2</sup> , Indah Sartika<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1,2,3</sup> IAIN Langsa, Langsa, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [fwandari@iainlangsa.ac.id](mailto:fwandari@iainlangsa.ac.id)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 5 February 2024

Revised 5 May 2024

Accepted 13 May 2024

Available online 31 May 2024

E-ISSN: 2745-8296

#### How to cite:

Meutia, C.I., Wiandari, F., & Sartika, I. (2024). An Analysis of the Types of Feedback Provided by the Lecturers: Students' Perceived. *Lingpoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research*, 5(4), 90-96.

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to learn more about lecturers' different types of providing feedback to students. A qualitative-descriptive analysis was carried out to apply it. Questionnaire was used to collect the information, and its goal was to determine how the English lecturer gives feedback to students in learning the language. The researcher found that English lecturers used many different kinds of feedback during this research, which refers to Wulandary's (2017) and Ellis' (2017) theory. They made use of each sort of feedback. However, it should be solicited in the first place. In addition, the lecturers provided students with written suggestions regarding how they might improve. The first is the amount of direct corrective feedback, which was the highest. When students write something wrong in English class, their lecturers will give them immediate feedback through written comments

**Keywords:** Feedback, Types of feedback, Students' perceived

### ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mempelajari lebih lanjut tentang berbagai jenis dosen dalam memberikan umpan balik kepada mahasiswa. Analisis deskriptif kualitatif dilakukan untuk menerapkannya. Kuesioner digunakan untuk mengumpulkan informasi, dan tujuannya adalah untuk mengetahui bagaimana dosen bahasa Inggris memberikan umpan balik kepada siswa dalam mempelajari bahasa tersebut. Peneliti menemukan bahwa dosen Bahasa Inggris menggunakan berbagai jenis umpan balik selama penelitian ini, yang mengacu pada teori Wulandary (2017) dan Ellis (2017). Mereka memanfaatkan setiap jenis umpan balik. Namun, hal ini harus diminta terlebih dahulu. Selain itu, dosen memberikan saran tertulis kepada mahasiswa mengenai bagaimana mereka dapat meningkatkan diri. Yang pertama adalah jumlah umpan balik korektif langsung, yang merupakan jumlah tertinggi. Ketika siswa menulis sesuatu yang salah di kelas bahasa Inggris, dosen mereka akan segera memberikan umpan balik melalui komentar tertulis.

**Kata Kunci:** Umpan Balik, Jenis umpan balik, persepsi Siswa



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International.

## 1. Introduction

Feedback is often viewed as the most significant aspect of fostering and consolidating learning. The term "teacher feedback" refers to a collection of tactics that educators implement in order to assess and respond to the behaviors and accomplishments of their pupils (Eriksson et al., 2017). In addition, Feedback is one of a few areas which recently become the key one in teaching and learning activities (Fithriani, 2019). As a competent one, the lecturer delivers typically feedback to ensure the running of the student's success and achievements. Research reveals that feedback, as part of the evaluation, often needs to be supplied successfully. An essential part of good feedback delivery is that students need to understand feedback and feel inspired to act on it (Lazar & Ryder, 2018). It speculates that in many of the theories of second language learning and education, the function of feedback has been underlined (Behroozi & Karimnia, 2017). Feedback can be significant since it can attract attention to (the presence of) an error in a learner's interlanguage (De Vries et al., 2015). This explains that feedback which was acquired from interaction should be advantageous and crucial for L2 learning (Zhai & Gao, 2018). Hovater (2007) defines feedback as the information provided by a variety

of agents (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding an individual's growth. Furthermore, feedback is information such as correction, advice, guidance, and progress from lecturers to their students regarding their performance in presenting material, to improve their performance (Al-Amri, 2011). Therefore, it implies that feedback comprises information that aids students in their learning context.

Moreover, feedback also can be media to prevent errors of students by reaching the emotional side of them. It is in line with Larsen and Freeman's argument that everyone knows that being a good teacher implies offering positive feedback to the student and being concerned with his or her affective side or their feeling. In addition, feedback from the teacher can generate a purpose for editing; without these remarks, students will revise their work in a regular, narrow, and predictable way (Sommers, 1982). To become proficient in English, however, English learners require their own and their teacher's efforts. The students and the teacher may experience faults in learning English that pupils have to stumble repeatedly. On the one hand, students tend to be perceived as simply recipients while they can be engaged and aggressive actors in the feedback process (Lee & Yin, 2021). On the other hand, the teacher needs to rectify those flaws with the teacher's input. It provides the option for training to be adapted to the needs of individual students through face-to-face interaction and written commentary at various points (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2018).

The trouble is, therefore, particularly in this context, practically all instructors are used to apply positive or negative criticism by utilizing their style in giving feedback. Nevertheless, not all of those attempts of feedback are fruitful and have a favorable impact on the students. Some are encouraging positive words toward their pupils by praising their works; while others only correct students' errors and give scores without looking at students' replies to the lecturer's feedback. This leads to having students to be hesitate to learn English. They were too terrified of making mistakes, even though making mistakes is a natural part of learning a language. It is a natural behavior when one is in a learning environment. In addition, the fact that students are allowed to make mistakes in their learning is a significant source of how well students absorb new material. The current investigation focuses on determining which types of feedback teachers in educational settings most frequently use. Precisely, this research reflects on an in-depth analysis of what form of feedback is most employed to offer some comments to enhance students in learning.

## 2 Literature Review

### *Feedback*

According to Burnett (2002), feedback is meant to specify the learner's language to improve the learner's education. It does this by gathering information from the students about how the class is progressing. When it comes to the process of teaching and learning, feedback is a form that is more valuable than grades. The learner is provided with suggestions in the form of feedback that they can use to enhance their language abilities. The learner will get helpful criticism from the feedback, which will help them do better the next time they have a chance to learn. The student gains insight into their current language abilities through the use of feedback. Not only does the instructor instruct students verbally or in writing on how to improve their weaknesses and blunders, but they also provide feedback to pupils about their areas of improvement. The act of providing the student with feedback might serve as an instructive stimulus. It may be a more effective method of motivating students than issuing marks or grades. The act of providing feedback encourages the student to engage in self-directed learning. The aim is to direct the students toward discovering their errors on their own. Students are able to understand what they should be doing because feedback demonstrates the correct form to use.

### *Types of Feedback*

#### *Oral Corrective Feedback*

Wulandari (2017) explained 6 (six) categories of oral feedback.

##### a. Explicit correction

In this category of feedback, the lecturer indicates clearly that what the students had said was incorrect, for example: *she bring a flower*. The lecturer then directly corrects the word by saying: *you need to add an "s" in bring*, so it should be: *she brings a bunch of flower*.

b. Recast

The teacher reformulates the students' utterances without indicating directly that their answer was incorrect. This can be seen in the form like: "...to buy" → "to buy. Nice".

c. Clarification request

A clarification request is needed when the student's response is misunderstood by the teacher. So that the teacher gives a response such as a question to make students clear about the answer. This type of feedback can refer to problems in comprehensibility inaccuracy.

d. Metalinguistics Feedback

This feedback obtains comment, information, or question related to student's utterances. Those indicate that students make mistake. Generally, metalinguistics feedback refers to solve students' error grammatically.

e. Elicit

This feedback contains three techniques that used by the lecturer directly to stimulate students in giving a correct answer. Firstly, the lecturer states incomplete in order to make students continue the form. The lecturer then uses a question to elicit correct forms. The last one is the lecturer occasionally asks the student to reformulate the sentence.

f. Repetition.

In this way, the lecturer does a repetition on student errors used of utterances. In most cases, the lecturer uses intonation to highlight the error.

*Written Corrective Feedback*

According to Bitchener & Knoch (2008), pupils are able to acquire and exhibit mastery of the application of linguistics and structure in their writing when they are given corrective feedback. Written corrective feedback is the correction of students' work of their grammatical errors in order to improve their writing skills. This correction aims to improve students' writing skills so they can write accurately James (1996). Based on those definitions, it is clear that the lecturer used written corrective feedback as a method of rectifying the errors that pupils make when writing. The lecturer, at this point, gives the pupils the proper form directly during the direct corrective feedback portion of the lesson. In most cases, the lecturer will strike through unneeded phrases, words, and punctuation.

Ellis (2012) divided corrective comments made in writing into six categories (Direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, focus feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation). The type of direct corrective feedback is advantageous because it helps the students to learn in the short term. This is because learners who have received direct corrective feedback recognize the correct form but they need help to understand more why it is correct or incorrect. When giving this kind of feedback, the lecturers have to admit that there are mistakes but they should provide specific ways to fix them. The inaccuracy is highlighted by the lecturers to demonstrate it to the students. Through the use of this method for providing feedback, the lecturers make a positive impression on the students and guide them toward the process of learning and problem-solving.

On the other hand, this type of feedback also has a drawback for the students who are poor at grammatical structure mastery. Therefore, the students will face some difficulties to analyze and repair their mistake. As a result, the student's work will be more challenging to understand. At this point, the instructor gives many metalinguistic indications to figure out where the students went wrong. The clue could be a code that is written out in the abbreviated form. For instance, the instructor might write "sp" for spelling, "WW" for wrong words in the margins of the paper. Providing students with metalinguistic corrective feedback can assist them in enhancing the accuracy of their written work. When a teacher uses metalinguistic corrective feedback, however, it might be challenging for students to comprehend their teachers' explanations.

*Significances of Feedback in the learning language*

We must increase our understanding of how teachers provide feedback to students because previous studies have indicated that feedback has a crucial role in student's academic growth and success (Hattie, 2012; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Providing feedback to students in the classroom can be an effective way to improve their skills and obtain a better knowledge in second language learning. This is because the students obtain enormous benefit from receiving constructive criticism. According to Rydahl, (2006), a lecturer will frequently utilize various feedback strategies at random, or they will use the same strategy for providing feedback regardless of the nature of the students' errors. The input provided by teachers also makes a significant impact on the students' improvement in doing works.

There are several different methods in which the lecturer can aid students by either explaining the goals, increasing their level of dedication, or increasing the amount of effort they put to attain objectives through feedback. In addition, R. Ellis (2009) offers a second definition of feedback, which describes it as the detection and correction of errors made by the learner and the positive reinforcement of accurate utterances. However, the lecturer needs to be more diligent in correctly identifying the faults made by the students. We are aware, as a result of such statements, that feedback carries great significance

### **3. Method**

The design of this study is descriptive qualitative research because it was chosen with careful consideration to the aims of this research. Consider qualitative research, Fielding (1999) defines it as "multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter," and they add that qualitative research involves "multi-method in focus." Its purpose is to investigate and make sense of the phenomena as they occur in their natural environments. This study was conducted at English Department of IAIN Langsa. 28 (twenty-eight) students from the eighth semester of the English department at IAIN Langsa volunteered to participate in this research. The questionnaire was used throughout the process of data collection, which was distributed through Google form. Following the completion of the distribution of the questionnaire, the researcher performed an analysis of the results. The researcher analyzed and categorized the responses to the questionnaire provided by the students based on Wulandari's (2017) and Ellis' (2017) theory. For the researcher to achieve the result, they must first understand the data percentages and data frequencies that are presented in the table. The responses of the students to the questionnaire, which is connected to the various forms of feedback from the lecturers, were summarized in the table. The researcher, after that, interpreted the data and came to the following conclusions.

### **4. Result and Discussion**

The researcher collected the data for this study from the responses that the students gave from the distribution of questionnaire. The online survey the researcher developed was hosted on Google Forms, which served as the platform. After that, she sent the questionnaire to each organization's WhatsApp group. The questionnaire that needed to be analyzed had 28 students as respondents. Before beginning work on the questionnaire, the researcher had the indicator of providing feedback arranged more logically. In this investigation, the researcher decided to apply the theory proposed by Lyster & Ranta (1997) for oral corrective feedback. This is about the six different types of oral feedback. There are many different kinds of oral feedback, including explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicit, and repetition, according to the typology of oral feedback developed by Lyster and Ranta. The researcher elaborated the data of the questionnaire result, which is the occurrence of each type of feedback, by calculating the percentage of students who gave scales of 'always,' 'often,' 'sometimes,' and 'never' on each statement on the questionnaire. This allowed the researcher to determine the frequency of each type of feedback. Every statement in the questionnaire makes some assumption about the spoken reply. The researcher decided to classify it based on the different questions asked on the questionnaire so that it would be simpler to explain. The following is a demonstration of the data obtained via oral feedback:

According to the findings of the research, the researcher discovered that the lecturers use a variety of approaches while providing feedback on the students' work. This demonstrates that the professors pay attention to more than just one student's feedback. It is consistent with what Ellis says in (Rydahl, 2005) where he states that a teacher will frequently utilize a variety of feedback strategies at random, or would use the same strategy

for feedback regardless of the sort of mistake made by the students. In addition, the findings demonstrate that lecturers each have their method of providing feedback to students. Based on the findings, each different sort of input presented its percentage. That indicates that the professors in each of the courses have a distinct method for providing feedback to their students. Make it clear that each EFL instructor has their own set of options for oral feedback. Therefore, it should come as no surprise that lecturers in the context of the classroom utilize many forms of feedback.

Explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic, elicit, and repeat are the six forms of oral feedback that Lyster and Ranta (Lyster et al., 1997) have identified as being used by lecturers. These are the sorts of feedback that Lyster and Ranta classify. According to the statistics, the frequency of explicit correction in English schools is approximately 70.75 per cent. In most cases, the instructor who applies this feedback will directly rectify the errors made by the students in order to make the topic more understandable and straightforward for further discussion. From Behroozi & Karimnia (2017) point of view, the explicit correction method is one that is both extremely helpful and efficient in terms of time use.

Then, there are professors who also treated the pupils by employing the type of feedback known as recast 82.15 per cent of the time. In most cases, the instructor will not pay attention to the mistakes that the pupils make in their learning but will continue to place primary emphasis on the meanings. As a direct consequence of this change, students now have the option to rectify the errors they previously made. Following that, the professors will also reinforce the student by asking for clarification on their work. The likelihood of receiving feedback of that nature in an English classroom is one hundred per cent. In most cases, the instructors would invite the student to elaborate on their response, which is reflective of the name of this form of feedback. Clearly, the professors are the ones who are in charge of leading it.

Next, a teacher's preference also plays a role in providing metalinguistic feedback to students. There is a 98.15% chance that you will receive this feedback. When he comments on or provides information on the student's utterances to hint at the nature of the subject matter, the students will digest all the input. In addition, the students agree that their teachers have control over their learning environments because of the use of elicit feedback. According to the conclusions of the research, there is a 99.7% possibility of elicit occurring in the classroom. The professors will frequently ask the students to finish their sentences or reformulate the sentences they have already said.

Finally, the lecturers should have the ability to include repetition and feedback in their mode of instruction. There is a 68.9% chance that something will repeat. The lecturers will occasionally change their intonation to emphasize the mistakes the students have made so that the students are aware of their errors. On the other hand, this critique could get the attention of the students. Not only do professors provide feedback orally, but they also do it in a written form by adopting the approach described above. They employ six different types of textual feedback (according to Ellis, these are direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, focus feedback, Electronic Feedback, and reformulation feedback), and all of it is based on the results (R. Ellis, 2009).

To begin, 97.35% of the time, students in English classes receive direct corrective comments on their work. Lecturers typically give the correction by crossing out the incorrect words. Because students typically struggle with self-correction, receiving this form of feedback enables them to address any errors they may have made directly. The second type of remedial input is indirect. In the English classroom, there is an 89.6% chance that students will receive feedback of this kind. The teacher would typically only highlight the incorrect response if explaining why it was incorrect. The student's capacity for self-correction will, of course, be heightened by receiving feedback of this nature. The third component is corrective feedback based on metalinguistic. According to the findings of the research, the probability of the occurrence of metalinguistic corrective feedback in English classes is 75.78%. A one-of-a-kind approach of providing a written correction on the mistakes made by students is called metalinguistic feedback. In most cases, lecturers will leave several codes on the worksheets that students have. A few of the students may have trouble understanding what the codes that have been provided mean.

In the fourth place, the pupils acknowledge that their teachers make use of focus feedback in the classroom. The probability of receiving feedback on the focus is 86.23%. When providing this kind of criticism, professors have two different options for correcting students' mistakes: they can either be focused or unfocused, which

relies on targeted feedback. Instructors will only provide corrections for one category of pupil inaccuracy in their answers. The clarity provided by the lecturers is of great assistance to a student in their academic pursuits. However, unfocused feedback involves the lecturers providing corrections for various faults made by the students. Although this may not be efficient, it could demonstrate pupils' capacity for long-term retention. Fifthly, the findings of the research show that 81.53% of the time, electronic feedback is used in the process of learning English. The teachers frequently use the program to rectify the students' faults. This kind of feedback is likely to occur rather frequently because, in this era of 4.0, technology plays a significant role in various fields, including education.

Sixthly, the pupils get the impression that there is an opportunity for reformulation feedback in their classroom. The goal of reformulation is to keep the students' texts true to their intended meaning while simultaneously reworking them such that the language sounds as much like their native tongue as is humanly possible. It demonstrates, for the most part, that an explicit correction is the type of feedback that is given the most frequently in oral corrective feedback. Oral corrective feedback was definitely the most common type of feedback given, and the reason for this is that in oral corrective feedback, the lecturers ask the students to specify the reasons for their answers. This kind of activity encourages children to participate actively in the classroom and helps them become more responsible by requiring them to answer questions. In addition, when it comes to written corrective feedback, the type of feedback that predominates the most is called direct feedback on learning English. According to Ellis (2009), direct feedback is the method by which a teacher delivers a correct form on faults made by students in their writing, this agrees with his viewpoint. This research has found that much feedback is being used in the English classroom at the Iain Langsa school's English department. It should be investigated further. It is vital for the other researcher to either perform the research on the same topic in a different manner or explore the topic in greater depth, such as by finding out the student's perceptions.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The researcher came to the following conclusion based on the information they got from the questionnaire and the analysis. There are six forms of oral feedback that the lecturers apply, and the verbal feedback used most frequently by lecturers is clarification requests. On the other hand, repetition is the type of feedback that English teachers give their students the least often. In addition, the instructors in the English classroom almost always provide the students with direct corrective comments regarding the written feedback. In contrast, metalinguistic corrective feedback is the type of input that people are least familiar with. Immediate disciplinary feedback accounts for 98.35% of the total. Various forms of feedback are available for lecturers and teachers, particularly those who instruct in English classrooms. To foster an environment conducive to productive learning in the classroom, instructors should vary the feedback they provide to students while they are making mistakes. In addition, the instructors need to identify the kind of feedback most applicable to the context of their respective classrooms. This research has found that a lot of feedback is being used in the English classroom at the Iain Langsa school's English department. This research should be investigated further. The other researcher needs to research the same topic differently or explore it more deeply by discovering the student's perceptions

## References

- Al-Amri, M. N. (2011). Getting Beyond Conversation Analysis: Critical and Pedagogical Implications for TESOL/Bilingual Curriculum for Diverse Learners in the Age of Globalization. *Education Inquiry*, 2(1), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v2i1.21969>
- Behroozi, B. K., & Karimnia, A. (2017). International Journal of research in English education. Educational Context and ELT Teachers' Corrective Feedback Preference: Public and Private School Teachers in Focus. *International Journal of Research in English Education*.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>
- Burnett, P. C. (2002). Teacher praise and feedback and students' perceptions of the classroom environment. *Educational Psychology*, 22(1), 5–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410120101215>

- De Vries, B. P., Cucchiarini, C., Bodnar, S., Strik, H., & van Hout, R. (2015). Spoken grammar practice and feedback in an ASR-based CALL system. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(6), 550–576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.889713>
- Ellis, N. C. (2012). Formulaic language and second language acquisition: Zipf and the phrasal teddy bear. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 32, 17–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190512000025>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 2–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/12.v1i1.9054>
- Eriksson, E., Björklund Boistrup, L., & Thornberg, R. (2017). A categorization of teacher feedback in the classroom: A field study on feedback based on routine classroom assessment in primary school. *Research Papers in Education*, 32(3), 316–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1225787>
- Fielding, N. G. (1999). The norm and the text: Denzin and Lincoln’s handbooks of qualitative method. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50(3), 525–534.
- Fithriani, R. (2019). ZPD and the Benefits of Written Feedback in L2 Writing: Focusing on Students’ Perceptions. *In The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 63–73.
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Feedback in schools by John Hattie. Feedback: The Communication of Praise, Criticism and Advice.*
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research*. 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hedgcock, J. S., & Ferris, D. R. (2018). *Teaching Readers of English. In Teaching Readers of English.* Routledge.
- James, C. (1996). A cross-linguistic approach to language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 5(3–4), 138–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.1996.9959903>
- Lazar, G., & Ryder, A. (2018). Speaking the same language: Developing a language-aware feedback culture. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 55(2), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2017.1403940>
- Lee, H., & Yin, J. (2021). As a Teacher, COVID-19 Means...”: Stories of How English Teachers in Asia Developed Resilience During the Pandemic. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(3), 764–779. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.3.2.764>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
- Rydahl, S. (2006). *Oral feedback in the English classroom: Teachers’ thoughts and awareness.*
- Sommers, N. (1982). *Responding to Student Writing. College Composition and Communication*. 33(2).
- Wulandari, A. S. (2017). *An analysis of teacher’s corrective feedback in writing skills at eights grade students of MTs N Sumberlawang in Academic Year 2016/2017* [Doctoral dissertation, Master’s thesis]. IAIN Surakarta.
- Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China’s university classroom. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1485472.