



Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345

<https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english>

DOI: 10.24127/pj.v13i3.10128

TEACHER CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES: A CASE STUDY

by

Affied Alfayed*

English Language Education Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

affiedalfayed@webmail.umm.ac.id

Sri Hartiningsih

English Language Education Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

malangharti2001@yahoo.com

Muhammad Fadhil Hamdani

SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari, Malang, Indonesia

hamdanifadhil25@gmail.com

**Corresponding Author*

(Article History: Received:14-05-2024;Reviewed1:06-08-2024;Reviewed2:25-09-2024: Accepted:16-10-2024;Published:20-10-2024).

Abstract:

The demand for vocational education in Indonesia is rising due to the evolving and fiercely competitive job market. English teachers are required to be able to improve students' English skills for specific purposes, mainly writing skills. Few studies have investigated how teachers provide corrective feedback on students' writing in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) settings. Therefore, this study investigates teachers' practice of corrective feedback and the rationale behind the practice in ESP settings. This research used a case study method on an English teacher in a secondary vocational school. Interviews, classroom observations, and documentation of student writing were used to collect data. The findings revealed that the teacher practiced oral corrective feedback when teaching the writing of a product description text. The oral corrective feedback strategies the teacher practices include explicit correction, metalinguistic correction, and recast. Additionally, the reason behind the practice is based on the teacher's teaching experience and personal beliefs. This study implies that teachers should consider students' developmental levels, linguistic needs, and feelings when using oral corrective feedback in ESP.

Keywords: *Descriptive text; teacher corrective feedback; writing, English for specific purpose (ESP).*

Abstrak:

Permintaan akan pendidikan vokasi di Indonesia meningkat karena pasar kerja yang berkembang dan sangat kompetitif. Guru bahasa Inggris dituntut untuk dapat meningkatkan kemampuan bahasa Inggris siswa untuk tujuan tertentu, khususnya kemampuan menulis. Beberapa penelitian telah menyelidiki bagaimana guru memberikan umpan balik korektif pada tulisan siswa dalam pembelajaran ESP. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki praktik umpan balik korektif guru dan alasan di balik praktik tersebut dalam ESP. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode studi kasus pada seorang guru bahasa Inggris di sekolah menengah kejuruan. Wawancara, observasi kelas, dan dokumentasi tulisan siswa digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data. Temuan mengungkapkan bahwa guru mempraktikkan umpan balik korektif lisan saat mengajarkan penulisan teks deskripsi produk. Strategi umpan balik korektif lisan yang dipraktikkan oleh guru meliputi koreksi eksplisit, koreksi metalinguistik, dan recast.

How cite this article:

Alfayed, A., Hartiningsih, S., & Hamdani, M. F. (2024). Teacher corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing of English for specific purposes: a case study. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 871–884. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.10128>

Alfayed et al, (2024)

Selain itu, alasan di balik praktik ini didasarkan pada pengalaman mengajar guru dan keyakinan probed. Penelitian ini menyiratkan bahwa guru harus mempertimbangkan faktor-faktor seperti tingkat perkembangan siswa, kebutuhan linguistik, dan perasaan ketika menggunakan umpan balik korektif lisan dalam ESP.

Kata kunci: umpan balik korektif guru, teks deskriptif, penulisan

INTRODUCTION

The demand for vocational education is increasing in Indonesia due to the changing dynamics of the employment market, which is becoming increasingly complex and highly competitive. People realize the importance of specific skills and practical abilities when entering the workplace. There is a significant need for vocational schools to incorporate English for Specific Purposes (ESP) learning in certain fields to enable students to compete in the global market in line with the demands of the 21st-century industry. ESP involves using English in specific areas of knowledge tailored to meet the needs of students in their intended field (J. D. Brown, 2016).

ESP involves more targeted learning goals in particular areas where students must enhance their English proficiency, aligning with their needs and academic disciplines (Masykar, 2019; Caroline et al., 2023). It is tailored to meet the unique needs of learners in specific fields, professions, and tasks. The language used is appropriate to those activities in terms of syntax, vocabulary, discourse, and semantics. It is limited to the particular language skills that need to be acquired.

Writing is a crucial skill in professional settings due to its complex structure and ability to convey deep meaning through language. In ESP learning, writing presents a challenge in organizing ideas into written form and selecting appropriate vocabulary, subject content, and written expression for a given context (Paltridge & Starfield, 2013). In this case, teachers must be able to teach writing skills tailored to the needs of a specific field.

Descriptive text is one of the text genres taught in vocational schools in Indonesia. Its purpose is to describe someone or something based on specific characteristics. In ESP learning, descriptive text must be tailored to meet the needs of students and the learning objectives of the specific domain. For instance, in English, for economics and business purposes, descriptive text is used to describe products that will be sold to customers. In this case, students are expected to write product descriptions using specific expressions (Surani &

Fatoni, 2019), employ persuasive language to entice potential buyers (Kubro & Suyitno, 2019), and utilize dynamic grammar to describe products vividly and engagingly (Huhta et al., 2013).

Due to the numerous features that students consider when writing descriptive texts for economic and business purposes, it is difficult for them to avoid making writing errors. These errors may be influenced by the student's first or second language or their second language development (Isa et al., 2017; Yusnitasari & Suwartono, 2020). To provide effective feedback on these errors, teachers need a strategy. Teachers can provide corrective feedback on students' errors in oral or written form (Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Zhu, 2023) and direct or indirect ways (Ha et al., 2021). It is also essential for teachers to consider the appropriate timing (immediate or delayed) for giving corrective feedback on students' writing errors in a target language.

Several previous studies have investigated how teachers implement corrective feedback in the classroom. Research by Hidayah et al. (2021) revealed that teachers used four types of written corrective feedback (direct, indirect, metalinguistic, and unfocused) in writing classes and provided feedback on all five aspects of writing (grammar, vocabulary, content, mechanics, and organization). However, the distribution of feedback and emphasis on various aspects varied. Elumalai (2019) conducted research that showed a significant improvement in fluency in students' writing skills after receiving direct corrective feedback. Khanlarzadeh and Nemati (2016) found that written corrective feedback can enhance students' grammatical accuracy in writing. Additionally, Sermsook et al. (2017) noted that indirect written feedback can motivate students to self-correct their writing errors.

Meanwhile, research conducted by Nassaji (2015) revealed that oral feedback provided by teachers is more potent in encouraging students' second language acquisition and language learning. Students retain auditory information better than visual information (Sobhani & Tayebipour, 2015). Several other studies have also found that giving explicit or direct feedback is preferred by students over implicit feedback (Ha et al., 2021; Lee, 2013; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016). This type of feedback is more effective in improving students' grammatical accuracy at the beginner level of proficiency (Sermsook et al., 2017; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014).

Alfayed et al, (2024)

It can be concluded that most of the research concerning teachers' corrective feedback is in the EFL or ESL context, especially when dealing with adult learners in higher education or younger learners at secondary schools. There are still a few studies on teachers' corrective feedback in ESP classrooms at vocational schools. Therefore, this study aims to identify how teachers apply corrective feedback in learning to write descriptive texts, especially in describing a product in the Office Management and Business Services department at SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari. Thus, there are two research questions to be proposed in this study:

1. How does the teacher practice corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing?
2. What are the rationales behind the teacher practicing corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing?

METHOD

Design

This study is qualitative research using a case study design. Qualitative research aims to enhance understanding by exploring problems and gaining insight into a central phenomenon. The case study is relevant to this study because it involves a detailed investigation to examine the practice of corrective feedback by the teacher in teaching writing texts that describe a product in the ESP setting and then to explore the rationale behind the teacher's current feedback practice.

Participant

The participant was *Pak* (pseudonym), an English teacher who taught grade 11 in the Office Administration and Business Services Department at SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari. The teacher was selected because he has implemented English for business purposes per the department's learning objectives. He is a novice teacher who has been teaching English for more than a year at the vocational school and has completed the basic ESP teaching training required by the school.

Instrument

The primary instrument utilized in this study was a semi-structured interview protocol comprising five open-ended questions to gather information regarding the participant's

Alfayed et al, (2024)

corrective feedback practices and the rationale behind using the corrective feedback. To ensure the validity of the interview data, classroom observations were conducted to examine the participant's actual practices and behaviors pertinent to the research focus. Additionally, relevant documents, including student work, were analyzed to triangulate findings and comprehensively understand teachers' practices. Finally, member checks were performed with the participant to verify the accuracy and interpretation of the research findings.

Data collecting technique

This study employed **semi-structured interviews** because it allowed the interviewee and the interviewer to express their thoughts and opinions freely. The interview session was conducted on November 16, 2023. The interview session was conducted in Indonesia to avoid language barriers, and then the interview was translated into English. It consisted of two parts. The first part focused on the teacher's practice for implementing corrective feedback in students' descriptive writing about a product, including types and strategies. The second part explored the rationale behind the practice of corrective feedback in the students' writing. However, to verify the interview responses, the researcher observed a class on January 10, 2024, and documented student writing that received corrective feedback from the teacher.

Data analysis technique

The recorded interview data was transcribed and translated into English. The interview texts were then analyzed using the three primary stages model: data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing (Miles et al., 2018). In the data condensation stage, relevant data related to corrective feedback practiced by teachers and the reasons behind the practice were identified and simplified. At the data display stage, the collected data were categorized into meaningful categories, such as teachers' corrective feedback types and strategies and the reasons behind the practices. In the final stage, the categorized data was reported descriptively, and data from classroom observation findings and documentation was triangulated.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Finding

This section presents two relevant issues: the teacher's practice of corrective feedback in teaching writing descriptive texts and the rationale behind giving the current corrective

feedback.

Teacher's practice of corrective feedback

The first research question of this study examined how *Pak* implemented corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing related to the description of a product, including the types and strategies of corrective feedback. The findings were obtained through an analysis of interviews, classroom observations, and documentation of student writing.

Based on the interview with *Pak*, it was mentioned that he chose to give oral corrective feedback in correcting students' descriptive writing when describing a product. He said, "I prefer to use oral feedback to correct *students' descriptive text writing*. *Previously, I have also used written feedback on other teaching materials.*"

The use of oral corrective feedback can be confirmed through classroom observations. *Pak* implemented a series of learning activities. First, he explained the lesson. Then, he asked the students to write a text describing a product. After that, the students read their texts individually to the teacher, who provided oral corrective feedback on errors in their writing. Finally, the students revised their errors immediately.

Pak utilized an explicit correction strategy for students with many grammatical errors when providing oral corrective feedback. This involved directly pointing out the errors and providing corrections, then requesting that the students correct similar errors. Regarding students with few grammar errors, *Pak* used the metalinguistic strategy. Instead of providing the correct form of correction, he provided comments and questions related to the information about the errors made by the students. The following excerpt illustrates the strategy employed by *Pak*:

"I usually point out the errors in the student's writing and provide corrections to the errors. However, I didn't correct all of them; I let the students correct the rest. I sometimes do not correct students' writing errors, but I stimulate them with some questions. This is usually for students who are more proficient and do not produce many errors in writing texts."

During the class observation, it was noted that *Pak* also utilized the recast strategy to provide oral corrective feedback. Specifically, he used this strategy when correcting students' writing ideas about describing the product. He avoided showing students irrelevant writing ideas and implicitly formulated the error before providing relevant facts for students to use in their descriptions.

Alfayed et al, (2024)

"I focus more on correcting students' writing ideas than correcting grammar errors or other features. I think students should be encouraged to write ideas first. Grammar mistakes that are not too fatal can be ignored first."

In the excerpt above, *Pak* believed that any errors made by students in writing should be corrected with feedback. However, he assumed the errors did not need to be corrected immediately. He focused more on the idea of the students writing rather than on grammatical errors. Feedback on grammatical errors is only given on fatal errors, such as tenses and verbs. He focuses on getting students used to writing based on ideas first, then improving the grammar structure in their writing.

The teacher's rationales behind practicing the current corrective feedback

The second research question explores the rationale behind teachers' use of current corrective feedback. The findings were obtained by analyzing the interview with *Pak*. The interview results in the second section revealed two main rationales behind *Pak*'s use of oral corrective feedback: teaching experience and personal beliefs. The first reason is exemplified in the following excerpt:

"So, based on my experience so far, students understand better when given oral feedback. I can use a language that students easily understand. Hmm, students can also directly ask questions if they do not understand what I mean..."

In the excerpt above, *Pak* emphasizes his practice of oral corrective feedback based on his experience teaching for over a year. He believes using easily understood language in oral feedback helps students comprehend the material better. Additionally, students can ask for clarification directly.

Pak stated that he had utilized written corrective feedback but faced challenges with student engagement and comprehension. Specifically, students did not consistently read or understand the meaning of the feedback provided, leading to misunderstandings. The following excerpt describes *Pak*'s experience:

"...I used to use written feedback too. The problem is that students sometimes do not read what I write, do not understand what I write, and sometimes even misunderstand what I write. So, I do not think it is effective in my class."

The following excerpt illustrates the second reason based on personal beliefs:

"When teachers give corrective feedback orally, students feel more valued. This is based on my experience when I was at university. When my lecturers corrected my writing, I felt appreciated, and it made me feel motivated and confident. It also made me more open with my lecturers. I can convey my complaints in writing, and my lecturers will provide solutions."

Alfayed et al., (2024)

Pak believes in giving oral corrective feedback when teaching writing and bases this on his experience as a university student. He found that receiving oral correction feedback made him feel more valued by his supervisors and opened a space for discussion. This, in turn, made him more confident and motivated to write. Due to this personal experience, *Pak* was motivated to provide oral corrective feedback to his students in class, creating a space for discussion between him and his students.

Discussion

In providing corrective feedback, teachers not only ensure that students' writing skills improve, but it is also essential to ensure that students identify the nature of their errors. This study aims to identify corrective feedback teachers use in teaching writing texts describing a product in an ESP setting. This study also explores the rationale behind the teacher's current feedback practices.

Based on the interview results, it was found that *Pak* applied oral corrective feedback in teaching text writing. This finding aligns with research by Ahmetovic et al. (2023) and Fadzil et al. (2021) that providing oral feedback can motivate students in second language acquisition and increase their confidence. Research by Eliza et al. (2023) also reported that giving oral feedback can help mediate students' inhibitions in writing and reduce students' hesitation in making writing mistakes (Mariana & Nurhajati, 2017). In contrast, the findings of this study are inconsistent with the research of Hartono et al. (2022), who reported that providing oral corrective feedback caused several psychological problems for students, such as reducing students' self-efficacy and self-confidence and increasing their emotions of anger. However, as Ellis (2008) notes, the effectiveness of corrective feedback can vary depending on factors like the type of feedback, the learner's proficiency level, and the overall classroom context. The results of this study suggest that teachers should consider effective strategies and avoid giving too much oral corrective feedback to overcome these adverse effects.

The research findings also revealed that *Pak* used explicit correction, metalinguistic correction, and recast correction strategies to provide oral corrective feedback to students. *Pak* practiced explicit and metalinguistic correction to address errors in grammatical structures made by students. At the same time, the recast strategy focused on developing students'

Alfayed et al., (2024)

writing ideas. This finding is in line with research conducted by Roothoof & Breeze (2016) and Ha et al. (2021), which stated that students prefer explicit correction and metalinguistic strategies and have a positive impact on improving the grammatical accuracy of novice students (Sermsook et al., 2017; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014). In the same vein, D. Brown (2016) suggested that recast correction is more effective in providing oral corrective feedback than prompts and grammatical errors, based on the findings of his meta-analysis study. In a study conducted by Yüksel et al. (2021), teachers favored recast correction, and there was a correlation between teachers' beliefs and teachers' practices toward recast correction. However, as Sheen (2011) points out, the effectiveness of different feedback types can interact with individual learner characteristics, and what works for one student may not be optimal for another. Therefore, Teachers should use various feedback techniques and adapt their approach based on the needs of their students.

The second finding of this study is related to the rationale behind teachers practicing corrective feedback in teaching writing texts to describe products. The findings revealed that *Pak's* practice was based on two factors, namely his teaching experience and his personal beliefs. From his teaching experience, he knows oral corrective feedback is more effective for his students. The findings align with Soruç et al. (2024) and Hernandez and Reyes-Cruz (2012), who reported that teachers' teaching experience contributed to their decision to use oral corrective feedback on student errors.

Meanwhile, *Pak believed* students would feel more valued when the teacher gave oral corrections. This finding aligns with what Borg (2019) revealed: teachers' theories and personal beliefs influence teachers' practices, especially in language learning. The findings of Soruç et al. (2024) also confirm that teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback is not only based on errors made by students but is done deliberately based on the belief and principle that students need such oral feedback.

However, several previous studies have suggested that the reasons why teachers choose to give oral corrective feedback are not only based on the two factors mentioned in this study. Other factors also need to be considered; for example, factors related to students (such as students' language development stage, students' linguistic needs, and students' feelings) and contextual factors (learning conditions, types of errors made by students) are the underlying reasons why teachers choose or not to provide oral corrective feedback (Sluman,

Alfayed et al, (2024)

2014). Therefore, future research should include a broader range of variables to understand teachers' decision-making regarding oral corrective feedback comprehensively. This will lead to effective teacher training programs and pedagogical approaches that support optimal language learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND IMPLICATION

Conclusion

This study investigates the teacher's practice of corrective feedback in teaching descriptive texts in a secondary vocational school and his rationale behind this practice. The findings reveal that the teacher primarily utilized oral corrective feedback, employing explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and recasts. The teacher's preference for these techniques was influenced by their teaching experience and personal belief in the value of oral feedback for student motivation and engagement. The findings align with previous research highlighting the positive impact of oral corrective feedback on language acquisition, confidence building, and reduced writing inhibitions. However, the study also underscores the potential negative consequences of excessive or poorly implemented feedback, emphasizing the need for teachers to consider individual learner needs and implement diverse feedback strategies.

Limitation

This research primarily focused on the practices of a single teacher within a specific ESP context, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Further research is needed to explore corrective feedback practices across various ESP settings and teacher demographics. Additionally, the study relied heavily on teacher self-reporting through interviews, which may be subject to bias. Future research could incorporate classroom observations and student perspectives to understand corrective feedback dynamics comprehensively.

Implication

The findings of this study provide insights for teachers to consider various factors when using oral corrective feedback in the ESP environment. These factors include the students' developmental level, students' linguistic needs, and students' feelings. Another factor to consider is the learning context, including the learning conditions and types of errors

Alfayed et al, (2024)

students make. By being aware of these factors, teachers can avoid the potential adverse effects that may result from giving excessive oral corrective feedback.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers would like to sincerely thank the principal and vice principal of SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari for their warm welcome and willingness to grant research permission.

BIO-PROFILE:

Affied Alfayed is a full-time English teacher at a madrasa in Aceh and a regional facilitator of the Professional Development (PD) program for English teachers under the Ministry of Religious Affairs in Aceh. He holds a Bachelor's in English Education from UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh. He is pursuing a Master's in English Language Education at the University of Muhammadiyah Malang through the BIB Kemenag-LPDP Scholarship. Corresponding E-mail: affiedalfayed@madrasah.kemenag.go.id

Sri Hartiningsih is a lecturer at the University of Muhammadiyah Malang. She regularly teaches the ESP course for English Language Education Department postgraduate students. Corresponding E-mail: malangharti2001@yahoo.com

Muhammad Fadhil Hamdani holds a Bachelor's in English Education from Universitas Negeri Malang. He currently teaches English at SMK Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari, Malang. Corresponding E-mail: hamdanifadhil25@gmail.com

REFERENCES

- Ahmetovic, E., Becirovic, S., Dubravac, V., & Brdarevic-Celjo, A. (2023). The interplay between corrective feedback, motivation and EFL achievement in middle and high school education. *Journal of Language and Education*, 9(1), 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.17323/JLE.2023.12663>
- Borg, S. (2019). *Language teacher cognition: perspectives and debates*. 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_59-1
- Brown, D. (2016). The type and linguistic foci of oral corrective feedback in the L2 classroom: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 436–458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814563200>
- Brown, J. D. (2016). *Introducing needs analysis and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Eliza, F., Sugirin, S., Triastuti, A., & Meutia, P. D. (2023). Strategi umpan balik langsung terhadap mahasiswa: potret pada kelas menulis bahasa asing. *Wahana Literasi: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.59562/wl.v3i1.50455>
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Elumalai, K. V. (2019). Teacher constructed corrective feedback enhancing students' writing skills in EFL classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(5), 103. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.5p.103>
- Fadzil, I. M., Ehsan, N., & Said, M. (2021). Exploring ESL teachers' insights on corrective oral feedback in a Malaysian secondary education context. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(9), 504–512. <https://doi.org/10.47405/MJSSH.V6I9.993>
- Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HELIYON.2021.E07550>
- Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The impacts of teacher's oral corrective feedback to students' psychological domain: A study on EFL speech production. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619>
- Hernandez, E., & Reyes-Cruz, M. D. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14, 63–75.
- Hidayah, N., Suparno, S., & Haryati, S. (2021). EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in using teacher written corrective feedback on students' writing. *English Education Journal*, 10(1), 1–12.

Alfayed et al., (2024)

- Huhta, M., Vogt, K., Johnson, E., & Tulkki, H. (2013). *Needs analysis for language course design: a holistic approach to ESP* (M. Huhta, K. Vogt, E. Johnson, H. Tulkki, & D. R. Hall, Eds.). Cambridge University Press (CUP).
- Isa, Q. N. M., Risdaneva, R., & Alfayed, A. (2017). An analysis of Acehnese EFL students' grammatical errors in writing recount texts. *Englisia Journal*, 5(1), 41.
<https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v5i1.2301>
- Khanlarzadeh, M., & Nemati, M. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of EFL students: An improvement over previous unfocused designs Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 55–68. www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr
- Kim, Y., & Mostafa, T. (2021). Teachers' and students' beliefs and perspectives about corrective feedback. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 561–580.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.027>
- Kubro, R. A., & Suyitno, I. (2019). Persuasive language in advertisement discourses (business advertorial analysis). *ISLLAC: Journal of Intensive Studies on Language, Literature, Art, and Culture*, 3(2), 296–304. <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jisllac>
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000390>
- Mariana, L., & Nurhajati, D. (2017). Corrective feedback to improve students writing ability. *Journal of Development Research*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v1i2.24>
- Masykar, T. (2019). Analisa kebutuhan English for Specific Purpose untuk pendidikan vokasi. *VOCATECH: Vocational Education and Technology Journal*, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.38038/vocatech.v1i0.9>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2018). *Qualitative data analysis: a method sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publication.
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *The Interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: linking theory, research, and practice*. Bloomsbury.
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855>
- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The impact of teacher corrective feedback on EFL student writers' grammatical improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), p43–p43. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ELT.V10N10P43>

Alfayed et al, (2024)

- Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and Second Language Learning* (Vol. 13). Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0548-7>
- Sluman, F. (2014). *A study into the factors influencing teacher and student perceptions of corrective feedback in the EFL classroom* [Master's Thesis]. University of Southampton.
- Sobhani, M., & Tayebipour, F. (2015). The effects of oral vs. written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' essay writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1601. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.09>
- Soruç, A., Yuksel, D., McKinley, J., & Grimshaw, T. (2024). Factors influencing EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback: the role of teaching experience. *Language Learning Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2338346>
- Surani, D., & Fatoni, A. U. (2019). Students' strategy in describing a product: the case of ESP writing. *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v13i01>
- Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (United Kingdom)*, 31(3), 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/IJAL.12336>
- Zhu, H. (2023). Measures for instructors to provide corrective feedback in L2 writing classes in high school. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(10), 634–639. <https://doi.org/10.4236/JSS.2023.1110036>
- Zohrabi, K., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit and explicit corrective feedback in Persian-speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2018–2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.637>