

MANAGING LEARNING: MISTAKES FEEDBACK ORAL AND WRITTEN WORK

Wisran¹, Dewi Furwana², Andi Husni A. Zainuddin^{3*} & Fauziah Tanjung⁴
^{1,2,3,4} State Islamic Institute of Palopo (IAIN Palopo), Palopo, Indonesia

*andihusni69@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study explores the critical role of mistakes and feedback in the learning process, focusing on the management of student performance in oral and written assessments. Mistakes are considered an inherent part of learning, so this study discusses strategies to effectively assess student performance, provide timely feedback, and create an environment that encourages continuous improvement. The first part of this study highlights that mistakes can be valuable learning opportunities. The study delves into the details of providing feedback in oral tasks, including how to deliver constructive feedback, encourage student reflection, identify areas for improvement, and motivate active participation in the learning process. The next section of the study addresses another crucial aspect of feedback, focusing on written assessments. It emphasizes effective methods to provide feedback to help students refine their writing skills. Additionally, it discusses how feedback can foster a growth mindset, increase resilience, and create a positive learning environment. The conclusion of this study advocates a holistic approach to learning, recognizing the role of mistakes while emphasizing the transformative impact of constructive feedback. By addressing both oral and written components, this study offers insights into effectively managing learning and creating an educational environment that supports continuous growth and improvement.

Keywords: Managing Learning, Mistakes Feedback, Oral Work, Written Work

INTRODUCTION

Learning a new language presents numerous challenges, and students often make errors during this process. Making errors is the most natural thing in the world and is intrinsically linked to being human; it is a necessary part of learning, and teachers should leverage these errors to achieve better results in the classroom (Li & Vuono, 2019). This suggests that teachers of a second language need to be both experienced and adequately qualified to harness these mistakes as learning opportunities (Shadiev & Yang, 2020). Furthermore, teaching English is an extraordinarily complex endeavor. Not everyone proficient in English is equipped to teach it effectively (Solhi & Eğinli, 2020). Therefore, it is crucial for English teachers to enhance their teaching strategies by understanding the learning difficulties and the factors that influence English language acquisition, which can be gleaned from the errors students make. Mistakes tell us more about what children understand about language than the correct things they say (Ahmad, 2011; Getie, 2020).

Despite generally good writing skills, Indonesian EFL students still face significant challenges in various aspects of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (Tarigan et al., 2023). These difficulties stem not only from a limited understanding of writing components and essay structures but also from personal factors such as a lack of writing practice, aversion to writing, writing anxiety, negative perceptions of writing, low motivation, insufficient time during tests, and inadequate instructional methods in the teaching of writing (Supiani et al., 2023). To address these issues, it is essential for improvements in teaching writing to be a collaborative effort involving both students and lecturers, aimed at overcoming the students' specific challenges and enhancing their writing skills (Toba et al., 2019).

On the other hand, the oral abilities of Indonesian students in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts have been the focus of numerous studies. These students often find oral presentations beneficial for enhancing their English and academic skills. Their speaking abilities are commonly evaluated through presentations in university-level courses (Purwandari, 2023). Moreover, Indonesian EFL students consider the ability to communicate in English one of the most challenging skills to master (Sari et al., 2021). These observations underscore the need to focus on and improve the oral communication skills of Indonesian students in EFL settings.

METHODS

The research method employed in this study is a literature review, which was selected to systematically explore and analyze existing scholarly works, studies, and theoretical frameworks (Snyder, 2019). This method focuses particularly on the effective management of learning processes, emphasizing how mistakes are addressed and feedback is provided in both oral and written assessments. By critically examining a broad spectrum of academic sources, this research aims to synthesize and evaluate the prevailing state of knowledge, identify predominant themes, and derive valuable insights into the best practices for managing learning through strategic handling of mistakes and feedback. The literature review facilitates a comprehensive examination of diverse perspectives, theoretical underpinnings, and empirical findings. This approach contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the topic and helps inform practical applications for educators and learners alike.

RESULTS

Mistakes and Feedback

The literature review reveals several intriguing findings about why students continue to make the same mistakes despite repeated corrections. These mistakes categorized into three types: 'slips', which students can correct themselves once pointed out; 'errors', which they cannot correct without further explanation; and 'attempts', where students try to express something but lack the correct method. Particularly challenging for teachers are 'errors', as these reflect a deeper misunderstanding and 'attempts' which can offer insights into a student's current linguistic understanding and provide opportunities for targeted instruction.

Two primary sources of errors have been identified: 'interference' from the student's first language, and 'developmental errors' common in language acquisition. 'Interference' occurs as students apply rules or sounds from their native language to English, leading to specific errors depending on their linguistic background. For example, Arabic speakers may confuse certain phonemes, while French students might struggle with grammatical constructions like the present perfect due to differences in time expression in their native language. 'Developmental errors' resemble those seen in child language development, where learners over-generalize language rules, such as applying incorrect past tense forms like "goed" instead of "went."

To effectively eradicate these mistakes, the research proposes three necessary conditions: the student's desire or need to correct the mistake, awareness of the mistake through some form of feedback, and opportunities for repeated practice in real-world conditions. This approach suggests that mistake correction is not just about pointing out errors but also about motivating students, providing clear and constructive feedback, and allowing ample practice in contextually meaningful settings.

Feedback During Oral Work

The research emphasizes that feedback should be specifically tailored to the actions of the individual rather than their personal characteristics to foster effective learning. Such personalized feedback helps learners recognize the consequences of their actions, making it more likely for them to adopt changes. For example, when learners are provided with specific oral feedback on the correct pronunciation of words, they not only learn the accurate pronunciation but are also more inclined to use it regularly, understanding its benefits such as adherence to standard pronunciation norms like Received Pronunciation. However, it's crucial to moderate the amount of corrective feedback given, as excessive feedback can lead to discouragement and negative outcomes.

Feedback in educational settings is often categorized by its delivery method, oral or written, and its focus, which can either be on accuracy or fluency. Before engaging in the feedback process, it's important for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers to distinguish between the types of errors students typically make. Systematic errors are usually due to incomplete knowledge of the language and require different instructional strategies compared to mistakes, which are often caused by external, non-linguistic factors such as fatigue or distractions.

Four primary forms of corrective feedback used by teachers. Clarification requests prompt students to repeat or reformulate their statements, aiding in clearer understanding. Recasts involve teachers subtly correcting errors by modeling the correct language form during their response. Elicitations encourage learners to correct themselves through strategic questioning that leads them to the correct form. Finally, metalinguistic feedback involves teachers providing explanations that include linguistic terms to clarify why certain forms are incorrect and how to correct them.

The study also considers the emotional and psychological aspects of receiving feedback. Since feedback can often feel like criticism, it may be met with resistance or rejection by learners. The emotional impact of feedback is significantly influenced by how it

is presented and managed. Needs into the feedback process suggests that ensuring basic needs such as physiological safety and social belonging are met can create a supportive learning environment. This foundation allows learners to progress towards higher needs like esteem and self-actualization, promoting a more receptive and proactive engagement with feedback and personal development.

Feedback on Written Work

Responding to student writing is a fundamental aspect of teaching writing, which significantly influences students' learning processes. Effective feedback enables students to refine and develop their writing skills crucially. In educational settings where feedback is not integrated into teaching practices, or where students struggle to comprehend and apply the feedback provided, developing sufficient writing proficiency becomes a formidable challenge. The capacity to access and effectively utilize teacher feedback is thus a critical element of the learning-to-write process. It is in these interactions that students learn to navigate the complexities of written expression and fine-tune their communicative abilities.

The importance of teacher feedback in writing has been extensively documented within both ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) writing research. Particularly in classrooms adopting a process-oriented approach to writing instruction, the role of feedback is profoundly acknowledged by both teachers and students. This process-oriented approach emphasizes continuous revision and refinement of student work, where teacher feedback acts as a pivotal guide. It helps students understand where their writing meets expected standards and where it falls short, providing clear directions for improvement.

Teacher written feedback typically encompasses any comments, questions, or corrections made on students' assignments and can take various forms such as questions, error corrections, praises, suggestions, and criticisms. Research in ESL education has highlighted the utility of teacher feedback as a powerful tool that encourages student revisions and facilitates the learning-to-write process. It is through feedback that teachers communicate the necessary changes and improvements required, making the revision process a central component of writing development.

Prominent educators and researchers have stressed the significance of this practice. The teacher's role as a "feedback provider" as central to the process-oriented approach to teaching writing. Teacher feedback is crucial as it not only identifies students' strengths and weaknesses but also significantly enhances their motivation during the writing process. Echoing this sentiment, Peterson points out that feedback informs students about the reader's reactions, thereby serving as a crucial link between the student writer and the audience. By providing insight into how their writing is perceived, teachers help foster students' development as writers and nurture their confidence, making feedback an indispensable tool in the education of effective communicators.

DISCUSSION

Mistakes and Feedback

The literature review conducted by Julian Edge provides a structured understanding of the recurring mistakes made by students in language learning, categorizing them into 'slips', 'errors', and 'attempts' (Edge & Darling, 1989). Each category represents a different level of cognitive processing and linguistic understanding, demanding tailored instructional responses. 'Slips' are relatively minor and can be self-corrected upon recognition, suggesting a level of knowledge that merely requires cueing (Akhzhbek & Kudaibergenova, 2023). On the other hand, 'errors' signify a deeper lack of understanding and require more substantive instructional intervention, indicating areas where learners have not yet internalized the correct linguistic forms. 'Attempts' highlight the explorative nature of language acquisition, where students try to articulate thoughts without having fully mastered the necessary linguistic structures, providing educators with valuable insights into the learners' developmental stage and potential areas for focused teaching (Edge & Darling, 1989; Juraj, 2024).

The research also identifies two predominant sources of these errors: 'interference' from a student's first language and 'developmental errors' typical of the language learning process. Interference errors occur when students unconsciously apply phonetic, grammatical, or lexical rules from their native language to the new language, which can lead to systematic mistakes depending on their linguistic background (Ratnaningsih & Azizah, 2019; Saeed Al-Sobhi, 2019). For example, the confusion of phonemes by Arabic speakers or the misuse of tense by French speakers illustrates how native language structures can impede the acquisition of English structures. Developmental errors, akin to those observed in child language development, occur when learners apply rules too broadly, evident in over-generalizations like using "goed" instead of "went" (Pasaribu, 2021; Yusuf et al., 2021). These errors are part of the natural learning process but require correction to prevent them from becoming ingrained.

The effective elimination of these mistakes hinges on fulfilling three conditions: students' motivation to change (driven by the need or desire to correct the mistake), their awareness of the error (typically enhanced by specific feedback), and sufficient opportunities for practice in contextually relevant settings. This holistic approach emphasizes not only the correction of mistakes but also the motivational and practical aspects of learning, suggesting that real progress in language proficiency requires more than just the identification of errors—it requires creating an environment where students are encouraged to understand their mistakes and are given ample opportunities to apply corrections in meaningful contexts (Han, 2019; Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019; Reynolds & Kao, 2021). This methodology not only addresses the cognitive aspects of learning but also acknowledges the emotional and practical dimensions, fostering a more comprehensive and effective learning experience (Johnson, 1988; Zhang et al., 2021).

Feedback During Oral Work

The research underscores the critical importance of tailoring feedback to the specific actions of learners rather than their personal characteristics, emphasizing the effectiveness of personalized feedback in facilitating meaningful learning experiences. Such feedback helps learners understand the implications of their actions, thereby increasing their likelihood to make necessary adjustments (Bergmann et al., 1997; Chen et al., 2020). For instance, providing learners with targeted oral feedback on pronunciation not only helps them grasp the correct sounds but also motivates them to consistently apply these corrections in their speech, appreciating benefits such as adherence to standard pronunciation norms like Received Pronunciation (Almusaed et al., 2023; Saine & Santoso, 2024). However, the study cautions against the overuse of corrective feedback, which can be counterproductive, leading to discouragement and adverse educational outcomes.

The methodology of delivering feedback, whether oral or written, and its focus—on either accuracy or fluency—plays a significant role in the educational context, especially for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers. Teachers must be adept at distinguishing between systematic errors, which stem from an incomplete understanding of language structures, and mistakes caused by external factors like fatigue or distractions (Ha et al., 2021; Tricia Hedge, 2000). Lightbown and Spada identify four primary types of corrective feedback: clarification requests, recasts, elicitations, and metalinguistic feedback, each serving a unique purpose in aiding students' comprehension and correction of errors (Spada & Lightbown, 1999). Clarification requests help clarify misunderstandings, recasts provide subtle corrections within the flow of conversation, elicitations probe students towards self-correction, and metalinguistic feedback offers deep insights into language rules (Khanahmadi, 2024; Menyani & Merabti, 2024).

Furthermore, the study delves into the emotional and psychological impacts of receiving feedback, acknowledging that feedback can often be perceived as criticism, which might lead to resistance or outright rejection from students. The emotional response to feedback is significantly shaped by its presentation and management. Integrating principles from Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs into the feedback process can greatly enhance its effectiveness (Ihensekien & Joel, 2023; Spada & Lightbown, 1999). By ensuring that basic physiological and safety needs are met, and fostering a sense of belonging and esteem, educators can create a supportive learning environment that not only facilitates error correction but also promotes personal growth and self-actualization among learners (Alqahtani, 2011; Hassan, 2019). This holistic approach to feedback not only addresses linguistic competencies but also supports the overall developmental needs of students, making the feedback process a powerful tool for educational and personal development.

Feedback on Written Work

Responding to student writing effectively is a cornerstone of teaching in process-oriented writing classrooms, particularly in ESL and EFL contexts (Mack, 2009). The study highlights the indispensable role of teacher feedback in enhancing the learning-to-write process, emphasizing that without adequate feedback, students struggle significantly to develop writing proficiency. Feedback serves as a critical tool for guiding students through

the iterative process of writing, revising, and refining their work (van der Kleij, 2020). In environments where feedback is lacking or not properly utilized, students often fail to make the necessary progress in their writing skills (Fathia Baresh, 2022). This underscores the importance of not only providing feedback but also ensuring that it is accessible and actionable for students.

The nature and implementation of teacher feedback can greatly influence the effectiveness of the learning process. Feedback is defined broadly to include any comments, questions, or corrections teachers provide on student assignments, and it can take many forms from specific corrections and questions to praise and more general suggestions. This versatility allows teachers to address diverse aspects of a student's writing, tailoring their feedback to the individual needs of each student (Eskelinen, 2016; Wihastyanang et al., 2020). Prominent educators like Jeremy Harmer and researchers such as Silver and Lee have noted that effective feedback not only helps correct immediate errors but also plays a crucial role in developing students' overall writing abilities (Harmer, 2015; Silver & Lee, 2007; Zhang et al., 2021). It boosts their motivation, helps identify their strengths and weaknesses, and provides essential insights into how their writing is perceived by others. Peterson's research further supports this by highlighting how feedback informs students about the reader's reactions, thereby building their confidence and helping them understand the impact of their writing. Thus, teacher feedback transcends mere error correction; it is a fundamental component of teaching that fosters deeper learning, encourages self-reflection, and supports students in becoming more competent and confident writers (Peterson & McClay, 2010; Williams & Beam, 2019).

CONCLUSION

This study explores strategies to enhance the learning process by addressing mistakes and optimizing feedback mechanisms in both oral and written assessments. Through an extensive literature review, key themes emerged, highlighting the critical role of specific, timely, and empowering feedback in boosting student performance. The research also emphasizes the importance of fostering a positive attitude towards mistakes, encouraging students to view them as essential learning opportunities. This shift in perspective is vital for students to embrace errors as part of their educational growth rather than setbacks, with effective feedback principles found to be universally applicable across different assessment modes.

The findings of this study provide a nuanced understanding of managing mistakes and delivering effective feedback, offering educators practical insights into best practices for improving learning outcomes. It underscores that a well-crafted feedback mechanism, coupled with a positive learning environment, significantly enhances both oral and written educational experiences. As education continues to evolve, the paper suggests that educators adopt strategies that not only correct errors but also empower students, fostering a culture of continuous improvement and resilience. This approach has the potential to transform educational practices, creating more supportive and enriching learning environments.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, N. (2011). The Nature of Difficulties in Learning English by the students at Secondary School level in Pakistan. *Of Education and Practice (JEP)*, 2(10), 18–24.
- Akhzhibek, B., & Kudaibergenova, M. R. (2023). Ways of Dealing with Pronunciation Errors of EFL Learners in School. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Research*, 3630(April), 29–32.
- Almusaed, A., Almssad, A., Yitmen, I., & Homod, R. Z. (2023). Enhancing Student Engagement: Harnessing “AIED”’s Power in Hybrid Education—A Review Analysis. *Education Sciences*, 13(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13070632>
- Alqahtani, A. A. (2011). EFL Teachers’ Feedback to Oral Errors in EFL Classroom: Teachers’ Perspectives Abdulmuhsen. *Arab World English Journal*, 2(1), 214–232.
- Bergmann, B. A., Rubin, A. R., & Campbell, C. R. (1997). Potential of Paulownia Elongata Trees for Swine Waste Utilization. *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers*, 40(6), 1733–1738. <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.21401>
- Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review. *IEEE Access*, 8, 75264–75278. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510>
- Edge, K. A., & Darling, J. (1989). The Pumping Dynamics of Swash Plate Piston Pumps. *Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement and Control, Transactions of the ASME*, 111(2), 307–312. <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3153051>
- Eskelinen, M. (2016). *Written Essay Feedback Given by a Teacher and As Experienced by Students* (Issue September). University of Jyväskylä.
- Fathia Baresh, E. (2022). Developing Libyan Undergraduates’ Writing Skills Through Reflective Journaling: a Critical Literature Review. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 27–35. <https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v3i1.1835>
- Getie, A. S. (2020). Factors Affecting the Attitudes of Students Towards Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Cogent Education*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1738184>
- 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), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
- Han, Y. (2019). Written Corrective Feedback from an Ecological Perspective: The Interaction between the Context and Individual Learners. *System*, 80, 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.009>
- Harmer, J. (2015). The Practice of English Language Teaching Fifth Edition. *ELT Journal*, 5(1), 1. https://www.scribd.com/embeds/490938777/content?start_page=1&view_mode=sg

ulung&access_key=key-fFexxf7MbzEfWu3HKwf

- Hassan, N. A. A. Al. (2019). Saudi EFL University Instructors' Barriers to Teaching the Speaking Skills: Causes and Solutions. *Arab World English Journal*, 222, 1–53. <https://doi.org/10.24093/aweij/th.222>
- Ihensekien, O. A., & Joel, A. C. (2023). Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theories: Implications for Organizational Performance. *The Romanian Economic Journal*, 85. <https://doi.org/10.24818/rej/2023/85/04>
- Johnson, K. (1988). Mistake Correction. *ELT Journal*, 42(2), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/42.2.89>
- Juraj, J. (2024). *Error Analysis of English Word Order in Written Assignments by EFL BA and Secondary School Students Language as a Foreign Language*, MA Programme BA and secondary school students Supervisor: Tanja Gradečak, Associate Professor. J.J. Strossmayer University in Osijek Faculty.
- Khanahmadi, A. (2024). ESP Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback on Medical Students' Reading Comprehension. *International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes (IAJESP)*, 7(1), 27–43.
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-Five Years of Research on Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What Conditions are Necessary for Effective Teacher Written Feedback for ESL Learners? *Polyglossia*, 16, 33–39. [http://r-cube.ritsumeai.ac.jp/repo/repository/rcube/680/4-polyglossia16_Issues and Dilemmas .pdf](http://r-cube.ritsumeai.ac.jp/repo/repository/rcube/680/4-polyglossia16_Issues_and_Dilemmas.pdf)
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating Written Corrective Feedback: (Mis) Alignment of Teachers' Beliefs and Practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45(November 2018), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Menyani, N., & Merabti, M. (2024). An Investigation of the Impact of Teachers' Corrective Feedback on Students' Spoken Errors: The Case of Moroccan High School Teachers. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 5(2), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v5i2.427>
- Pasaribu, A. N. (2021). A Common Error Analysis in Students' English Narrative Writing. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 4(2), 436–445. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i2.2338>
- Peterson, S. S., & McClay, J. (2010). Assessing and Providing Feedback for Student Writing in Canadian Classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 86–99.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.003>

Purwandari, J. D. (2023). EFL Students' Emotional Responses to Oral Feedback: The Case of Indonesia. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(1), 224–235. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i1.17794>

Ratnaningsih, S., & Azizah, A. (2019). Error Analysis in the Descriptive Text Writing of Vocational High School Students. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 175–186. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1364>

Reynolds, B. L., & Kao, C. W. (2021). The Effects of Digital Game-Based Instruction, Teacher Instruction, and Direct Focused Written Corrective Feedback on the Grammatical Accuracy of English Articles. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(4), 462–482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1617747>

Saeed Al-Sobhi, B. M. (2019). The Nitty-gritty of Language Learners' Errors – Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 7(3), 49. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.7n.3p.49>

Saine, K., & Santoso, S. B. (2024). The Impact of Teacher Competencies, Academic Supervision, and Principal Leadership on Teacher Performance in the Gambia's Government High Schools. *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 15(Iconomics 2023), 100–106. <https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v15i.934>

Sari, Y. A., Septiyana, L., Suhono, S., Anggaira, A. S., & Hasyim, U. A. F. A. (2021). Corrective Feedback in Learning Interaction: Integration of Surface Strategy Taxonomy. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 13(3), 2266–2280. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v13i3.847>

Shadiev, R., & Yang, M. (2020). Review of Studies on Technology-Enhanced Language Learning and Teaching. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(2), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12020524>

Silver & Lee, S. (2007). What Does It Take to Make a Change? Teacher Feedback and Student Revisions RITA SILVER. *Distribution*, 6(1), 25–49.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 333–339.

Solhi, M., & Eginli, I. (2020). The Effect of Recorded Oral Feedback on EFL Learners' Writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.17263/JLLS.712628>

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, First Language Influence, and Developmental Readiness in Second Language Acquisition. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00002>

Supiani, Yansyah, & Basthomi, Y. (2023). Indonesian University Students' Engagement with

Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback in English as an Additional Language Writing Classroom. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 11(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2023.121334>

Tarigan, K. E., Stevani, M., Ginting, F. Y. A., Prayuda, M. S., Sari, D. W., & Lumbanraja, B. (2023). Oral Corrective Feedback and Error Analysis: Indonesian Teachers' Beliefs to Improve Speaking Skill. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p140>

Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The Current Issues of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing Comparison and Contrast Essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73.

Tricia Hedge. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford University Press.

van der Kleij, F. M. (2020). Evaluation of the 'Feedback Engagement Enhancement Tool' to examine and enhance students' engagement with feedback on their writing. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 66(July), 100907. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100907>

Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S. R., Latief, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of Providing Online Teacher and Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 21(2), 178–189. <https://doi.org/10.17718/TOJDE.728157>

Williams, C., & Beam, S. (2019). Technology and Writing: Review of Research. *Computers and Education*, 128, 227–242. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.024>

Yusuf, Y. Q., Mustafa, F., & Iqbal, R. M. (2021). An Inquiry into Grammatical Errors in Writing Committed by High Achieving EFL Students. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 15(2), 1–22.

Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(April), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>