

EXPLORING THE TEACHERS AND LEARNERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ONLINE CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK THROUGH MULTIPLE PLATFORMS

Ris Suliandari

rissuliandari12@gmail.com

English Education Department, Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Ahmad Zamzam

ahmadzamzam@unram.ac.id

English Education Departmen, Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Khusnul Khotimah

khusnul_pena@unram.ac.id

English Education Departmen, Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Abstract

The shift to online learning milieu due to the Covid-19 pandemic has brought some impact in the practices or teaching learning including the nature of writing corrective feedback (WCF) that should also be migrated to online platforms. Although much research has been conducted on the effectiveness of WCF, less has explored student and teacher preferences and perceptions of online corrective feedback through various platforms in student thesis writing in response to this abrupt learning transformation. Lensing from a case study, we recruited two English teachers and fifteen learners non-randomly with a purposive sampling technique. This study used closed-ended questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. In analyzing the data, the researchers used the formulation of Sudijono (2006) for a closed-ended questionnaire and adapted the steps formulated by Creswell (2003) to analysis the interview data. The result showed that there were differences in preferences and perceptions between teachers and learners regarding the use of different types of WCF: direct and indirect feedback. The teachers prefer to use both types of feedback: direct and indirect feedback. Meanwhile, learners preferred direct corrective feedback. Thus, some pedagogical contribution is also discussed, accordingly.

Keywords: *Direct and Indirect feedback, Multiple Platforms, Perception*

Sari

Pergeseran ke lingkungan belajar online akibat pandemi Covid-19 telah membawa beberapa dampak dalam praktik atau pembelajaran termasuk sifat menulis umpan balik

korektif (WCF) yang juga harus dimigrasikan ke platform online. Meskipun banyak penelitian telah dilakukan tentang keefektifan WCF, lebih sedikit yang mengeksplorasi preferensi dan persepsi siswa dan guru tentang umpan balik korektif online melalui berbagai platform dalam penulisan tesis siswa dalam menanggapi transformasi pembelajaran yang tiba-tiba ini. Lensing dari studi kasus, kami merekrut dua guru bahasa Inggris dan lima belas pelajar secara non-acak dengan teknik purposive sampling. Penelitian ini menggunakan kuesioner tertutup dan wawancara semi terstruktur. Dalam menganalisis data, peneliti menggunakan rumusan Sudijono (2006) untuk kuesioner tertutup dan mengadaptasi langkah-langkah yang dirumuskan oleh Creswell (2003) untuk menganalisis data wawancara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan preferensi dan persepsi antara guru dan peserta didik mengenai penggunaan jenis WCF yang berbeda: umpan balik langsung dan tidak langsung. Para guru lebih suka menggunakan kedua jenis umpan balik: umpan balik langsung dan tidak langsung. Sementara itu, pembelajar lebih menyukai umpan balik korektif langsung. Dengan demikian, beberapa kontribusi pedagogis juga dibahas..

Kata kunci: *Umpan balik langsung dan tidak langsung, Berbagai Platform, Persepsi*

Received 2021-09-28

accepted 2021-11-22

published 2022-01-31

APA Citation: Suliandari. S., Zamzam, A., & Khotimah. K. (2021). Exploring the Teachers and Learners' Perceptions of Online Corrective Feedback Through Multiple Platforms. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, 5(1), pp. 53-70 <http://dx.doi.org/10.33603/rill.v5i1.5855>

Introduction

In the context of higher education, writing a thesis for undergraduates brings some challenges such as organizing ideas, choosing appropriate vocabulary, mechanics and grammatical structure (Rahma, et.al., 2020). Moreover, according to Ellis (2012) writing is a way of expressing ideas, information, knowledge, or experience, as well as comprehending the writing in order to gain knowledge or information. In writing, generally we have the same writing process. As maintained by Lunsford (2010) and Mulyani (2018) there are some steps in the process of writing: exploring the topic, narrowing and researching the related topics, organizing the topic, drafting, reviewing, revising the draft, editing, formatting and proofreading. During the writing process, there are many mistakes or errors in the learners' writing. To reduce the same replication of errors in learners' thesis writing it takes feedback from teachers.

The condition when the teachers and students share a similar perspective on corrective feedback plays a crucial role in the writing process (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990). It can play a crucial role in the writing process because it helps the teachers to indicate errors

and the use of the target language incorrectly (Lightbrown & Spada, 1999: Kirgoz, 2015). Feedback is a main thing that is used as the basis or fundamental elements of the approach to the writing process (Keh, 1990: 294). In general, there are two kinds of corrective feedback that are often used: direct and indirect corrective feedback. Ellis (2008:99) suggests that a method used by teachers to correct learner errors by providing the correct linguistic structure or form. Meanwhile, indirect CF is when the teachers indicate the learners' errors without providing correct form, it can be done by using codes or underlining (Ellis, 2008:100). Direct feedback is more effective than indirect CF for learners with low writing proficiency (Ferris and Roberts, 2000).

During the pandemic Covid-19, most learners who are currently writing thesis will conduct online consultation and the advisors will give online feedback through multiple platforms. Assidiqi and Sumarni (2020) view the platform of a technology program that can support the success of online learning. The example of multiple platforms such as e-mail, google classroom, WhatsApp, zoom, google meet etc. In providing feedback on learners' thesis writing using multiple platforms can be done synchronously and asynchronously learning style. According to Khan (2006) synchronous e-learning is said to be a process of interaction between instructors and learners via a web in real time. Meanwhile, based on (Mayadas, 1997: Shahabadi, 2015) asynchronous e-learning is defined as an interactive learning process that does not have the limitations of time, space and location.

Giving corrective feedback either direct or indirect through multiple platforms caused a different perception between teachers and learners. There are different views and perceptions between learners and teachers regarding the use of different types of written corrective feedback (Widyaningsih, 2018). Differences in perception between teachers and learners can lead to misunderstandings and ineffective learning. (Horwitz, et.al., as cited in Brown, 2009) mismatch of expectations between teachers and learners can have a negative impact on student satisfaction in learning language. It is important to explore the preferences and perception between teachers and learners regarding the use of different types of feedback through multiple platforms. This can have a significant impact on the learning process, particularly in writing (Hattie, 2007). In this vein, the

teachers have awareness and belief that giving feedback can improve learners' writing skills. Likewise, learners will find it helpful and realize their weaknesses and strengths in the process of writing.

Regarding the use of different types of corrective feedback through multiple platforms, a study conducted by Mulyani (2018) found that the supervisor applies the direct and indirect corrective feedback to correct students' errors and the students give the response that both the direct or indirect can influence their progress in writing . Similarly, Babanoğlu, Açam, and Badem (2018) found that both direct and indirect WCF have an effective effect on EFL learners' performance. As maintained by Mainland China by Chen, Nassaji and Liu (2016) students give the positive perceptions towards error correction on WCF. The implementation of online corrective feedback was very helpful in improving students' writing skills Widyaningsih (2018). Receiving online feedback through multiple platforms can encourage students to rethink errors on their paper and revise more (Tuzi, 2004). It is also supported by other studies that have found that students' writing skills improve as a result of their use of online feedback (Guasch et al., 2013). Implementing different types of feedback online can lead to different perceptions between instructors and learners. As claimed by Kalra & Tangkiengsirisin (2016) there is a difference in perceptions between the types of CF. Most students give the positive perceptions on Indirect CF and agree to the application of indirect CF which can help them to minimize errors in writing process (Rahma, et.al., 2020).

Indirect corrective feedback improves the quality of students' writing to be better compared to direct feedback (Jamalinesari, et.al., 2014). The research results from Eslami (2014) found that direct CF gave better results than indirect CF. The different perceptions regarding the use of different types of feedback can create mismatch between the teachers and learners. Therefore, it is fundamentally crucial to explore the teachers and learners' preferences and perceptions in the EFL context. Thus, this study attempts to address this call by seeking for teachers and learners' preferences and perceptions on direct and indirect written corrective feedback on multiple platforms.

Methods

This study used qualitative descriptive in the form of a case study. This study took place in the English Education Program at one of the universities in Mataram. In particular, the researchers recruited two English teachers and fifteen learners non-randomly with a purposive sampling technique. The participants volunteered to take part in this research and they also had the right to decide whether to participate in or withdraw from this research. The teachers who have experience in providing feedback or thesis guidance online and learners who are preparing their thesis by receiving feedback online through multiple platforms are the criteria for recruiting participants by purposive sampling. The teachers' demographic information in this study consisted of two male teachers with an average age of 40-60 years and having a minimum of 5 years teaching experience. While the learners consist of thirteen females and two males with an average age of 21-23 years. To keep personal data from participants, the researchers used the initials L1 and L2 for teachers and the initials for the learners are S1 to S15. Before conducting research to participants, the researchers first send consent letters to ask for permission and get an agreement in carrying out research.

The data were collected using a close-ended questionnaire and semi-structured interview to investigate the teachers' and learners' preferences and perception on direct and indirect written corrective feedback on multiple platforms. The close-ended questionnaire was used and adopted from the related previous study by Mulyani (2018). Close-ended questionnaire is given by distributing google forms links to be accessed by learners. As for teachers, researchers collect data by giving questionnaire sheets directly on campus. The collection of questionnaire data was carried out for one week. The questions asked to participants were about a general overview of feedback through digital platforms, preference of the types of feedback, the benefits and effects of feedback. In this questionnaire the scale to be used is a Likert scale: Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Don't Know (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1). In conducting the interview, it takes about 5-10 minutes per respondent. Meanwhile, research data from interviews were conducted using Indonesian. The purpose of semi-structured interviews is to answer the first research questions, to describe the lecturers and learners' perception on direct and indirect written corrective feedback through digital

platforms. Where, interviews with students were conducted via WhatsApp by sending recorded voice notes from the results of their responses. Interviews with teachers were conducted directly on campus by recording the results of the interviews using mobile phones. Data collection from the interview is carried out for a week with an estimated time of 10-20 minutes per individual interview. While the results of the questionnaire data were analyzed based on the formula of Sudijono (2006), the interview data were analyzed based on Creswell (2003) that there are six steps to data analysis: perusing, exploring the data gathered, coding, classifying, tabulating, interpreting and writing the findings.

Results and Discussion

The data from the questionnaire are presented briefly in the form of tables. The researchers explained the questionnaire data by comparing the results of the responses between teachers and learners. The results of the questionnaire are contained in the following table:

Table 4.1 Teachers Response on the General overview about feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
1.	It is important to provide feedback on the errors of the learners' thesis writing	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
2.	I prefer to provide feedback through multiple platforms	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%

Based on the questionnaire data, it is acquired that the use of corrective feedback has an important role in teaching writing, especially in writing thesis. Table 4.1 shows that both lecturers agreed and strongly agreed that providing corrective feedback on learners' thesis writing is an important role to reduce learners' errors. In addition, the two lecturers also preferred to provide feedback on learners' thesis writing through multiple platforms during the covid-19 pandemic.

Table 4.2 Learners Response on the General overview about feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
1.	I prefer to get feedback from teachers in my thesis writing through digital platforms	6,7%	6,7%	20%	60%	6,7%
2.	I prefer when teachers write the corrections of the errors in my thesis writing	0%	0%	13,3%	33,3%	53,3%

Table 4.2 presents the result that as much as 60% learners agreed if they get feedback from their supervisor on their thesis writing via digital platforms. Then the data showed 53% learners are aware that corrections from lecturers can reduce their errors in thesis writing.

Table 4.3 Teachers Response on the Preference of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
3.	I prefer to underline the learners' errors without correcting it	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
4.	I prefer to writes the correction of the errors in learners thesis writing	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
5.	I prefer to use two type feedback (direct and indirect) to correct learners' errors	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
6.	Direct corrective feedback is effective for learners	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
7.	Indirect corrective feedback is effective for learners	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Table 4.3 is part of the type of corrective feedback preferred by lecturers. It can be seen that 100% of lecturers don't like it if they only underline the errors in the students' thesis writing without providing other corrections. In the next statement, 50% agree and 50% strongly agree that the lecturer prefers to write the correction of the errors in learners' thesis writing. L1 and L2 have the same opinion regarding the use of both types of corrective feedback, both direct and indirect feedback. The lecturers 100% agree if direct feedback is effective to give to the learners and 100% strongly agree if indirect feedback is effective to give to the learners. It means that the two types of feedback, both direct and indirect, are effective feedback to be given to learners. Both types of feedback can help learners improve their writing skills.

Table 4.4 Learners Response on the Preference of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
3.	I prefer when the teachers just underline the errors without correcting it	13,3%	66,7%	6,7%	13,3%	0%
4.	Direct corrective feedback influenced my thesis writing improved better	6,7%	13,3%	6,7%	60%	13,3%
5.	Indirect corrective feedback influenced my thesis writing improved better	13,3%	26,7%	6,7%	33,3%	20%

Table 4.4 is part of the type of corrective feedback preferred by learners. From table 4.4 show that most learners preferred direct corrective feedback over indirect

corrective feedback. The percentage ratio is 60% for direct and 33% for indirect. It can be concluded that lecturers and learners have different preferences on the use of different types of feedback.

Table 4.5 Teachers Response on the Clarity of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
8.	It is important to provide feedback that is clear and easy for the learners to understand	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Tables 4.5 set out the responses of the lecturers to the clarity of the feedback received by the learners. It can be seen that 100% of lecturers strongly agree if they have to give feedback to learners clearly.

Table 4.6 Learners Response on the Clarity of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
6.	The concept of online corrective feedback applied in my thesis is understandable	0%	6,7%	40%	46,7%	6,7%

Tables 4.6 set out the responses of the learners to the clarity of the feedback given by the lecturers. It can be seen that 47% learners also agree if the feedback given by lecturers is understandable. Although some learners feel unclear or do not understand the feedback given. Giving feedback online must be given clearly to avoid misunderstanding between lecturers and learners. So that what is conveyed by lecturers can be understood and accepted by learners.

Table 4.7 Teachers Response on the Assistance of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
9.	Giving feedback through multiple platforms can make it easier to correct learners' errors	0%	%	0%	100%	0%
10.	Providing online feedback is one solution during the Covid-19 pandemic	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%

Tables 4.7 show assistance from using multiple platforms in providing feedback to learners during the covid-19 pandemic. The responses from the two lecturers showed that they 100% agreed that giving feedback online through multiple platforms could make it easier to correct students' thesis writing and be one way of conducting consultations during the covid-19 pandemic. 67% of the learners also have the same

opinion if online feedback through digital platforms can make it easier for them to correct mistakes.

Table 4.8 Learners Response on the Assistance of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
7.	Receiving feedback through digital platforms can make me easier to correct the errors in my thesis writing	0%	0%	20%	66,7%	13,3%
8.	Corrections in the form of comments from teachers can provide more clues for me to make correct revisions	0%	0%	6,7%	66,7%	26,7%

Tables 4.8 show assistance from using multiple platforms in providing feedback to learners during the covid-19 pandemic. The responses from learners that 67% agree if they receiving online feedback from the lecturers can make them easier to correct the errors. Then, 67% learners agree if the lecturers providing more clues can help them to understand the corrections that have been given.

Table 4.9 Teachers Response on the Encouragement of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
11.	There is a significant change in the learners' thesis writing after giving feedback	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
12.	Not only providing feedback, it is also important to provide motivation to learners	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Tables 4.9 is a description of the changes that occur in learners' thesis writing after getting feedback from lecturers. Both lecturers have the same opinion, namely that there is a change in the students' thesis writing after being given feedback either directly or indirectly. To assist learners in improving and completing their thesis writing, it is also important to provide motivation from lecturers. It can be seen from the lecturers' response that 100% strongly agree that providing motivation is an important thing to give.

Table 4.10 Learners Response on the Encouragement of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
9.	The feedback given by the teachers can improve my writing ability	0%	0%	6,7%	66,7%	26,7%
10.	I wish to get more feedback from my teachers to improve my writing	0%	0%	6,7%	40%	53,3%
11.	After getting feedback from	0%	0%	0%	53,3%	46,7%

	the teachers, I do my best revising on my thesis writing					
12.	There is a significant change in my thesis writing after receiving feedback	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%

Tables 4.10 is a description of the changes that occur in learners' thesis writing after getting feedback from lecturers. Responses from learners show that 67% agree that feedback given by the lecturer can improve their writing ability but most of the students also expect to get more feedback from lecturers. The lecturers and learners have the same response if the feedback can help learners to correct their mistakes and make a significant change in their thesis writing.

Table 4.11 Teachers Response on the Negative Effect of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
13.	There is no significant change in the learners' thesis writing after giving feedback	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
14.	The internet connection sometimes is problem	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%

Tables 4.11 show that there is a significant change in students' thesis writing after receiving direct or indirect feedback. It can be seen that 100% of the lecturers gave a strongly disagreed response to the statements that there is no significant change in the learners' thesis writing after giving feedback. It means that there is a change in the learners' writing after receiving feedback. In the next statements the lecturer gave a response if the internet was not a problem in providing online feedback to learners.

Table 4.12 Learners Response on the Negative Effect of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
13.	There is no significant change in my thesis writing after giving feedback	46,7%	46,7%	0%	6,7%	0%
14.	The internet connection sometimes is problem	0%	20%	33,3%	40%	6,7%

Tables 4.12 show that 47% of learners gave statements that they strongly disagree and disagree if there is no significant change in their thesis writing after giving feedback. It means that there is a significant change in their thesis writing after receiving feedback from the lecturers. Then, the learners gave the response if internet connection is

sometimes a problem when doing online consultations. So, in this statement the negative effect is the internet connection which becomes an obstacle for learners.

Table 4.13 Teachers Response on the Positive Effect of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
15.	Corrective feedback online through multiple platforms has a positive effect during the covid-19 pandemic	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%

Tables 1.13 show that there is a positive effect caused by the use of online feedback through multiple platforms. The lecturers 100% agree if corrective feedback online through multiple platforms has a positive effect during the covid-19 pandemic.

Table 4.14 Learners Response on the Positive Effect of the Types Feedback

No	Statements	1 SD	2 D	3 DK	4 A	5 SA
15.	Corrective feedback online through multiple platforms has a positive effect during the covid-19 pandemic	0%	6,7%	6,7%	53,3%	33,3%

Tables 4.14 show that there is a positive effect caused by the use of online feedback through multiple platforms. Most of learners gave responses if corrective feedback online through multiple platforms has a positive effect during the covid-19 pandemic. In addition to minimizing the spread of the virus, online feedback can also simplify the process of giving feedback where lecturers only need to mark errors in the learner's writing by using the track changes menu.

During the interview, it was found that the teachers preferred to use both types of feedback: direct and indirect. They have the perception that not all learners have good inferences and there are various types of errors in learners' thesis writing. In providing feedback online, the teachers use two different types of feedback, both direct and indirect. Direct feedback is usually given to students who don't have good inference power. The types of errors that are usually corrected by the teacher directly are in the form of errors in spelling and language, grammar. Direct corrective feedback is usually given by the teachers on grammatical structure of the learners' writing errors (Bitchener, et al., 2016; Ferris, 2003a). Meanwhile, indirect feedback is more likely to be given if there are errors in the content in the form of cohesiveness and coherence. Indirect corrective feedback is a method commonly used by teachers to correct learners' errors in

context (Ellis, 2008:100). The feedback function influences the categorization of feedback according to function (Delante, 2017). Although there are some learners who do not show significant changes in their thesis writing, corrective feedback helps them to know their weaknesses and strengths in writing. However, during the covid-19 pandemic, the teachers transferred the feedback online through multiple platforms to reduce the spread of the covid-19 virus.

The teachers often provided online guidance asynchronously through WhatsApp where the student thesis writing will be given a correction after a few days from the time of submission. The implementation of online corrective feedback received a positive response from the teachers. This is one of the strategies so that the thesis guidance process can still be carried out even though it is online. (Ken & Hyland, 2006) said that many researchers have been looking for innovations to meet the needs of new types of learners where face-to-face learning is no longer an obstacle to limiting the learning process. It means that the existence of an online consultation minimizes obstacles if face-to-face learning cannot be done directly.

From the interview done with learners, it can conclude that the learners give a different perception from the teachers. Most learners prefer to get direct feedback even though they realize that direct corrective feedback does not have a big effect on writing and makes them passive. As stated by Ferris & Roberts (2000) that the learners' perception of direct feedback given by the instructor will make them passive learners. However, learners have the perception that direct feedback is more time-saving because they no longer need to correct errors in their writing. Then, the learners also provide positive perceptions in the application of online feedback through multiple platforms. Scheeler, McKinnon & Stout (2012) found that the use of online feedback provides a positive effect in the teaching and learning process. However, they hope to get synchronous and asynchronous feedback. This is because there are several corrections given by teachers asynchronously which are not clear and difficult to understand.

The results show that teachers preferred to use both types of corrective feedback: direct and indirect corrective feedback. This is in line with Mulyani's research (2018) that the

supervisor applies the direct and indirect corrective feedback to correct learners' errors. Meanwhile, learners prefer to get direct feedback. This shows that there is a mismatch between teachers and learners in determining the preferred type of feedback. This finding is in accordance with the research results of Chen, Nassaji and Liu (2016) that there is a difference in preference between teachers and students, where students prefer the type of direct feedback compared to indirect.

There are differences in preferences between teachers and learners due to differences in perception. The researchers found that there are different perceptions between teachers and learners on the use of different types of feedback through multiple platforms. This finding is similar to Kalra & Tangkiengsirisin (2016) that there are differences in perceptions of the use of different types of feedback. The teachers have a perception that it is important to provide both types of feedback because there are various types of errors in learners' writing and not all students have good inferences if they are given indirect feedback only. Meanwhile, most learners prefer to be given direct feedback. This is considered if direct is easier than indirect where they can save time because they no longer need to find the right answer for their writing mistakes. This response is in line with Eslami's (2014) research that direct feedback gave better results than indirect feedback. Compared to indirect, it makes learners more active and has more knowledge and progress. As stated by Ferris & Roberts (2001) that the learners' perception of direct feedback given by the instructor will make them passive learners. Westmacott (2017) found that indirect corrective feedback was more useful than direct corrective feedback, believing that indirect feedback could encourage and deepen their cognitive learning.

Providing online feedback through multiple platforms has implications for the continuity of the thesis guidance consultation process for learners during the covid-19 pandemic. According to Assidiqi and Sumarni (2020) multiple platforms can make online learning easier for teachers and learners to correct writing errors and it can support the success of online learning. The implementation of online corrective feedback was very helpful in improving students' writing skills based on Widyaningsih (2018). The implications of differences in perception require teachers to have confidence and awareness that giving feedback has an important role in the students'

writing process. Teachers are advised to provide understanding to students if giving different types of feedback has different purposes in helping them to improve their writing quality and ability. Likewise, students will feel helped and realize their weaknesses and strengths in the writing process.

Conclusion & recommendation

Adapting to conditions where the learning process is transferred online caused by the covid-19 pandemic, in which participants are transferred online by providing online feedback through multiple platforms, both synchronously and asynchronously were employed. This study was in an attempt to investigate the teachers and learners' preferences and the perception of online corrective feedback through multiple platforms. The findings confirmed that teachers prefer to use both types of feedback: direct and indirect feedback. They have a perception that both types of feedback are important to be given because there are different types of errors or errors in learners' thesis writing. Errors in the form of grammar and spelling can be corrected directly and errors in context are corrected indirectly. Meanwhile, the learners prefer to get feedback directly from teachers. They have a perception that direct feedback can save time and they do not need to find the right answer from the errors in their thesis writing. This shows that there is a mismatch between teachers and learners regarding the use of different types of feedback online through multiple platforms.

Considering these differing preferences and perceptions, it is important for teachers and students to have the awareness and belief that applying different types of feedback is great for helping students improve their writing skills. Teachers must provide understanding to students if there are differences in the function of giving different types of feedback. In accordance with the findings which show that learners become passive if only given direct feedback. To make learners become active and think critically in writing, indirect feedback is needed. This will help learners to realize the benefits and importance of direct and indirect feedback given.

In this study, there are weaknesses such as misunderstandings between researchers and learners when collecting data. Data collection for learners was carried out online by

distributing a google form link and interview data obtained via WhatsApp using voice notes. Before taking data, the researcher gave an explanation of this research. However, some learners have difficulty understanding and distinguishing between direct and indirect corrective feedback even though they have received feedback in both ways. This makes some of the data obtained unsatisfactory. It is different when data collection with lecturers is carried out directly (face-to-face) on campus. This does not cause misunderstandings and the resulting data is satisfactory.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the principal participants who voluntarily participated in this research.

References

- Ali Jamalinesari, F. R. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Volume 192, 116-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018>
- Assidiqi, M. H., & Sumarni, W. (2020). Pemanfaatan Platform Digital dalam Pembelajaran Daring di masa Pandemi Covid-19. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pascasarjana UNNES.
- Babanoğlu, M. P., Ağçam, R., & Badem, N. (2018). Explicit and implicit written corrective feedback in higher EFL education: Evidence from Turkey. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 19(3), 104-116.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development* (Vol. 96): Multilingual Matters.
- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46-60.
- Chen et al. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1-5. doi: 10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). *Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports*. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research*

- insights for the classroom (pp. 155-177). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications
- Ellis, R. (2008). *A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types*. *ELT Journal Volume*, 99-100.
- Eslami, E. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 98*, 445-452. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438
- Ferris, D. R., Chaney., S. J., Komura, K., Robert, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000). *Perspective, problem, and practice in treating written error*. In Colloquium Presented at International TESOL Covention, Vancouver.
- Guasch, T., Espasa, A., Alvarez, I. M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2013). Effects of feedback on collaborative writing in an online learning environment. *Distance Education*, 34(3), 324–338. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.835772>
- Hattie, John & Timperley, Helen. (2007). The Power of Feedback. Review of *Educational Research*. 77. 81-112. 10.3102/003465430298487.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. *Feedback in second language writing:* <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation. *ELT Journal Volume Oxford University Press*, 294.
- Khan, B. H. (2006). *Flexible Learning in an Information Society*: Hershey PA17033: Information Science Publishing (August 7, 2006), USA
- Mehdi Mehri Shahabadi, M. U. (2015). Synchronous and Asynchronous e-learning Styles and Academic Performance of e-learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 176*, 129-138. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.453
- Mulyani, A. (2018). *The Study of Advisers' Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on the EFL Students' Final Academic Writing (An Analysis of Teachers' Written Feedback in Writing Among the Grade VIII Students' of SMP Negeri 5 Sleman in the Academic year of 2012/2013)*. S1 thesis UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta

- Nimrod L. Delante (2017): Perceived impact of online written feedback on students' writing and learning: a reflection. *Reflective Practice*. doi: 10.1080/14623943.2017.1351351
- Rahma, E. A., Fitriani, S.S., & Syafitri, R. (2020). Students' perception to the use of indirect corrective feedback in writing recount text. *IJELR: International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, 2(1), 25. Journal Homepage: <http://jurnal.utu.ac.id/IJELR>
- Scheeler, Mary & Mckinnon, Kathleen & Stout, Jonathan. (2012). Effects of Immediate Feedback Delivered via Webcam and Bug-in-Ear Technology on Preservice Teacher Performance. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*. 35. 77-90. 10.1177/0888406411401919.
- Sudijono, A. (2006). *Pengantar statistik pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo
- Tangkiengsirisin, S., & Kalra, R. (2016). Thai Students' Perceptions on the Direct vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: A Thai University Context. *Arab World English Journal*, 7, 161-176.
- Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, 21(2), 217-235.
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 22(1), 17-32
- Widyaningsih, T. L. (2018). An Analysis of Online Corrective Feedback Implementation in Writing Class. *BRIGHT: A Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*.
- Yasemin Kirgoz, R. A. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions on Corrective Feedback in Turkish Primary Schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, Volume 192*, 574-581. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096

Conflict of Interest

There are no potential conflicts of interest that need to be reported.

About authors

Ris Suliandari is a lecturer at the department of English Education in Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. She can be contacted at rissuliandari12@gmail.com

Ahmad Zamzam is a lecturer at the department of English Education in Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. He is available at ahmadzamzam@unram.ac.id

 6057923

Khusnul Khotimah is a Ph.D student and also a lecturer at the department of English Education in Universitas Mataram, West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. She can be reached at khusnul_pena@unram.ac.id

 6140579

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5309-443X>