



Teacher Corrective Feedback VS Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) in Improving EFL Students' Writing Performance

¹Puan Tursina*, ²Henny Susanty; ³Zuhri Efendi,

^{1,2,3}English Education Department, STKIP Muhammadiyah Aceh Barat
Daya, Susoh, Indonesia*

Email: forlangncyu12@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to explore the students' preference toward teacher's feedback with different proficiency levels, to describe the most students' preference in receiving feedback between teacher written feedback and CEWI at different proficiency levels and to figure out the strengths and weaknesses between teacher corrective feedback and CEWI. A qualitative design was chosen to conduct the study. 16 students from department of English education at STKIP Muhammadiyah Aceh Barat Daya in Aceh, Indonesia, were involved in this study. The participants were assigned into two different groups; high proficient students and risk proficient students after receiving the treatments. Students' essays and semi-structured interviewed were used to collect the data. Data from the interview were coded and classified in a word processor by using NVivo 12 to get the conclusion. The findings showed that (1) all of them had a positive attitude toward the feedbacks because it helped them to improve their writing performance, (2) No matter high proficient students or risk proficient students assumed that most of them preferred teacher corrective feedback to Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI). Also, more than 10 students preferred to receive indirect feedback to direct feedback. In addition, teacher corrective feedback could check both global and local errors made by students meanwhile CEWI only focused on the local errors and (3) The strength of teacher corrective feedback was able to ask for the clarification directly and it provided the suggestions for both errors. While, CEWI provided the valuable feedback instantly in their writing. On the other hand, the weakness of teacher corrective feedback was spending a lot of time, while CEWI was only focused on local error and was not able to discuss. In conclusion, a teacher must be able in choosing and providing the appropriate feedback

to students. A lot of things must be taken as his or her consideration so the feedback might assist and functional to students' writing skill. In addition, both of feedback could give students benefit but a teacher's role is the most important aspect needed by students to help them improving their writing.

Keywords: Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI); Global Errors; Local Errors; Teacher's Feedback; Writing

A. Introduction

Some English as Second language (ESL) students or English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students who are studying a new language, somehow feel uneasy, shy or insecure when others including their teachers or peers recognize or notice she or he made some errors in learning or acquiring a language (Seifried & Wuttke, 2010). Moreover, if their teachers are a lit bit strict, unfriendly and do not support them in providing feedback to motivate them and let them know that it is tolerable to make errors then students will be easily be passive. They do not want to practice the language because they are afraid to make errors. Krashen (1978) emphasized it is impossible not to make errors when someone learns a language so he suggests teachers to correct students' errors based on students' needs.

Writing as one of the important and hardest skills learnt by students really needs attention a lot from teachers (Ahmadi, Maftoon, & Mehdrard, 2012; & Tursina & Chuang, 2016). However, there are some considerations that they have to stress on, namely, types of feedback; indirect feedback is defined as underlines or circles on the students' errors without providing the correct answers (Ferris, 2002). Meanwhile, direct feedback occurred when the teacher informed the students' the correct answers of the students' errors directly on their writing (Hendrickson, 1984), students' proficiency levels, types of error; local errors means the errors made by students in terms of spelling, grammar and vocabulary while global errors can be described as the errors made by students in terms of content and organization (Ferris, 2002). And most importantly, the teachers should spare his/her time availability. Appropriate feedback can only be chosen if teachers have ample time to create and provide feedbacks. Otherwise, it will not be useful for students.

Regarding to the types of feedback, some scholars assumed that teacher corrective feedback is very helpful (Farrokhi & Sattapour, 2011) to improve students' writing skill (Van, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012). Besides, they believed that providing indirect corrective feedback to students is more acceptable in stimulating their cognitive ability because they are given the time to correct and find the errors by themselves (Westmacott, 2017). However, some scholars disagree They described that providing direct corrective feedback to students are more appropriate because not all of the students are able to solve the problems by themselves, it does not spend a lot of time and could help them feel easy to revise their errors (Guénette & Lyster, 2013). Also, some experts argued that those types of feedback might work well. If teachers are able to identify and recognize their students' proficiency levels, they will be able to select the best one for their students because every student has his or her unique ways and preference in learning a language. The following issue must be

investigated in providing the feedback is the types of errors. Should teachers correct both local such as grammar and global errors such as content and organization made by students at the same time? Or should teachers focus only on one error such as grammar or content or organization of the essay of students' writing? Those questions have been debated for many years (Tursina & Chuang, 2016) and they revealed that errors might be provided depend on the students' needs and students' goals. For example, when students write a narrative essay, then the teacher might focus on past simple tense as the local error, then focus on the content of the essay or focus on both errors at the same time.

Since the pandemic of covid-19 has been spread over the world, teachers have to change and create other strategies in providing feedback to students. Online distance learning is required to be implemented in many countries including, Aceh, Indonesia (Ministry of Education & Culture, Indonesia, 2020). Another problem appeared, teachers' time, therefore to solve the problem. Many applications which provide automated feedback created and used by teachers in writing class. As stated by Luo and Liu (2017), they figured out that automated feedback could help the students to improve their writing performance specifically on the global errors. Cheng (2017) added that the students who received online automated feedback enhanced their performance better than students who did not use it. Regarding to the previous explanations, it can be explained that both teacher corrective feedback and automated feedback could help students in improving their writing performance. However, it did not explain clearly how each type of feedback could give contributions in terms of errors and students' proficiency level. Also, there is no research which describes the function of Cambridge English Write and Improve to improve the students' writing. Therefore, this study was designed to answer the gap in the EFL research through the following research questions:

1. What are the students' perception toward teacher corrective feedback and CEWI at different proficiency levels?
2. What is the most students' preference in receiving feedback towards teacher corrective feedback and CEWI at different proficiency levels?
3. What are the strengths and weaknesses between teacher corrective feedback and CEWI?

The Sociocultural Theory

This theory is likely to be explained as the relation between a social and cultural phenomenon and cognitive development which implies the interactions between individuals and their environment specifically historical context (Wertsch, 1985). Also, it can be reflected by from indirect

interaction from tools and sign in which people manage their behaviour from two directions; outside, it can be connected by the signs while the mind can be regarded as the inside direction and through those direction the internalization of meaning can be reached (Vygotsky, 1978).

Also, Vygotsky (1978) introduced the concept of the ability of students in accepting and challenging themselves to be independent in solving their problems by getting an aid from adult's guidance or their classmates who have the high performance to go to the next level. In other words, the ability of students to change their capability from low level to high level in understanding or using rules or things could be affected by their surroundings. In this study, teacher's feedback and CEWI's feedback were pointed as the guidance to help them to improve students' ability in writing.

Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI)

Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) is a free service for learners of English to practice their written English. In addition, CEWI is a free online tool helps learners to practice their writing and get valuable feedback instantly. It is simple to use, just choose a task, write or upload a written response and use the feedback to quickly improve. The score is aligned to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and also shows them how to improve their spelling, grammar and vocabulary. There are some steps to practice your writing for Free namely choose a topic or create your own, find out how to improve your grade and understand your progress and keep improving. Lastly, CEWI provides two types of feedback, firstly; compliment which means CEWI gives positive motivation such as "Very Good, Nice, Good work, etc. Secondly; providing the level number namely, 1 till 5, number one represents the lowest level of students' revision while number five describes the highest level of students' revision or essay. On the other words, 1 can be described as the poor category while 5 can be described as the best category of students' performances.

B. Method

A qualitative design was used to address the research questions in this study. As stated by Creswell (2012, p. 181), "qualitative research has multiple methods that are interactive and humanistic. The methods of data collection are growing, and they increasingly involve active participation by participants and sensitivity to the participants in the study. The researchers applied two different types of feedback; teacher corrective feedback and Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) feedback.

In total, participants of this study were English Education department students at STKIP Muhammadiyah Aceh Barat Daya from different classes;

beginner, junior, sophomore, and senior students. 3 were male students and 13 were female students with an average age of 18 and 21. All of the students were taking the writing course at that time.

The instruments used in this study were students' essays and semi-structured interviewed with consisted of eight questions adopted from the previous study (Tursina et al., 2019) which was redesigned based on the purposes of the study. Three questions were related to teacher written feedback while five questions were focused on Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI). The interviewed was done through online. The researcher called the participants via whatsapp group application. Every participant took 10-15 minutes to be interviewed and Bahasa was used to make all participants understand the questions well.

All participants took the writing course for one semester. In order to experience two different feedbacks, the students were assigned to write four essays with different topics and they received two different feedbacks; four times teacher written feedbacks and four times Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) feedbacks. After they received those feedbacks, the researcher grouped them into two categorizes; high proficient students and risk proficient students. Finally, each class had four representatives; 2 high proficient students and 2 risk proficient students in which in total 16 students were involved to get interview. Data from the interview were coded and classified in a word processor by using NVivo 12 to get the conclusion.

C. Research Findings

Students' Perception at Different Proficiency Levels toward Teacher Written Feedback and CEWI

Regarding to Table 1 below, it showed that no matter high proficient students or risk proficient students expressed that they preferred to receive feedback in writing course. Because they felt that by receiving the feedback, they know their errors, improve their writing performance by revising their drafts. Also, four of high proficient students stated that they improved their knowledge after revising their last draft. Meanwhile, no one from the risk proficient students who had the same feeling that receiving feedback might improve their knowledge. To sum up, all of them had a positive attitude toward the feedbacks because it helped them to improve their writing performance (Ferris, 2002; Hyland, 1998).

Table 1. Students' Opinion of the Feedbacks

Opinions	Proficiency Levels			
	(n)	High Students	Proficient	(n) Risk Students Proficient
Know the errors	8	I know my errors and know how to make my writing became better. (RK)	8	I know my errors and I have to be careful in writing the next essay (NS)
Improve Writing	8	After receiving the feedback, I know how to write my essay well and improve my writing (SD)	8	By receiving the feedback, I felt that I can improve my writing. (YZ)
Revise draft	1	Receiving the feedbacks, gave me chances to revise my draft better and better (NA)	1	I like to receive the feedbacks because I can re-write my essay became better than the previous one. (MU)
Improve knowledge	4	By receiving the feedback, I recalled my knowledge or sometimes, I learnt a new thing (RR)	-	-

Note: RK, NS, SD, YZ, NA, MU, & RR are the initial names of participants.

The Most Students' Preference in Receiving Feedback between Teacher Written Feedback and CEWI at Different Proficiency Levels

To answer the second research question, the researcher tried to summarized the data based on three issues; (1) their preference and reasons, (2) types of teacher written feedback, and (3) types of errors. As it can be seen on Table 2. The first issue is about students' preference toward teacher written feedback and CEWI. Three of the high proficient students mentioned that they enjoyed to receive two type of different feedbacks because each of them had different advantages such as by receiving teacher corrective feedback, they might ask the unclear suggestions or comments directly even they had to wait for a few days, while CEWI could be received instantly or any time they wanted.

Moreover, five of them emphasized that they preferred teacher written feedback to Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) because they could meet their teachers or tutor to discuss their feedback. On the other hand, seven students from risk proficient students described that they preferred teacher written feedback to CEWI because they could ask the comments given by the teacher or tutor directly when they did not understand but they could not do it with CEWI. Unpredictably, only one risk proficient writer who explained that no matter teacher written feedback or CEWI she wanted to receive it.

Next, the following issue is about types of teacher corrective feedback that they preferred to receive; direct or indirect feedback. Unsurprisingly, all of high proficient students mentioned that they preferred receiving indirect feedback to direct feedback. While only four risk proficient students who preferred to receive indirect feedback to direct corrective feedback. Those students because receiving indirect feedback, they got challenge to think what's the correct words or sentences must be written on their essays. Besides, they believed that it helped them to stimulate their brain to think (Westmacott, 2017) which means they have to try to solve their problem for example, when they saw their essay's paper underlined or circled and provided some questions by the teacher or tutor "what do you mean? Also, it might train themselves to be an independent learner who is not always depended on the teacher or tutors' answer. They could read other references through online resources or discuss with their classmates (Vygotsky, 1978).

Conversely, the rest of four risk proficient students declared that they preferred receiving direct corrective feedback to indirect corrective feedback. They wanted their teachers or tutors directly provided them the correct answer so they did not need to think harder to revise their errors. In addition, they had a thought receiving a correct answer is better than asking them to think by themselves.

In brief, it is good for a teacher or a tutor to let students who had high proficiency find the correct answers by themselves, or just show them a guidance how to revise their draft to be better than previous draft. On the other side, not all of the risk proficient students wanted to label as a lazy student who copied the correct answers given by teachers. Some of them wanted to have a chance to improve their knowledge. Besides, Luo and Liu (2017) emphasized that sociocultural theory takes a part in developing students' thinking. Overall, it is suggested for a teacher or tutor to identify and be aware of his or her students' proficiency so that he or she can provide the suitable feedback for students and be useful for them.

The final issue is about students' perception about types of errors provided by teachers and CEWI. According to the high proficient students, two of them agreed that teacher corrective feedback could provide both

local and global errors (Chen, Nassaji, & Liu, 2016) while two of them thought that most of the time the teacher stressed on the content and the rest of them mentioned that it focused on the local errors. Moreover, the voice of CEWI, most of them assumed that CEWI only focused on the local errors such as spelling and grammar. Two of them expressed that CEWI focused on both errors. Besides, two of them agreed that it only corrected on the global errors.

On the other hand, all of the risk proficient students explained that teacher corrective feedback provided both global and local errors. Meanwhile, only one of them described that CEWI focused on both errors. Five of them believed that CEWI stressed on local errors only and two of them felt that CEWI focused only on global errors.

In conclusion, no matter high proficient students or risk proficient students assumed that most of them preferred teacher corrective feedback to Cambridge English Write and Improve. Also, more than 10 students preferred to receive indirect feedback to direct feedback. In addition, teacher corrective feedback could check both global and local errors made by students meanwhile CEWI only focused on the local errors.

Table 2. The Most Students' Preference in Receiving Feedback between Teacher Corrective Feedback and CEWI at Different Proficiency Levels

1 st Issue	Proficiency Levels					
	(n)	High Students	Proficient	(n)	Risk Students	Proficient
Teacher corrective feedback	5	I can ask the unclear suggestions or comments directly even I had to wait for a few days (HD)		7	I can ask the teacher to explain directly about my errors and what I have to do (HN)	
CEWI	-			-		
Both	3	It depends on my errors. Each of them has its advantages (SH)		1	I like both of them. (YL)	
2 nd Issue	(n)	High Students	Proficient	(n)	Risk Students	Proficient

*Teacher Corrective Feedback VS Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) in Improving
EFL Students' Writing Performance*

Puan Tursina, Henny Susanti, Zuhri Efendi

Direct feedback	-			4	I want the teacher to give me the correct answer because I don't want to think hardly.
Indirect feedback	8	I like when the teacher asked me the questions for the clarification of my essay (SD)		4	I don't like to accept the correct answers all the time, I want to think for the correct ones. (YL)

3 rd Issue	(n)	High Students	Proficient	(n)	Risk Students	Proficient
Teacher Corrective Feedback	-			-		
Global errors	2	In my experience, I think the teacher corrected the content of my essay often. (MR)		-		
Local errors	4	I think, my teacher focused on spelling and grammar. (SH)		-		
Both errors	2	In my opinion, the teacher corrected both of the grammar and the content of my essay. (RK)		8		

CEWI	(n)	High Students	Proficient	(n)	Risk Students	Proficient
Global errors	2	In my experience, CEWI helps me to correct the content of my essay. (RK)		2	I think, it helps me to correct what I wrote to be understood by the readers. (WW)	
Local errors	6	I think CEWI worked to correct my spelling and		5	In my opinion, CEWI doesn't correct my content just focuses on	

	grammar. (DR)		grammar and spelling. (NB)
Both errors	-	1	I think, it helps me to check my grammar and the content of my essay. (EF)

Note: HD, HN, SH, YL, SD, RK, MR, WW, NB & EF are the initial names of participants.

The Strengths and Weaknesses between Teacher Written Feedback and CEWI

Each type of feedback might have the strengths and weaknesses. First, the researcher discussed both the strengths of teacher corrective feedback and CEWI. No matter high proficient students or risk proficient students believed that that teacher written feedback gave them advantages and allowed them to ask for the clarification directly and it provided the suggestions for both local errors and global errors. Meanwhile, CEWI could provide the valuable feedback instantly in their writing, they did not need to wait for long time to receive their feedback and revised it directly. Related to the various of provided by CEWI, most of them preferred to receive compliment feedback to level of feedback in which when they saw the compliment such as Good job, It's a good way to start your essay, Very good, etc than looking at their level such first, second, third, fourth or fifth level after they revised their essay. In addition, they felt that they had a new motivation to revise their draft to be a better draft or essay when they read the compliment comments.

Second, regarding to the weaknesses of teacher corrective feedback, no doubt, all of them mentioned that it was time consuming, they did not like to wait for long time to receive their feedback. While, most of the students thought CEWI had some shortcomings issues; (1) most of the time, it only focused on local error such as spelling, grammar and vocabulary, (2) the unclear comment provided on the global error for example, by underlining or blocking the sentences only without any explanation and (3) it needed internet connection when the students want to practice their essays and receive the feedback and sometimes it was not easy for them to have the internet connection.

To conclude, a teacher must be able in choosing and providing the appropriate feedback to students. A lot of things must be taken as his or

her consideration so the feedback might assist and functional to students' writing skill.

Table 3. The Strengths and Weaknesses of Teacher Corrective Feedback and CEWI

Students' Proficiency level	Types of Feedback	Strengths	Weaknesses
High and Risk Proficient Students	Teacher Corrective Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asking for the clarification Focusing on both global and local errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Taking a lot of time
	Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing valuable feedback instantly Providing two different types of feedback at the same time; compliment by using words and level of the correction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a lot of local errors Providing unclear comment on the global errors Spending money to buy the internet connection

D. Conclusion

Providing feedback is necessary for a teacher to help students to know and notice about the errors made by themselves in writing. Also, it is good to recall the knowledge that have been studied (Krashen, 1987). In addition, no matter high or risk proficient students, they still need feedback to help them improving their writing skill (Tursina & Chuang, 2016; 2019). Moreover, both types of feedback, teacher corrective feedback and Cambridge English Write and Improve (CEWI) could trigger students became an independent learner with the right or appropriate guidance

(Toro & Hurd, 2014). Also, it showed that giving chances to students to have different roles such as readers and reviewer might allow them to improve their knowledge when they discuss their feedback with their classmates and could give motivation as well (Wei, 2015; Luo, 2016). Besides, a teacher must create various actions to provide the feedback to students because students believe that their teacher is the best guidance to help them to correct their errors or motivate them to be able to solve their problems as the function of ZPD concept which insists the students to jump to the next challenge in learning a language. Finally, it can be summarized that how great the technology is, the most essential part who can give a great contribution such as feedback is a teacher (Krashen, 1987).

However, the poor internet connection and the total number of tasks and genre were accepted as the limitation of this study. For the future research, the institution could provide the free internet for students which can be accessed easily and fast. Also, the teacher can give more tasks to let them practice more with different genres of writing.

E. Acknowledgment

This research was supported by Dikti research grant in 2020. Also, thank you so much for Ms. Henny Susanty and Mr. Zuhri Efendi who became the team work of this study and all English students at department of English education, STKIP Muhammadiyah Aceh Barat Daya who gave a lot of contribution in finishing the study.

References

- Ahmadi, D., Maftoon, P., & Mehdrad, A. G. (2012). Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL students' writing. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 46, 2590-2595.
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (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), 1-17.
- Cheng, G. (2017). The impact of online automated feedback on students' reflective Journal writing in an EFL course. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 34, 18-27.
- Farrokhi, F., & Sattapour, S. (2011). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12), 1797-1803.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Guénette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written corrective feedback and its

- challenges for pre-service ESL teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(2), 129-152.
- Krashen, S.D. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. UK: Prentice Hall
- Luo, S. (2016). Implementing scaffolded peer evaluation in MOOC: A Case with EFL writing tasks. *Computer-Assisted Foreign Language Education*, 172, 42-47.
- Luo, Y., & Liu, Y. (2017). Comparison between peer feedback and automated feedback in college English writing: A case study. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 7(4), 197-215.
- Seifried, J., & Wuttke, E. (2010). Students errors: how teachers diagnose and respond to them. *Empirical Research in Vocational Education and Training*, 2(2), 147-162.
- Toro, M. F., & Hurd, S. (2014). A model of factors affecting independent learners' engagement with feedback on language learning tasks. *Distance education*, 35(1), 106-125.
- Tursina, P., & Chuang, M. T. (2016). Direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students' writing performance. *Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC) in conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU) between Sultan Idris Education University and Syiah Kuala University*, 209-214.
- Tursina, P., Chuang, M. T., Susanty, H., Silmawati, S., & Effendi, Z. (2019). EFL students' preference in receiving written corrective feedback. *Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 2(2), 23-32.
- Van, B. C., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1-41.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. London Harvard University Press.
- Wei, M. (2015). An empirical study into effects of feedback on college English writing. *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University*, 22, 43-50.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the Social Formation of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Westmacott, A. (2017). *Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions*. Ikala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 22(1), 1-20.