Beliefs about Feedback Provision in EFL Writing
and Actual Practicesby an Experienced Indonesian Teacher

Muthia Farida

IAHN Tampung Penyang Palangka Raya, Indonesia

muthiafarida@iahntp.ac.id

Abstract

This article reports the research on an experienced Indonesian teacher's beliefs about feedback provision and her actual practices in an EFL writing classroom. Previous work has conducted analyses of teacher beliefs about feedback, but there is a scarce of research focusing on teacher beliefs and practices on feedback provision to experienced EFL teacher, especially in the Indonesian context. Therefore, this case study investigates an experiencdEFL teacher who taught advanced writing courses in one of the leading universities in Indonesia. The data used were qualitative. In order to gain the data, a preliminary interview, observation, and a retrospective interview were carried out, respectively. Samples of the students' work were reviewed as a supplementary. The data analysis was done through data transcription, data reading, data data reduction and categorization, data comparison, data description and interpretation, and finally drawing conclusion. The findings show that the teacher believed that feedback was essential and, thus, she put herself as a major source of feedback for her students. Her beliefs influenced her practices to optimize her feedback provision, including her preferences in terms of modes, types, and sources of feedback. Her professional coursework and experiences played important roles in leading consistency between her beliefs and practices. For future teaching practices, it is suggested for teachers to equip themselves with adequate knowledge and skills, and to incorporate various methods to maximize their feedback provision. For future research, it is strongly recommended to use this reflective interview to help capture teacher beliefs behind their actual practices.

Keywords: *Beliefs, feedback provision, experienced Indonesian teacher, EFL writing*

INTRODUCTION

Feedback plays a key role in the development of students' second language (L2) writing. It serves as a way to inform students' writing performance in terms of their strengths and weaknesses (Hyland, 2007; Srichanyachon, 2012). Feedback is also helpful to reinforce students' progress. This is because through feedback the students are able to diagnose their problems in writing (Nation, 2009) and finally improve their writing performance (Kroll, 2001). Indeed, providing feedback to students to improve their writing requires a lot of teachers' efforts. Therefore, as part of their responsibilities, teachers frequently provide feedback to help improve the students' writing. In Indonesian writing classes, where English is a foreign language (EFL) the way in providing feedback is crucial in assisting students' progress in writing. This is because English is taught as a subject, but it is not used as a means of communication by people in common (Cahyono & Widiati, 2011). Therefore, EFL writing is a big challenge for Indonesian students (Harjanto, 2014). Accordingly, students' EFL writing development

depends on the sources of learning close to them. One of the sources of learning for EFL students is teachers' feedback.

A great deal of literature reporting about teacher feedback has uncovered many findings. Teachers are still viewed by students as the only source of authority to provide feedback because they are considered as more knowledgeable than peers or the students per se (Srichanyachon, 2012). Meanwhile, the results of research on the practices of teachers in providing feedback generally showed that feedback given to students was helpful and able to be a platform for the students to revise their writing (Ismail, Maulan, & Hasan, 2008; Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006) though it was still found that teacher had struggle in providing it (Vattøy, 2020). Research studies on types of feedback also have explored the effectiveness of each type of feedback. For example, Ahmadi et al. (2012) found that both indiret and direct feedback improved students' writing performance, but the former was more effective than the latter. However, Kahraman (2013) found that students preferred direct feedback to the indirect one because it reduced their anxiety when revising. It was also reported that different types of comments (statement feedback, question feedback, and imperative feedback) in teachers' written feedback on students' writing resulted in different attitudes to students where statement feedback was the most helpful to students because it was neither unclear and unthreatening(Sotoudehnama & Molavi, 2014). Research focusing on the content (it is also called meaning-focus) revealed that after being provided with feedback focusing on the content, students improved their writing performance (Baghzou, 2011). Moreover, teachers who provided explicit feedback on content and organization could motivate students to re-write their drafts and improve their writing products (Perez et al, 2014).

It is important to note that teacher as an educational practitioner has her/his own beliefs in relations to instructional practices as approved by some educational theorists. Ajzen (1991) with his Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)postulates that the ability of individual to perform actual behavior is affected by beliefs which are interplayed with perception of behavioral control and intention. Teacher beliefs can influence their actions in the classroom (Williams and Burden, 1997), and they have greater influence in terms of lesson planning and teacher decision-making (Pajares, 1992). Borg (in Birello, 2012), an expert in educational psychology, has also mentioned that beliefs function as teacher's guide. In other words, teacher has underlying reasons behind his/her actual practices, and they are perceived as beliefs. As a result, investigating teacher beliefs and practices can give a reflection to teachersso that they can see whether or not thier beliefs have led them to successful teaching.In his Theory of Teacher Cognition, Borg (2003) explains that beliefs are part of teacher cognition interrelated with teacher knowledge and are affected by four factors, including teachers' schooling experiences in learning within schooling and professional coursework factors, contextual factors, and classroom practices. Therefore, teacher beliefs and practices are worthy of further explorations as beliefs are dynamic and personal, and there are many factors that can influence individual teacher to conduct his/her own instruction.

Exploration on teacher beliefs in providing feedback will help understand the way teacher practices feedback provision in classroom.Earlier, Lee (2008) explored the teachers' beliefs and practices about written feedback and showed that there were ten mismatches. However, it was questionable whether it occurred because of the real contextual factors or merely the teacher excuses. Therefore, a qualitative study was

recommended. Junqueira and Payanti (2015) investigated a case study on teachers' written feedback to a novice teacher. The results showed the teacher sometimes failed to practice her beliefs in her classroom. Shulin's (2013) studythat focusedon peer-feedbackrevealed that classroom contexts and teachers' experiences affected the teachers' beliefs and practices. More recent studies focused on examining teacher beliefs and practices about feedback in relation to other dimensions and language skill (Vattøy, 2020) and feedback on students' oral presentation (Wang et al., 2018). Other studies investigated beliefs and practices about feedback of secondary teachers (Gamlem, 2015) and novice EFL tertiary writing teachers (Cheng et al, 2021). Another recent investigation has also been done in EAP setting (Weekly et al, 2022). In Indonesia setting, research on this topic has also been carried out. Previous studies focused on exploring beliefs and practices about written corrective feedback to secondary teachers and showed that teachers had different beliefs (Mulati et al., 2020) while others still could not align their beliefs with their actual practices (Hidayah et al., 2021). Sujarwatiet al (2019) who conducted a study to a novice EFL lecturer at tertiary level also found out that there was still an unconsistency between teacher beliefs and practices. Some of the contributing factors to the different beliefs the teachers had to the inconcruency were academic background, teaching and learning experiences, workload, and student proficiency.

In light of the aforementioned previous literature, this present study attempts to fill in the gap with the setting in Indonesia. Since the existing reports focused on beliefs of secondary and novice tertiary teachers, the researcher believes that it is also important to explore beliefs and practices of an experienced teacher. This is to see what an experienced teacher's believes about feedback and whether or not he or she could articulate his or her beliefs into practices because the experienced teacher would be considered more knowledgeable and has rich experiences that might give different results from that of novice teachers. This present research aims to conduct this further investigation with the following questions:

1. What does the experienced Indonesian teacher believe about her feedback provision in EFL writing?

2. How does the experienced Indonesian EFL teacher actually provide feedback to students in her classroom?

Method

This is an in-depth exploration about beliefs of feedback provision of an experienced Indonesian EFL teacher and how she actually provided feedback in EFL writing classroom. In order to dig up teacher beliefs and find out teacher's actual practices, in-depth interviews as well as thorough observations were required. Thus, this research was qualitative in nature by employing a case-study design in order to get an intensive description about the teacher's beliefs and practices.

It involved a university teacher in the English Department of a university in Malang, Indonesia. The subject, who is a professor in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), has been teaching for more than 30 years when the research was conducted. With the high level of her degree and years of experiences, it indicated she had adequate knowledge and rich experiences in teaching English, especially in teaching EFL writing. Such qualities were required to assure that the subject had rich information to dig up

her beliefs and practices in feedback provision.Since this research explored both the teacher beliefs as well as the actual practices, this research required to carry out investigation on the teacher's class to see her actual practices in providing feedback. The investigation was conducted in this Argumentative Writing class as it was the only writing course she was teaching at that time the research was conducted.

The data for this study were collected through interviews, observation, and document review. Two kinds of interviews were implemented: preliminary and retrospective interviews. The preliminary interview was conducted before the observation. In the interview the teacher was asked several questions to capture her beliefs about feedback provision. Then the observation was implemented to see the actual practices of the teacher in providing feedback in the classroom. It examined the modes in feedback provision by the teacher, the focus of feedback, and the types of feedback. To do this, an observation sheet was used. The observation was conducted in 4 meetings starting at the beginning of students' learning writing process until the process was finished. The second interview was done after the sequence of observations was finished. It was aimed at confirming the results of observation andseeking the reasons behind the teacher's particular actions. The interview questions were unstructured as they were based on the obtained data of observation. Meanwhile, the document review was conducted on the students' work to review the written feedback practice done by the teacher. Hence, a number of samples from the students' writing were collected. Then they were reviewed to find out the focus and types of feedback used in her written feedback.

The data of the study were analyzed to answer the research questions. To answer the first research question regarding the teacher's beliefs about her feedback provision in EFL writing classroom, the results of the preliminary interviews were transcribed and read. Then they were categorized into a number of the teacher's beliefs. To answer the second research question about the teacher's practices in providing feedback, the results of observations and document review on the students'workwere read to see whether the data were already complete and if there was any unclear information regarding the teacher's practices. Then, the restrospectiveinterview results were added to complete the data from the observation and document review. Some irrelevant data were reducedand the rest of data were categorized regarding the types, modes, and sources of feedback. Afterwards, the data of the teacher's beliefs and that of the teacher's practices were compared to analyze the consistency between them. The data were described and interpreted, and finally the conclusions were drawn based on the findings. The results of this research about the teacher's beliefs about feedback and her actual practices are further described in the following section Results and Discussion.

Results and Discussion

Results

Teacher's Stated Beliefs about Feedback Provision

The first data analysis was about the result of preliminary interview. This was to explore the teacher's stated beliefs about feedback provision. As feedback is the integrated part of assessment, the interview questions began with a question leading to her beliefs about the importance of assessment in writing classes. Then the second

question focused on what the teacher believed about how feedback should be given. The teacher's responses on the second question was essential for it was expected that her beliefs regarding the source of feedback could be revealed as the preliminary data. Furthermore, the last question was intended to seek the teacher's beliefs the focus of feedback on students' writing.

The teacher responded to the first question by classifying writing assessment into twofolds: process assessment and product assessment. She believed that both kinds of assessment were essential. On the one hand, she pointed out that process assessment was aimed to improve students' writing ability and assure that they make progress which was implemented during the learning process. On the other hand, she pointed out the purpose of product assessment as a measurement of students' achievement provided in the form of individual writing assignment.

> In this case, I would classify assessment into process (assessment in learning) and product assessment (assessment after learning → measurement of achievement). Both kinds of assessment are very important. The purpose of the first type is to improve the students' ability in writing (to ensure that they make progress) done in the process of learning. It can be in the form of giving feedback either written or spoken feedback, either in pair/group or individual work. The second is for measuring their achievement (formal assessment). It can be in the form of a writing test or writing assignment → individual writing assignment.

Based on the above response, she believed that process assessment could be done through feedback. She explained that feedback provision could be either in written or spoken and either in pair/group or individual work. All in all, it shows that the teacher had adequate knowledge in terms of assessment in writing and she believed that either process assessment or product assessment had its own essential function to implement.

Related to the second question, the teacher's responses had led us to a number of findings. Firstly, she explicitly answered that feedback from teachers was absolutely necessary and the most important one. She viewed teacher's role as the more knowledgeable and experienced person in the classroom that had authority in giving feedback. The statement is shown in the following:

> In my opinion, teacher feedback is indispensible. Peer feedback can be used only for making them involved in sharing for learning but the result is not as good as expected (limited improvement). So, the most important feedback is from the teacher because she is the one who is more knowledgeable and experienced, and thus more skillful and competent in giving feedback for improvement in many different kinds of the component of writing.

Based on this belief too, she became not quite reliant on assessment done by students (peer-feedback or self-directed feedback). In her opinion, such feedback might be beneficial to involve students in sharing for learning but with little contribution. Thus, she believed feedback from teacher was more effective than student feedback.

The last point to analyze is about the focus of feedback in assessing writing based on the writing course being taught. Since she was teaching Argumentative Writing course, the teacher determined a number of components to focus on in assessing argumentative writing. According to her, a good argumentative writing was identified by adequate content development (knowledge), organization of ideas (logical reasoning for support and refuting the opponents' point of view), language use, vocabulary choice, discourse

markers use for coherence, and mechanics. Furthermore, she believed that students who were taking argumentative writing must have advanced writing performance. Therefore, she did not emphasize on the content only but also the form of writing. The overall teacher's stated beliefs can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. The Teacher's Stated Beliefs

The Teacher's Stated Beliefs
Assessment, both proces and product, is important for the improvement and measurement of students' writing ability
Feedback from teacher is indispensible and more effective than student feedback
The focus of feedback should be on the content as well as the form of students' writing

To sum up, this preliminary interview result had already displayed and the teacher's beliefs were highlighted. First, the teacher believed in the importance of conducting assessment in writing classes both in learning process and after learning process. Second, she believed that the source of feedback, which belongs to process assessment, should be mostly from teacher than students. Last, she viewed that it was important to focus feedback on both content and form for assessing her students' writing. Based on the preliminary data, these highlighted points are regarded as the teacher's stated beliefs about feedback provision.

Teacher's Actual Practices and the Reasons Behind the Practices

Through a sequence of classroom observation, the data regarding the teacher's practices was obtained. The observation started at the planning stage of writing, and followed by drafting and revising stages. From the overall result of observation, it can be seen that, indeed, the teacher was the major source of feedback during the writing process. Further, feedback from teacher was analyzed through the modes of providing feedback, the focus of feedback, and the types of feedback. The record of the teacher's actual practices in providing feedback is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The Teacher's Actual Practices in Providing Feedback

Aspects			Meeting 1	Meeting 2	Meeting 3	Meeting 4
Writing Stage(s)			Planning	Drafting	Revising Drafting	Revising
Mode in Providing Feedback	Oral	Content Focus	√	√	√	√
		Form Focus	√	√	√	√
	Written	Content Focus	-	-	√	√
		Form Focus	-	-	√	√
Types of Feedback		Direct	√	√	√	√
		Indirect	√	√	√	√

Table 1 shows that the feedback practices by the teacher appeared in every meeting. The oral feedback was given starting from planning to revising stage while the written feedback was provided in meetings 3 and 4 during drafting and revising. The feedback was also focused on both content and form of writing. Last, the feedback provided was in the form of direct and indirect feedback. The further description is presented in the following sections.

Mode in Providing Feedback

The observation result showed that oral feedback appeared through a dialog approach either in individual conferences or in class conferences. While the students were working on their writing in the planning, drafting, and revising stages, occasionally she visited the students and gave comments on a number of works or asked them to come to her for a consultation. Taken for example, when the students worked in pairs to outline the possible supports for pros and cons of one issue, she approached the pairs and discussed about whether their supports were relevant with the issue they chose as in meeting 1. In meeting2, the teacher assigned the students individually to make a topic sentence of their chosen issue and such conference was again held. In meeting 3 and 4, during drafting and revising the teacher conducted the individual conferences. Not only the teacher who approached the students, but the students were allowed to come to the teacher for consulting their works. So, the dialogs occured in a two-way interaction between the teacher and the students during the individual conferences.

Meanwhile, the class conferences were also implemented. In meeting 2, the teacher picked three samples of the students' prior works and gave comments on their works. In meeting 4, the teacher held a class conference to give summative feedback on the students' last drafts. She showed five common problems found from the students' essay drafts along with the samples and discussed how to revise the samples. It can be

concluded that the oral feedback was given by the teacher in every stage of writing process.

On the other side, written feedback was given by the teacher on the students' writing, too. In her practices, the teacher gave written feedback right after the students submitted their writing and returned them along with her written feedback in the next meetings. During the process of learning, the teacher gave written feedback twice. The first was given on the students' introductory paragraph drafts in meeting 3. Due to the written feedback, the students revised their introduction as well as drafted the complete essay. The second was given on the students' complete essay drafts in meeting 4. After obtaining the written feedback, the students revised their own drafts on the basis of the information found from the feedback.

Further, when being asked why she gave oral feedback in every writing activity, she explained that it was just impossible to merely depend on the written feedback through which it was impractical to explain very clearly what they should revise on, too. She claimed that written feedback would be effective for those who understood her written comments; unfortunately, not all the students could fully understand such feedback and know how to revise it as well. Consequently, she conducted conferences to facilitate her students to clarify and to ask her help on the revision. It can be inferred that she believed that written feedback was used as a guide of the students' revision in their writing, while oral feedback functioned to give clarification and suggestion for refining the students' writing.

In a nutshell, the result showed that both oral and written feedback were provided by the teacher. Oral feedback was given through conferences during the process of learning to mediate her and the students to discuss on the problems in their writing and how to revise them. On the other hand, written feedback was also given to indicate the problems found on the students' writing and to guide them in revising them. All in all, both oral and written feedback was given by the teacher to optimize her feedback provision in the learning process.

Focus of Feedback

Observing the focus of feedback was implemented from the beginning of the students' writing process until finishing writing. Through oral feedback, the teacher focused on both content and form. Starting from the planning stage in meeting 1, the teacher gave her feedback on the content regarding the students' outlines of logical supports for the issues they would write. It was to ensure the relevance between the logical ideas of supports and the topics. In meeting 3, During drafting and revising, the teacher focused her attention on the content as well as the form to assist the students' essay development. In the last interview, she had confirmed that she paid attention to all components of writing, such as the organization or flow of ideas, cohesive devices for coherence, the word choices and language forms, and mechanics. Meanwhile, in delivering her summative feedback, both content and form of writing was also focused on to help the students finish their writing. She discussed the five common errors made by the students in their previous essay drafts: inadequate background in introducing the topic, unsuitable thesis statements, irrelevant conclusion, form-meaning relationship, and citation. The following is the teacher-student interaction occured in the class conference for the summative feedback.

> T   : Look. The topic is about production and sale of cigarette *(read the topic sentence)*. The background is not enough to bring the readers to e... follow your ideas that the production and sale of cigarette should be made illegal.
>
> SS   : ....
>
> T   :The last is about the grammar *(read the sample)*. So this is quite e... ungrammatical. The use of 'that are' is wrong. Can you make it grammatical? *Maksudnya 'yaitu' kan?* (The meaning should be 'namely', shouldn't it?)
>
> Ss   : Yes.
>
> T   : The use of 'yaitu' is not 'that are' in this case.

In the last interview, she was asked to reflect on her practice dealing with this summative feedback practice. She stated that she made a kind of summary of common problems not only on the form, but also on the content which commonly found in most of the students' writing to make them aware of their mistakes. Since she knew that many students made the some mistakes in the area, it saved her time by giving the summative feedback.

The focus of feedback also could be seen in her written feedback. From the samples of the student's drafts, it was seen that the feedback focusing on both content and form existed. Due to the content, the teacher commented on the unclear ideas, the non-existence of refutation, and the relevance of arguments with the topics. Additionally, the feedback informed the students about the errors they made in their writing forms, such as errors in subject-verb agreement, incorrect verb tense, and incorrect paragraphing.

Overall, it shows that both content and form were obtained attention by the teacher. During the conferences, the teacher paid her attention to giving feedback on the content and the form to help them aware of the mistakes they made. Similarly, the focus of feedback in the written feedback was given to both content and form on the students' writing. In other words, comparable attention was provided by the teacher across the focus of feedback that confirmed her belief that feedback should focus not only the content but also the form of writing.

Types of Feedback

The teacher's practices in providing feedback were also investigated from the angle of the directness/indirectness of feedback given on the students' writing. Overall, it was revealed that both direct and indirect feedback appeared in the teacher's practices.

Indirect feedback was more dominant both in oral and written feedback. Through oral feedback, the teacher was likely to give comments in the forms of statements or questions as observed in the conferences she held. She tended to deliver her comments on the students' writing by asking students at first indetifying the problems. Sometimes she informed the students the points to revise and asked them what they needed revise before giving further explanation. The dialogs also occured for clarifying as well as giving suggestions if the students got stuck with their ideas to develop their writing. The following excerpt shows indirect feedback given by the teacher through an individual conference.

> T   : Oh.. 'but i argue' *(read the sentence),* e.. it's not quite suitable directly saying 'but I argue'...

> S   : Mmmm *(nodded his head).*
>
> T   : '...but I argue for two reasons'. It's not really clear you argue what. What is your position? Making it illegal or continuing...?
>
> S   : Continue.
>
> T   : Okay...
>
> S   : 'but I argue that the production and sale of cigarette should continue...'
>
> T   : All right. *Tapi itu harus ngomong dulu kenapa mesti* illegal (but you have to tell the readers why it should continue first).

The above dialog shows the problem that the student encountered on his draft was the development inadequacy of background for introducing the issue. It was obvious that the teacher did not directly give direct correction to revise the student's problem. Instead, she gave suggestion on how to make his introduction adequate and logical.

Similar ways of providing feedback was given in the written feedback. The feedback was available in the forms of statements, questions, underlines,circles, and brackets to indicate the teacher judgments on their writing. For example, the teacher wrote comments about inadequate supports in one supporting paragraph and the irrelevance of conclusion with the thesis statement. Similar to statement comments, questios were given to comment on the content. As seen in one of the students' work, the teacher gave comment questioning 'What is your refutation' referring to unavailability of refutation in the student's arguments on one particular supporting paragraph. Meanwhile, underlining, circling, and brackets were done by the teacher tended to show problems on the writing forms.

Reflecting on her indirect feedback practices, she confirmed that she liked to give indirect feedback to her students to make them think. She believed that if she always gave them the correct answer or direct correction, they would never think and learn. Meanwhile, the reason of why using underlines, circles, and brackets was basically practicality. She preferred to use this way to locate the problems. Although these two ways could indicate problems in the content and the form, there was a tendency that comments were mostly given to show problems in the content while the others were for the errors on the form.

However, the teacher occasionally gave direct feedback in her practices, too. In the class conferences, for example,she also wrote down the revised version of the problems after discussing with the students. She revealed that it would take time to think of how to revise the problems and they might not know the best to revise them. Hence, sometimes it forced her to do such a modelling to give correction by herself. Apart from oral feedback, a number of direct written feedback were also found. The sample of the student's draft in Appendix 3 shows some of the problems were identified with direct feedback. She added the word *made* after the word *be* in *should be illegal* in line 9 and the phrase *in the focus of what?* in line 4. These examples show that direct feedback delivered explicit information to the students regarding the revision. She gave such direct corrections on the students' writing as she argued that sometimes it might be time-consuming to explain the problems, so she chose direct feedback to save the time.

All in all, It has been mentioned that the teacher had her own preferences to give feedback either directly and indirectly. Dealing with providing indirect feedback, the

Beliefs about Feedback Provision in EFL Writing and Actual Practices by an Experienced Indonesian Teacher

teacher believed that it would make the students think and learn the problems and how to revise them. Meanwhile, the teacher believed that providing indirect feedback was also required as it was time-saving when it was complicated to explain the problems. Even though both direct and indirect feedback had its own functions, the more frequently feedback given was indirect feedback as it allowed the students learned from the feedback.

Discussion

After analyzing the teacher's beliefs about feedback provision and describing her actual practices in providing feedback, we come to the discussion which, in this part, highlights the important findings. Despite the similarity of the findings of this present research with that of previous work, a few different results are still found among them. The discussion is further explicated in the following parts.

One interesting fact was found particularly related to the source of feedback. The teacher believed that teacher feedback was more effective than student feedback. Yet, she explicitly suggested her students to have a discussion with their peers to help each other with the revision although without using any feedback guidance. She believed that the students needed to work collaboratively to ease them with the revision. These findings showed two contrasting beliefs held by the teacher and it impacted her practices. She believed that student feedback was less effective; at the same time, she believed that allowing the students to help each other during the revision was helpful. Similar findings were also shown by some previous research that teachers might be eclectic in their strategies used (Khanalizadeh & Allami, 2012; Zheng, 2013) or they might change their practice to adjust the contexts (Shulin, 2013). What we found in our case was that she made her instruction flexible in a way that the two beliefs were still facilitated. She still could mediate her students to have a discussion; simultaneously, the control of feedback was still from her.

In terms of modes in providing feedback, the reseracher had the same interests with other previous research that focused the investigations on oral/written feedback as conducted by Telçeker and Akcan (2003), the effect of both oral and written feedback given by teacher was investigated to see the impacts on students' writing performance. It showed that both written and oral feedback only positively affected the grammar performance but not the content. They claimed that probably one reason why such feedback practices did not successfully help the students' revision on the content was students' lack of writing skills and knowledge on the components of writing. However, in this research we found that particularly in written feedback, what might make the feedback ineffective was that the students could not understand fully the teachers' written feedback by themselves. Thus, the teacher conducted conferences so she could facilitate her students to consult their writing to her to resolve such shortcoming written feedback. This action was in line with what some researchers had suggested (Nicol, 2010; William, 2013) that using a dialog approach could help both teachers and students discuss the feedback more effectively.

In addition, the results of our investigation dealing with the teacher's overall preferences on the modes, the focus and the directness/indirectness of feedback showed that the teacher was flexible in her instructional preferences. She believed that either oral or written feedback had its own strengths and that the focus of feedback should not only be given on the content, but also the form directly or indirectly. Although she

believed that indirect feedback would be more beneficial for students, she still used gave direct feedback when necessary. Despite some researchers found that one kind was preferable than the others (see Baghzou, 2011; Ahmadi et al., 2012; Kahraman, 2013; Williams, 2013; Rahanama et al., 2015), after all teachers are suggested to combine all different kinds of feedback to make their feedback practices more effective (Telçeker & Akcan, 2003; Ahmadi et al., 2012; Pham, 2015). In our case, the teacher successfully incorporated all different kinds of feedback to fit the needs of her teaching.

Finally, we can conclude that the teacher's overall actions done when providing feedback reflected her beliefs about feedback provision. She showed her adequate knowledge about the functions of assessment and feedback as the integral part of assessment in learning process. Thus, she believed feedback as a prominent aspect in assisting the students' writing development. It was reflected in the ways she provided feedback during the observation. It might answer the previous research regarding the incongruency between teachers' beliefs and practices in providing feedback. Meanwhile, a number of research (Ferede et al., 2012; Melketo, 2012; Shulin, 2013; Junqueira & Payanti, 2015) found that lack of practical skills and experiences are the hindrance for teachers to act based on what they believed was true.

Particularly in Indonesian context, the finding revealed by Susanti (2013) show that there is still a common belief in Indonesia that teacher has the authority to provide feedback. This is to declare that teacher's role in providing feedback in Indonesia is very essential. In some research, the differences between teacher beliefs and their actual practices were still found in secondary school teachers (Mulati et al., 2020; Hidayah et al., 2021) and novice tertiary teacher (Sujarwati et al., 2020) in Indonesia, compared to this present research finding where the experienced teacher could accommodate her beliefs into her practices. In this case, we conclude that knowledge and experience mediated the teacher to consistently conduct the feedback practices on the basis of her strong beliefs about feedback provision.

Conclusions

A Number of conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the present research. In terms of the beliefs held by the teacher, it was elicited that she believed that teacher feedback was essential and, hence, she could position herself as the major source of feedback for her students. It could be seen from various techniques she applied to provide her feedback which she did in the students' process of writing. Besides, she incorporated both oral and written as well as direct and indirect feedback in her practices. At the same time, she focused her feedback comprehensively to all components of writing which she believed important to assess. In particular, by asking the teacher to reflect on her practices, this research could reveal that the reasons behind her preferences dealing with such modes, focus, and types of feedback were based on the teacher's beliefs. She believed that all of them had their own functions which could be optimized to help her suit the needs of her class. Based on the findings, it can also be concluded that her professional coursework and experiences led her to be able to optimally articulate her own beliefs into her practices.

On the basis of these research findings, a number of suggestions are offered. First, as a major source of feedback, teachers should equip themselves with adequate knowledge and skills so that they can give optimal feedback to students. Incorporating various ways of providing feedback is also suggested to make their feedback provision practices more

effective. At last, as this research succeeded to guide the teacher to reflect on her practices and to dig up the reasons behind them through a retrospective interview, we recommend the future research investigate the beliefs to use such an interview to capture the beliefs behind one's actions.

References

Ahmadi, D., Maftoon, P., & Mehrdad, A. G. (2012). Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL students' writing. *Precedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 46, 2590-2595. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.529

Ajzen, I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process,* 50: 179-211.

Baghzou, S. (2011). The effects of content feedback on students' writing. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, 51*(2), 169-180.

Birello, M. (2012). Teacher cognition and language teacher education: beliefs and practice. a conversation with simon borg. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature,* 5(2): 88-94. https://raco.cat/index.php/Bellaterra/article/view/253372.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching,* 36(2), 81-109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2011). *The teaching of english as a foreign language in indonesia*. State University of Malang Press.

Cheng, X, Zhang LJ, &Yan Q.(2021).Exploring teacher written feedback in EFL writing classrooms: Beliefs and practices in interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, DOI:10.1177/13621688211057665

Ferede, T., Melese, E., & Tefera, E. (2012). A descriptive survey on teachers' perception of efl writing and their practice of teaching writing: prepatory schools in jumma zone in focus. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science, 8*(1), 29-52.

Gamlem, S.M. (2015) Feedback to support learning: changes in teachers' practice and beliefs. *Teacher Development*, 19(4), 461-482. DOI: 10.1080/13664530.2015.1060254

Harjanto, I. (2014). Teaching EFL academic writing through I-search. *Language Education in Asia,* 5(1), 151-159. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/14/V5/I1/A12/Harjanto.

Hidayah, N., Suparno, &Haryati, S. (2021). EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in using teacher written corrective feedback on students' writing. *English Education Journal,* 10(1), 1-12.https://doi.org/10.20961/ee.v10i1.53294

Hyland, K. (2007). *Genre and second language writing.*Michigan University Press.

Ismail, N., Maulan, S., & Hasan, N. H. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Academic Journal of Social Studies, 8*(1), 45-54.

Junqueira, I., & Payanti, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": a novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27*(1), 19-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.11.001

Kahraman, A. (2013). Affective and cognitive effects of coded teacher feedback on FL writing students. *H. U. Journal of Education, 28*(1), 189-201.

Khanalizadeh, B. & Allami, H. 2012. The impact of teachers' beliefs on efl writing instruction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 2(2): 334-342. DOI:10.4304/tpls.2.2.334-342

Lee, I. (2008). understanding teachers' written feedback practices in hong kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 69-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jlsw.2007.10.001

Mellati, M., Khademi, M., & Shirzadeh, A. (2015). The relationships among sources of teacher pedagogical beliefs, teaching experiences, and student outcomes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 4*(2), 177-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.177

Melketo, T.A. 2012. Exploring tensions between english teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching writing. *International Higher Education Teaching and Learning Association,* 2(2), 98-114.

Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a chinese efl writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(1), 179-200. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004

Mulati, D.F., Nurkamto, J., &Drajati, N.A. (2020). The teachers' beliefs in teacher written corrective feedback on the students' writing. *JOALL,* 5(1), 1-10. http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v5i1.7644

Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading And Writing.* Routledge.

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(5), 50-517. http://dx.doi/10.1080/02602931003786559

Pajares, M.F. 1992. Teachers' beliefs and educational research: clearing up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research,* 62(3): 307-332.

Perez, R. C., Fuentealba, M. M., Barra, M. M. D. L, Rojas, J. S., & Cisternas, M.T. (2014).The impact of explicit feedback on efl high school students engaged in writing tasks. *Profile, 15*(2),149-163.

Pham, T.K.D. (2015). Different forms of corrective feedback and their effects on l2 students' writing accuracy: a case study. *Asian Journal of Educationl Research, 3*(1), 10-17.

Rahanama, M., Rad, N. F., & Razmjoo, S.A. (2015). Why focused feedback? Corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing Accuracy. *International Journal of Review in Life Sciences, 5*(8), 637-643.

Shulin, Y. 2013. EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding Peer Feedback in L2 Writing Classrooms. *Polyglossia, 24*, 74-79. :doi/10.34382/00011524

Sotoudehnama, E., & Molavi, M. (2014). The effect of teachers' written comment types and iranian efl learners' attitudes. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 11*(4), 21-51.

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for l2 learners' writing development. *Silpakon University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 12*(1), 7-17.

Sujarwati, I., Saleh, M., &Fitriati, S.W. (2019). The provision of written corrective feedback on student writing: belief and practice.*International Conference on Science and Education and Technology (ISET 2019).* https://www.atlantis-press.com/proceedings/iset-19/125941404

Susanti, R. (2013). *Students' perceptions towards the effective feedback practices in the large EFL writing class based on participants, gender,and English proficiency level.* Unpublished Masters Thesis. Pennsylvania: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Telçeker, H., & Akcan, S. (2003). The effect of oral and written teacher feedback on students' revisions in a process-oriented efl writing class. *TESL Reporter, 43*(1), 31-49.

Vattøy, K.D. (2020). Teachers' beliefs about feedback practice as related to student self-regulation, self-efficacy, and language skills in teaching English as a foreign language. *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 64(100828). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2019.100828.

Wang, B., Yu, S. & Teo, T. (2018). Experienced efl teachers' beliefs about feedback on student oral presentations. *Asian Journal of Second and Foreign Languange Education,* 3(12), https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0053-3

Weekly, R., Pollard, A., & Macpherson, J. (2022). EAP corrective feedback in an emi setting: student and teacher beliefs. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes,* 101157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101157

William, J. G. (2013). Providing feedback on esl students' written assignments. *The Internet TESL Journal, 19*(10). http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Williams-Feedback.html

Williams, M. & Burden, L.R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivis Approach.*Cambridge University Press.

Yang, Y. C., Chao, Y. J., & Huang, C. (2014). The role of efl teachers beliefs in web-supported writing instruction and feedback practices. *NCUE Journal of Humanities, 9*, 101-122.

Zheng, H. (2013). Teachers' beliefs and practices: a dynamic and complex relationship. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* 41(3), 331-343.