Indonesian English Teachers' Beliefs
on Self-Written Corrective Feedback

Sonny Elfiyanto
（Received. October 3, 2019）

Abstract: The aims of this study are to investigate the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs regarding the use of self-written corrective feedback in teaching English writing, and to know if their beliefs affect their practices in classes. The data were collected through one-on-one semi-structured interviews with eighteen English teachers in senior high schools in Indonesia. They were asked to answer eight questions regarding their beliefs on self-written corrective feedback and the practices in classrooms. The results showed that the Indonesian senior high school English teachers had different ideas concerning the effectiveness of self-written corrective feedback, and their practices tended to vary considerably according to their beliefs and situation. The findings also advise that Indonesian English teachers may not be mindful of the usefulness of self-written corrective feedback for their students. Thus, it is necessary to train Indonesian senior high school English teachers about the implementation of self-written corrective feedback activities in their writing classrooms. Further research should examine the Indonesian senior high school students' beliefs regarding the application of self-WCF in their classes.

Key words: self-written corrective feedback, teachers' beliefs, teaching practices, English writing

1. Introduction

Teaching writing requires instructing learners not only about how to think out the ideas, but also about how to put them into a text that can be read and understood. Still, teaching and learning English writing is one of the most challenging tasks. Indonesia, based on the EF EPI data (2018), is ranked 51st out of 88 countries in the world, and 13th out of 21 countries in Asia. Having average score of 51.58 makes Indonesia belong to the low proficiency band category. Therefore, the government of Indonesia revised its curriculum to improve the ability of senior high school in English, especially in teaching and learning writing. In Indonesian revised senior high school curriculum, English is provided as general English, integrating four language skills in one meeting. For writing itself, the teaching methodology combines the genre-based approach and the process writing approach (Kemendikbud, 2018). These two approaches emphasize the importance of exploring the social and cultural context of the language used in writing and refers to a broad range of strategies that include pre-writing activities. However, many Indonesian teachers believe that teaching writing takes up their time. There are numerous students

in each class, and lack of motivation in learning English is a problem for some of them. Besides, one teacher has to teach English writing for more than five classes every week.

Furthermore, teachers are expected to recognize the responsibility of giving corrective feedback on their students' writing products. Therefore, it requires a strategy on how to provide corrective feedback on the students' writing. Thus, the purpose of this study is to find the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs regarding the use of self-written corrective feedback (self-WCF) in teaching English writing.

Teachers' beliefs can affect their teaching strategy in the classroom. Recent studies on L2 and EFL written corrective feedback have found that students usually cannot assess or check their own writings, even though writing guidance is provided. This is partly because the students have never been in the teachers' position. Therefore, many students are unable to precisely assess their own writing products (Bjork, 1999). As a result, they always rely on their teachers, and the idea of being an autonomous writer cannot be achieved. It seems to be true that it is easier to find mistakes or errors in others' work than in one's own. Therefore, practicing self-WCF can help students' awareness in finding similar problems in their writing.

Self-WCF – the ability to recognize strengths and weaknesses and points for improvement in one's product – has become the focus for some researchers (Boud, 2000; Zimmerman, 2002). Although self-WCF has been studied from various aspects, it is essential to understand the teachers' beliefs, since it can help the students in minimizing their errors.

However, very few studies have been conducted on teachers' beliefs about self-WCF, particularly in EFL and senior high school levels. Thus, there is limited information about the relationship between EFL teachers' attitudes concerning self-WCF and their practices of implementing self-WCF in senior high school classes. In order to fill the gap, the present study attempts to explore Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs concerning the use of self-WCF in teaching English writing.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Self-Written Corrective Feedback in English Writing

Self-WCF, also known as self-correction, self-assessment, and self-verification are primarily concerned with achieving greater accuracy and self-knowledge (Sorrentino & Hewitt, 1984; Trope, 1986).

Traditionally, teachers have provided written corrective feedback on errors to students. However, teachers can share their job with their students by allowing them to check their own writing or giving it to their peers. According to Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005), self-correction is indirect feedback where the teacher provides students with choices that would allow them to notice the correct form by themselves. These authors consider that regardless of the mode – self or peer – it is the teachers who seem to accurately identify the errors, since the teachers usually show the items that should be corrected. Another feature of self-WCF is that it attracts the students' awareness of their errors, encouraging them not only to notice their errors but to revise them. This is an effective approach to become aware of common errors, recognize problem areas to resolve and make the students independent.

2.2 The Advantages of Self-Written Corrective Feedback

Many researchers suggest self-correction as the most effective strategy of corrective feedback (Pishghadam et al., 2011; Ibarrola, 2009). Pishghadam et al. (2011) pointed out that once learners were able to practice self-correction, they already knew the right form or at least had it as an option in their minds. Self-correction was defined by Wanchid (2013, p. 158) as "a strategy according to which students read, analyze, correct, and evaluate their writing by using guided questions or checklists,

both form-focused and meaning-focused." Moreover, this written corrective feedback helps students to concentrate better on their errors and reduce dependence on their teachers, thus fostering students' autonomy and self-decision making (Ancker, 2000).

Some of the advantages of conducting self-correction, are the increased independence of students from the teachers, the students' recognition of their own mistakes, their awareness of their learning process (including strengths and weaknesses), and the time-saving factor (Yang, 2010). Moreover, this approach to corrective feedback helps students concentrate better on their errors and diminishes dependence on the teacher, fostering students' autonomy, and self-decision making (Ancker, 2000). Apart from this independence from the teacher, Pishghadam et al. (2011: 958) include that learners are "given an opportunity to consider and activate their linguistic competence so that they can be active participants."

Furthermore, studies indicate that self-WCF can reduce the number of errors made by the students (Kubota, 2001; Maftoon, Shirazi, and Daftarifard, 2011). Other findings reveal that self-WCF was more effective than teachers' WCF and recasts; it also favored the learners' positive attitude towards the discussion of error correction in the classroom. Fahimi and Rahimi (2015) said that self-assessment instruction encouraged students to plan, revise, and evaluate the progress of their writings. In addition, involvement in self-WCF practices can improve students' metacognitive skills.

In another study, Makino (1993) conducted experimental research with 62 Japanese college students. This study tried to investigate how far the students could correct their own errors with the help of teacher's cues. The result revealed that the students could correct their own errors, even when no hints were provided to indicate the errors.

In sum, the existing studies revealed positive effects of applying self-WCF in classrooms. However, inadequate studies have been conducted to know the teachers' point of view regarding self-WCF, especially in senior high school level. Furthermore, very little research has been conducted on teachers' beliefs and their practices in applying self-WCF in classrooms.

Thus, the present study investigates Indonesian English teachers' beliefs and practices in applying self-WCF in their classroom. It seeks to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs regarding self-written corrective feedback in their classrooms?
2) Do the Indonesian senior high school English teachers apply self-written corrective feedback in their classrooms? If yes, how do they use it?

3. Methods

3.1 Participants

The participants of this study were 18 Indonesian English teachers from various senior high schools in East Java, Indonesia. They were chosen because they voluntarily replied to the announcement from the researcher in the English Teacher Working Group. As the participants lived in different cities from the researcher, they never met each other before the interviews were conducted. All the participants had been teaching English for more than two years, and seven of them have been teaching for more than twenty years. Most of them had completed undergraduate degrees in English Language Education, and two teachers held a master's degree in English Language Education.

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

This study used a qualitative method in order to reveal the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' perceptions concerning the use of self-WCF in their classrooms. These perceptions were developed through prior experiences during their professional careers.

Table 1. Data about the Participants

Categories	Sub-categories	Indonesian teachers (n=18)
Gender	Male	4
	Female	14
Educational Background	Undergraduate	16
	Graduate (MA)	2
Teaching Experience	1−2 years	2
	3−5 years	2
	6−10 years	2
	11−15 years	2
	16−20 years	3
	More than 20 years	7

The data were collected through one-on-one interviews with each participant from March 4 to March 15, 2019. An interview guide was developed to prompt teachers' beliefs about self-WCF, their experiences of implementing self-WCF in classrooms, the reasons for practicing self-WCF or not, along with the effectiveness of self-WCF. The detailed questions used in this study can be seen in Appendix 1.

Interviews with the participants of the study were conducted after school hours. Before an interview began, the researcher notified the interviewee about the selection process and guaranteed confidentiality. These interviews were approximately 45 minutes in length and focused on eight semi-structured interview questions. After the interviews, member checking was applied, in terms of credibility. This technique permitted the participants to evaluate intentions, correct errors, and volunteer additional information. Then, the interview recordings were transcribed; the researcher sent the interview transcriptions to the participants through email. When needed, the participants could make the appropriate corrections to the interview transcripts and reviewed the documents to verify their accuracy.

After transcribing the participants' interviews, the data were analyzed using the interpretational analysis method. While analyzing the data, the researcher asked three senior high school teachers from different provinces who held a master's degree in English Language Teaching to be the auditors. They examined the interview process, the records, and the transcripts. Moreover, they served as consultants during the research process and assisted in developing themes or patterns from the data. Therefore, the researcher and the auditors classified the interview items and the participants' responses to significant research questions and then read the answers multiple times. Based on this extensive reading, it is possible to identify the patterns of the responses. Finally, the researcher and the auditors summarized the participants' beliefs, practices, and reasons based on the primary code data analysis.

4. Results and Discussion

The results of this study are described and interpreted focused on the two research questions for this study.

4.1 Research Question 1: What are the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs regarding self-WCF in their classrooms?

Table 2. The Efficacy of Self-WCF from the Indonesian Senior High School English Teachers' Beliefs

Items	n	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree
The Efficacy of self-WCF in students' writing development	18	15	3	0

The Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs about self-WCF in their classrooms focused on the effectiveness and benefits of self-WCF, and students' competency to use the self-WCF checklist. Their beliefs vary significantly regarding the efficacy of self-WCF and to what extent self-WCF can be useful for the students. Table 1 indicates that most of the participating teachers (15 teachers) think that self-WCF is probably effective and helpful, but there are three teachers (J, L, and M) who are not sure about its usefulness in classes.

For most teachers, self-WCF is useful for their students to raise their awareness of the common errors in their writing, to improve their own writing quality, to stir self-reflection, and to motivate them to write in English. For example, Teacher F responded that "*I think my students need to know the way their teacher sees their writing. Besides, they need to check their writing by themselves first before they hand it to their teacher. Also, the students can examine their writing first, before their teacher or other readers may read, review, appreciate, and comment on their work. So, they consult first to the self-WCF checklist before submitting the writing task.*"

Teacher G said that, "*My students could identify the basic errors in their writings. Moreover, they can recognize their previous mistakes easily and avoid committing similar mistakes. I think this feedback can help students to improve their English writing.*" Also, Teacher D mentioned that "*Self-WCF trains my students to have a critical review on their own work.*"

Three teachers said that they felt unsure whether self-WCF was beneficial for the students' writing achievement. For example, teacher P said that self-WCF is good as long as the students are competent in providing feedback, but she seldom applies it to her students because her students had low levels of English proficiency. Further, it needs more time to train them to be able to do self-WCF. She added that her students seemed to lack motivation in learning English, mainly in writing. Therefore, it is impossible to use self-WCF in her classroom.

4.2 Research Question 2: Do the Indonesian senior high school English teachers apply self-WCF in their classrooms? If yes, how do they apply it?

Table 3. Applying Self-WCF in Their Classrooms

Items	n	Yes	No
Indonesian senior high school English teachers apply self WCF in their classrooms	18	11	7

Table 3 reveals that more than a half of the participants (11 out of 18) have applied self-WCF in their classrooms. However, three out of eleven Indonesian English teachers who apply self WCF stated that they regularly applied self-WCF in their classes. These teachers asked their students to check their writings with a self-WCF checklist after the completion of each composition. They usually implemented these activities at the end of the lesson when they conducted writing tasks in the classroom. For example, Teacher A stated that "*I use self-WCF in my class every end of the meeting by completing the self-WCF checklist. Before, doing that, I have to train my students on how to use the self-WCF checklist. I ask the students to point out the difficulties in their writing tasks, correct the grammatical errors, and write a reflection comment.*" At the beginning, teachers usually explain to their students how to practice self-WCF by giving some examples and explaining the function of the self-WCF checklist. After that, the teachers asked the students to focus on one particular aspect of their writing, such as tense, subject-verb agreement, or the usage of conjunctions.

Teacher A added that, "*before they start to check their writings, I usually ask the students to focus on one specific aspect of writing, and I tried to apply focused feedback here. For example, I asked them to check the content and the generic structures of the text. After that, they were followed by checking grammatical mistakes. At the end, I provided their writings with positive corrective feedback to encourage them.*"

Table 4. The Indonesian Senior High School Teachers Frequency in Applying Self-WCF

Items	n	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Indonesian senior high school teachers apply self WCF in their classrooms	18	3	3	5	7

Table 3 described that 11 out of 18 teachers applied self-WCF in their classes; however, only three teachers (A, F, and G) often used self-WCF in their classrooms. Their reason for using self-WCF consistently in their classes was that it could help students improve their writing achievement and enable them to measure their own ability. Besides, they could understand their own mistakes and hopefully, minimize them in the future classes.

Three teachers (D, H, and N) responded that they occasionally provide their students with self-WCF. Notably, in daily tasks, midterms, and final tests. Teacher D said that "*I apply self-WCF to my students if I found that they make big mistakes, for example, like they choose different tense and vocabulary. Also, the content of their writing is not suitable for the writing instruction which I have provided.*"

Five teachers (C, E, K, M, and R) applied self-WCF once or twice in a semester. For instance, teacher C has only used self WCF once in her class when she had limited time to give written corrective feedback. She said that "*Applying self-WCF in my class, spend much time since my students have low motivation and competence. Besides, writing doesn't have a big portion of my class. Therefore, mostly, the corrective feedback is coming from me as the teacher.*" Teacher J also responded that "*Sometimes, I motivate my students to check their writing first with the corrective feedback checklist, but I don't have time to do it.*"

So far, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers, who have practiced self-WCF in their classes, play various roles in the implementation of self-WCF activities, not only as teachers but also as trainers, models, checkers, and as feedback givers.

For the seven teachers (B, I, J, L, O, P, and Q) who never apply self WCF in their classes, they argued that it is hard for the students to perform this form of written corrective feedback because most of their students have low competence in English writing. Further, the students did not know how to use the self-WCF checklist, even though, their teachers explained it in the first lesson. Also, Teacher P said that applying self WCF made him double-check the work since he didn't believe in his students' ability and found it more effective to provide the written corrective feedback himself.

Moreover, these teachers stated that they worry about the effectiveness of self-WCF, the students' ability to give this feedback, and limited time to use self-WCF in the classroom. For example, Teacher L said that "*Self-WCF is not an important part in my class, so I didn't provide them how to use this feedback, besides it's difficult for the students to do it.*"

Furthermore, according to them, self-WCF has no impact on improving their students' ability. For example, Teacher O stated that it was a waste of time since she could not see the effectiveness of self-WCF. If she applied it in her class, she still had to recheck her students' writings. Teacher P responded that self-WCF mainly focused on spelling and grammatical errors rather than the contents and organizations of the writing. Teacher Q reported that "*It's ineffective. It's mostly no significant revision from their first draft because the students feel that this is the best they can do. Further, the students believe in their own judgment; for they cannot recognize the errors in their writing. Besides, most of them feel bored by reading and checking their own writing.*"

Teacher J responded that "*My students will not take self-WCF seriously since the level of the ability and*

the motivation of his students are low. Furthermore, I doubt that my students can be objective in checking their own writing. So, I don't think my students can do this part well."

Based on the results and findings on the previous research questions, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs have affected their practices. To summarize, there are three cases which can be seen from the previous data analysis. First, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs do influence their decision to introduce self-WCF in their classrooms and the methods of implementation. Second, some teachers applied self-WCF activities in their classes since they thought it could contribute to their students' writing ability. Third, some other teachers seldom or never provided self-WCF as they doubted the benefits of self-WCF for their students. They said that the obstacles to providing self-WCF were the level of their students' proficiency and their low motivation in learning English, especially writing. Thus, for those teachers who belong to the first case, they tend to practice what they believe, considering the benefit of self-WCF or lack thereof.

In the second case, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs differ from their actual practices. Although some teachers thought that self-WCF was useful for their students' improvement in English writing, they still did not apply it in their teaching practices. For example, teacher K considered that self-WCF is beneficial, but he did not use it since self-WCF is rather challenging to be implemented. As such, he adopted the teacher WCF in his classes. He said that "*It is not easy to conduct self-WCF in my classroom.*" For example, he said that "*when students finish reviewing their writings, I need to spend more time reading their checklist and also their writing. So, it wastes my time. So, I prefer to use only teacher written corrective feedback in my class.*"

In the third case, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' practices tend to change with their changing beliefs. For example, Teacher C said that "*It is good to let students practice self-WCF in the class because the students can avoid producing basic errors which are found in their writings task. This [self-WCF] can help me save my time.*" However, she once tried to apply self-WCF in her class, but she gave up because she did not notice any improvement in her students' writing tasks. She reported that "*I used self-WCF in my classes last year and found that my students' scores did not significantly increase. Thus, I don't apply self-WCF now, and I think applying self-WCF takes much time. Besides, I have to provide corrective feedback and comment also, because they only wait for my comments or feedback on their writings*". After that, she decided to change her practices, "*Yet, I keep asking my students to do self-WCF before they submit their writing task.*"

In short, the results expose that the Indonesian senior high school English teachers' beliefs and practices are interconnected to each other in a specific context in which students' responses and the effectiveness of self-WCF would influence teachers' beliefs and practices. Moreover, the result of this study is in line with previous researchers (Ancker, 2000; Kubota, 2001; Yang, 2010), who said that self-WCF can make the students become more independent, recognize their own mistakes, and help teacher to save their time from checking the students' mistakes.

5. Conclusion

This study investigated the Indonesian senior highs school English teachers' beliefs and practices concerning the implementation of self-WCF in the classrooms. In this study, the Indonesian senior high school English teachers had several different attitudes about the effectiveness and benefits of self-WCF for their students' writing development. Also, their practices tended to change along with their beliefs and their students' condition, such as students' proficiency levels and motivation. Although the teachers usually follow what they believe, their practices sometimes differ from their attitudes when it comes to self-WCF.

The findings imply that some Indonesian English teachers may not recognize the potential impact of self-WCF on their students' achievement which can make them become autonomous writers, so they

will not much depend on their peers or teachers. Consequently, there is a need to provide training for senior high school English teachers in Indonesia about how to implement self-WCF in their classes effectively, since self-WCF could improve the students' achievement in writing class and minimize their mistakes. As a result, it will save English teacher's time in checking the mistakes and providing self-WCF.

This study implies that the Indonesian senior high school English teachers can apply this kind of written corrective feedback both in-class and out-class. Furthermore, they can ask the students to consult their self-WCF checklist first when they want to compose a writing task. This way, self-WCF can be performed within the limited time available in the class. Further research should look into different types of WCF sources (e.g., teacher and peer) to draw upon the teachers' and students' limited and specific awareness. Also, it would be interesting to examine the problems faced by different EFL teachers from different countries, like Thailand or Japan, regarding self-WCF and compare their ways of solving the issues. Besides, it would be interesting to conduct classroom action research about the application of self-WCF in reducing students' errors in their revised writings and explore students' beliefs regarding the implementation of self-WCF.

However, there was a limitation to the present study. This study only interviewed a limited number of Indonesian English teachers in one province out of thirty-four in the nation. If the study is conducted with a bigger sample size and teacher participants from different provinces, the result will be more comprehensive. Further studies should be conducted by involving students' voice regarding on the application of self-WCF in their classrooms. Such studies would provide whether there is a gap between teachers' and students' beliefs.

6. References

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum, 38*(4), 20-24.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205.

Bjork, R. A. (1999). Assessing our own competence: Heuristics and illusions. In D. Gopher & A. Koriat (Eds.), *Attention and performance XVII. Cognitive regulation of performance: Interaction of theory and application,* (pp.435-459). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boud, D. (2000). Sustainable assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society. *Studies in Continuing Education, 22*(2), 151-167.

English First (EF). (2018). *EF English Proficiency Index.* Retrieved from https://www.efjapan.co.jp/epi/regions/asia/indonesia/

Fahimi, Z., & Rahimi, A. (2015). On the impact of self-assessment practice on writing skill. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 730-736.

Ibarrola, A. L. (2009). Reformulation and self-correction: Testing the validity of correction strategies in the classroom. *RESLA, 22*, 189–215.

Kemendikbud (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan). (2018). *Konsep dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013. [The concept and implementation of curriculum 2013].* Retrieved from https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/kemdikbud/dokumen/Paparan/Paparan% 20Wamendik.pdf

Kubota, M. (2001). Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task. *System, 29*(4), 467-480.

Maftoon, P., Shirazi, M. A., & Daftarifard, P. (2011). The effect of recast vs. self correction on writing accuracy. *BRAIN: Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2*(1), 17-28.

Makino, T.-Y. (1993). *Learner self-correction in EFL written compositions. ELT Journal, 47*(4), 337–341.

Pishghadam, R., Hashemi, M., & Kermanshahi, P. (2011). Self-correction among Iranian EFL learners: An investigation into their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 2*(5), 957-962.

Sorrentino, R. M., & Hewitt, E. C. (1984). The uncertainty-reducing properties of achievement tasks revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(4), 884-899.

Trope, Y. (1986). Self-enhancement and self-assessment in achievement behavior. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior* (pp.350-378). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Wanchid, R. (2013). The use of self-correction, paper-pencil peer feedback and electronic peer feedback in the EFL writing class: Opportunities and challenges. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 2*(3), 157-164.

Yang, Y. F. (2010). Students' reflection on online self-correction and peer review to improve writing. *Computers & Education, 55*(3), 1202-1210.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41*(2), 64-70.

Appendix 1

Interview Guide

Section 1

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male　　　　　　b. Female
2. What is the highest level of formal education you have completed?
   a. Undergraduate　b. Master　　　　c. Doctor　　　　　　d. Others _____
3. By the end of this school year, how many years in total will you have been teaching English (including part time years)?
   a. 1–2 years　　　c. 6–10 years　　e. 16–20 years
   b. 3–5 years　　　d. 11–15 years　　f. more than 20 years

Section 2

1. How do you teach English writing in your class?
2. Are you familiar with self-written corrective feedback? If yes, what do you think of the role of self-written corrective feedback?
3. Do you provide self-written corrective feedback to your students in your class? Why or why not?
4. If yes, how often do you apply it? Could you describe how you provide it in your class?
5. Do you train your students to do self-written corrective feedback? If yes, what kind of training do you provide for them?
6. Based on your experience, is self-written corrective feedback useful in improving your students' achievement in English writing? Why? Or why not?
7. What kind of problems do you face while teaching writing skills in English?
8. How do you overcome the problems you face while teaching writing skills in English?