

Exploring teachers' corrective feedback strategies in English for specific purposes (ESP) descriptive text writing

Affied Alfayed¹, Sri Hartiningsih², Muhammad Fadhil Hamdani³

Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia^{1, 2}

SMKS Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari, Indonesia³

Email: affiedalfayed@webmail.umm.ac.id¹

Abstract - The growing demand for vocational education in Indonesia is driven by an increasingly competitive job market, requiring students to develop specialized skills, including proficiency in English for Specific Purposes (ESP). English teachers play a crucial role in enhancing students' writing abilities, particularly in crafting descriptive texts relevant to their fields of study. However, limited research has explored how teachers provide corrective feedback in ESP writing instruction. This study investigates the corrective feedback strategies employed by an English teacher in a vocational school when teaching descriptive text writing. It also examines the rationale behind the teacher's feedback practices. A qualitative case study approach was used, with data collected through interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of students' written assignments. The findings indicate that the teacher primarily utilized oral corrective feedback during writing instruction, focusing on product description texts. The feedback strategies included explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and recasts. Explicit correction involved directly pointing out errors and providing correct alternatives, while metalinguistic feedback prompted students to self-correct by offering linguistic explanations. Recasts, on the other hand, involved reformulating students' erroneous statements in a more accurate form. The study further revealed that the teacher's feedback approach was influenced by personal teaching experience and beliefs about effective language instruction. These findings highlight the importance of oral corrective feedback in improving students' writing skills in ESP contexts. They suggest that teachers should adopt varied feedback strategies tailored to students' needs to enhance learning outcomes. Future research could explore the long-term effects of different corrective feedback methods on students' writing development in vocational education settings.

Keywords: teacher corrective feedback, descriptive text, writing process, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), English learning

1. Introduction

The demand for vocational education in Indonesia is increasing due to the evolving nature of the job market, which has become more competitive and requires specialized skills. Recognizing the importance of practical expertise, vocational schools must integrate English for Specific Purposes (ESP) into their curriculum to equip students with the necessary linguistic competencies to compete globally. ESP focuses on teaching English in specific fields to meet learners' academic and professional needs (Brown, 2016).

ESP instruction is goal-oriented, emphasizing the development of language proficiency relevant to students' disciplines and career aspirations (Masykar, 2019). It is designed to meet the specific requirements of various fields by incorporating subject-specific vocabulary, syntax, discourse, and semantics (Faridah, 2017; Wajdi, 2018). Among the four language skills, writing is particularly significant in professional settings due to its structured nature and its ability to convey detailed information. However, in ESP contexts, writing poses challenges such as organizing ideas effectively, selecting appropriate vocabulary, and ensuring clarity and coherence (Paltridge & Starfield, 2013). Consequently, teachers must tailor writing instruction to align with students' field-specific needs.

One of the text genres taught in Indonesian vocational schools is descriptive writing, which involves presenting detailed information about a person, place, or object based on specific characteristics. In ESP, descriptive writing should be adapted to match students' learning objectives. For example, in business and economics, students are required to write product descriptions using precise expressions (Surani & Fatoni, 2019), persuasive language to attract customers (Kubro & Suyitno, 2019), and effective grammatical structures to enhance clarity and engagement (Huhta et al., 2013).

Given the complexity of writing in ESP contexts, students frequently encounter errors in their descriptive texts, often influenced by their first or second language (Isa et al., 2017). To help students improve their writing, teachers employ corrective feedback strategies, which can be delivered in oral or written form (Kim & Mostafa, 2021; Zhu, 2023) and presented directly or indirectly (Ha et al., 2021). The timing of corrective feedback—whether immediate or delayed—is also crucial in maximizing its effectiveness in second language learning.

Previous research has examined how teachers implement corrective feedback in various educational settings. For instance, Hidayah et al. (2021) found that teachers utilized multiple forms of written corrective feedback (direct, indirect, metalinguistic, and unfocused) to address different aspects of writing, including grammar, vocabulary, content, mechanics, and organization. Elumalai (2019) highlighted that direct corrective feedback significantly improved students' writing fluency. Similarly, Khanlarzadeh and Nemati (2016) demonstrated that written feedback enhances grammatical accuracy, while Sermsook et al. (2017) argued that indirect feedback encourages self-correction.

Although written feedback has been widely studied, Nassaji (2015) emphasized that oral feedback plays a more influential role in second language acquisition, as auditory information is often retained more effectively than visual cues (Sobhani & Tayebipour, 2015). Furthermore, studies indicate that students generally prefer explicit feedback over implicit forms (Ha et al., 2021; Lee, 2013; Roothoof & Breeze, 2016), with explicit corrective feedback proving more effective for beginner-level learners (Sermsook et al., 2017; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014).

Despite the extensive research on corrective feedback, most studies focus on EFL and ESL contexts, particularly among adult learners in higher education or secondary school students. However, limited research has explored how teachers implement corrective feedback in ESP writing instruction within vocational schools. Therefore, this study aims to examine how teachers provide corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing, particularly in the context of product descriptions in the Office Management and Business Services department at SMKS Muhammadiyah 3 Malang.

This study is guided by the following research questions: (a) How does the teacher implement corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing? (b) What are the rationales behind the teacher's approach to corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing?

2. Method

This study employs a qualitative research approach, utilizing a case study design to provide an in-depth exploration of the teacher's implementation of corrective feedback in descriptive text writing at SMKS Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari. Qualitative research aims to gain a deeper understanding of a central phenomenon by examining real-life experiences and perspectives. The case study method is particularly suitable for this research as it allows for an intensive analysis of a single case within its specific context. The selected participant for this study was an English teacher, referred to as Pak (pseudonym), who teaches grade 11 students in the Office Administration and Business Services department. He was chosen due to his experience teaching English for business purposes in line with the department's learning objectives. Despite being a novice teacher, with just over a year of teaching experience at the vocational school, he has completed the required basic ESP (English for Specific Purposes) teaching training. His approach to corrective feedback in students' writing provided valuable insights into ESP pedagogy within vocational education.

2.1 Method of Collecting Data

To gain a comprehensive understanding of the teacher's feedback implementation, this study employed multiple data collection methods, including semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis.

The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews, which allowed for open-ended discussions and provided the teacher with the opportunity to elaborate on his practices and rationale for implementing corrective feedback. The interviews were divided into two sections. The first section focused on the types and strategies of corrective feedback the teacher employed in students' descriptive writing about a product. The second section explored the underlying reasons behind his chosen feedback techniques. Conducting the interviews in the Indonesian language ensured that the teacher could express his thoughts freely without language barriers. The responses were then translated into English for analysis. The interview sessions were recorded with the participant's consent, transcribed, and systematically coded to identify key themes and patterns.

To validate the information obtained from the interviews, classroom observations were conducted to document the actual feedback strategies used in practice. The researcher attended one of the teacher's classes to observe how he provided feedback on students' descriptive writing in real-time. Observational data included notes on the teacher's verbal and written feedback, student engagement, and how feedback was incorporated into subsequent writing tasks.

Additionally, a document analysis was performed to examine student writing samples that had received corrective feedback from the teacher. These documents were analyzed to determine the types of feedback provided, including direct, indirect, metalinguistic, and reformulation strategies. This triangulation of data sources – interviews, observations, and document analysis – enhanced the credibility and reliability of the findings.

2.2 Technique of Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using thematic analysis, which involves identifying, organizing, and interpreting recurring themes within the dataset. The process began with transcribing the interview recordings and classroom observation notes. The transcriptions were then coded manually by categorizing key phrases and statements related to corrective feedback strategies and teacher rationale.

The next step involved identifying patterns across the three data sources. Recurring themes were categorized into major and minor themes, focusing on how corrective feedback was implemented, its effectiveness, and the teacher's pedagogical reasoning. The researcher cross-checked the interview findings with observational data and student writing samples to ensure consistency and validity.

The final stage of analysis involved synthesizing the findings into a coherent narrative that addressed the study's research questions. Direct quotations from the teacher were included to support interpretations, and discrepancies between different data sources were

discussed to provide a balanced perspective. This analytical approach ensured that the study provided a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of corrective feedback implementation in ESP writing instruction within vocational education.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

Corrective feedback is essential in ESP writing instruction, helping students refine their linguistic and conceptual skills. This section examines the methods used by ESP teachers and the rationale behind their feedback strategies.

ESP teachers employ various corrective feedback techniques, with oral feedback being the primary method observed in this study. The teacher, Pak, structured his lessons by first introducing the topic, assigning a writing task, and then having students read their work aloud. He provided immediate oral corrective feedback, allowing students to revise their texts accordingly.

Pak used explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback to address grammatical errors. For frequent mistakes, he directly pointed out errors and provided corrections. For minor errors, he used metalinguistic feedback, prompting students to self-correct through guided questions. Additionally, he applied the recast strategy to refine students' writing ideas, subtly rephrasing their sentences without directly pointing out mistakes.

Two key factors influenced Pak's approach: his teaching experience and personal beliefs. He found oral feedback more effective as it enabled students to seek clarification immediately. He also believed that oral feedback fostered open discussion, making students feel valued and motivated. His approach aligns with research emphasizing that teachers' personal experiences and beliefs significantly shape their instructional choices.

Understanding these corrective feedback practices can help educators refine their strategies to enhance student learning in ESP classrooms.

3.1.1 ESP Teacher's Implementation of Corrective Feedback

The first research question in this study investigates how Pak applied corrective feedback in teaching descriptive text writing, specifically in the context of product descriptions. This includes the types of corrective feedback used and the strategies employed. The findings were derived from interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of student writing samples.

During the interview, Pak stated that he predominantly used oral corrective feedback when addressing errors in students' descriptive writing. He explained, "I prefer to use oral feedback when correcting students' descriptive text writing. In the past, I have also provided written feedback for other teaching materials." His preference for oral feedback stems from his belief that immediate, spoken corrections provide students with a clearer understanding of their mistakes and facilitate a more interactive learning experience.

Classroom observations confirmed his use of oral corrective feedback. The lesson followed a structured sequence: first, Pak introduced and explained the topic, ensuring that students understood the concept of descriptive writing, particularly in relation to product descriptions. Next, students were tasked with writing a descriptive text about a product of their choice. They then read their texts aloud to the teacher, who provided oral corrective feedback on their errors. Finally, students made immediate revisions based on the feedback received. This step-by-step approach allowed students to engage in active learning and make real-time improvements to their writing.

When delivering oral corrective feedback, Pak adopted an explicit correction strategy for students who made frequent grammatical errors. He directly pointed out these errors, provided the correct forms, and asked students to apply the corrections in similar instances. This method ensured that students with significant grammar challenges received precise guidance on how to improve their writing. Explicit correction was particularly useful

for common mistakes related to verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, and word order, which are essential components of effective descriptive writing.

In contrast, for students with fewer grammatical mistakes, he employed a metalinguistic feedback strategy. Instead of offering direct corrections, he posed questions and provided comments that guided students toward recognizing and correcting their own errors. For instance, rather than simply stating that a sentence was incorrect, he might ask, "Does this verb match the tense of the sentence?" or "Can you think of a more appropriate adjective to describe this product?" This strategy encouraged students to think critically about their writing and develop self-editing skills.

Beyond grammatical accuracy, Pak also focused on improving students' content and organization. He frequently used the recast strategy to refine students' ideas without overtly pointing out errors. This involved subtly rephrasing or restructuring students' sentences to enhance clarity and coherence. By doing so, he ensured that students maintained ownership of their work while also learning how to express their ideas more effectively.

During class observations, it was noted that Pak prioritized content over grammar when providing feedback. He believed that students should first focus on developing their ideas and structuring their writing logically before refining grammatical accuracy. However, he did address major grammatical errors, particularly those that significantly impacted meaning, such as incorrect verb forms or misplaced modifiers. Minor grammatical mistakes were often overlooked unless they interfered with the overall readability of the text.

The rationale behind Pak's approach was further elaborated during the interview. He emphasized that students tend to be more receptive to oral feedback because it allows for immediate clarification. Unlike written feedback, which students might not fully understand or engage with, oral feedback creates an opportunity for dialogue. Students can ask questions, seek clarification, and discuss their errors in real-time, leading to deeper learning and a stronger grasp of writing conventions.

Additionally, Pak shared that his preference for oral corrective feedback was influenced by his own experiences as a university student. He recalled that receiving oral feedback from his professors helped him feel more valued and motivated to improve his writing. This personal experience shaped his teaching philosophy, as he aimed to foster a supportive and interactive learning environment where students felt encouraged to refine their writing skills.

In summary, Pak's approach to corrective feedback in descriptive text writing was characterized by a combination of explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and recasting. His feedback strategies were tailored to students' proficiency levels, ensuring that each student received appropriate support. Through oral feedback, he facilitated an interactive learning experience that not only addressed grammatical errors but also enhanced students' ability to develop and structure their ideas effectively. The findings from this study highlight the importance of adaptive feedback strategies in teaching writing, particularly in ESP contexts, where clarity and coherence are essential for professional communication.

"I usually point out the errors in the student's writing and provide corrections to the errors. But I don't correct all of them, I let the students correct the rest. I sometimes don't correct students' writing errors, but I stimulate them with some questions. This is usually for students who are more proficient and do not produce many errors in writing texts."

During classroom observations, it was noted that Pak frequently employed the recast strategy when providing oral corrective feedback to his students. This approach was particularly evident in instances where students needed assistance in refining their ideas for product descriptions. Rather than overtly highlighting errors or directly pointing out irrelevant aspects of their writing, Pak subtly reformulated incorrect phrases or sentences and presented them with accurate information. This method guided students toward

recognizing their mistakes organically and incorporating relevant details into their descriptions without feeling discouraged or overwhelmed by direct corrections.

By employing the recast strategy, Pak ensured that students remained engaged and focused on improving the content of their writing while also being exposed to correct linguistic forms in a natural manner. This technique aligns with the principle of scaffolding, wherein teachers provide support that helps students gradually develop their language skills. Through recasting, Pak modelled proper sentence structures and vocabulary choices, allowing students to internalize the correct forms without explicit negative feedback. This indirect correction technique proved to be effective, as students were able to refine their ideas and make meaningful adjustments to their descriptions without experiencing anxiety or frustration associated with excessive corrections.

Beyond his use of recasting, Pak held strong beliefs about the importance of corrective feedback in the learning process. He maintained that while addressing errors in students' writing was essential, not all mistakes required immediate correction. His pedagogical approach emphasized the development of students' ideas over strict grammatical accuracy. He believed that fluency and idea generation should take precedence, allowing students to express their thoughts freely before refining their grammatical structures over time.

Pak's prioritization of idea development was evident in his selective approach to grammar correction. He primarily provided feedback on major grammatical errors, particularly those related to tenses and verb usage, as he believed these aspects had a significant impact on overall comprehension. Minor errors, such as preposition choices or article usage, were often overlooked unless they interfered with the clarity of the message. This method allowed students to concentrate on constructing coherent and well-developed descriptions without becoming overly fixated on minor linguistic mistakes.

His approach to corrective feedback aligns with research in second language acquisition, which suggests that focusing too much on grammar can hinder students' willingness to take risks in their writing. By encouraging students to first develop their ideas and later refine their grammatical structures, Pak fostered a supportive learning environment that promoted both creativity and confidence. Students were able to engage in the writing process more actively, knowing that their ideas would be valued and that they would have opportunities to improve their language skills progressively.

Moreover, Pak's approach was influenced by his own experiences as both a student and a teacher. He recalled instances in which oral corrective feedback had helped him feel more engaged in his learning process, as it provided immediate opportunities for clarification and discussion. He aimed to replicate this experience for his students, creating an interactive and communicative classroom dynamic where students could actively participate in refining their writing skills.

Another significant aspect of Pak's feedback strategy was his adaptability in responding to students' individual needs. He recognized that each student had a unique learning pace and different levels of linguistic competence. To accommodate this diversity, he adjusted his corrective feedback strategies accordingly. For students who struggled significantly with grammar, he provided explicit correction by directly pointing out errors and explaining the correct forms. For students with fewer grammatical mistakes, he employed metalinguistic feedback by prompting them with guiding questions or comments that encouraged self-correction. This differentiated approach ensured that students received appropriate support based on their proficiency levels, thereby enhancing their overall learning experience.

The effectiveness of Pak's feedback strategies was also evident in student responses. Many students demonstrated increased confidence in their writing, as they were able to express their ideas without fear of excessive correction. They also showed improved awareness of grammatical structures over time, as Pak's selective correction allowed them to focus on key language aspects progressively. Classroom observations indicated that

students actively engaged in discussions with Pak regarding their writing, seeking clarification and making revisions based on his feedback.

Overall, Pak's approach to corrective feedback exemplifies a balanced and student-centred methodology. By integrating oral corrective feedback strategies such as recasting, explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback, he created an environment that nurtured both idea development and language accuracy. His belief in prioritizing content over grammar, coupled with his ability to adapt feedback to individual student needs, contributed to a more effective and engaging learning process.

In conclusion, Pak's corrective feedback practices highlight the importance of a thoughtful and strategic approach in language teaching. His use of the recast strategy, combined with his emphasis on idea development, allowed students to refine their writing skills in a supportive and interactive setting. By selectively addressing grammatical errors and focusing on student engagement, he facilitated a learning experience that not only improved language proficiency but also encouraged students to take an active role in their writing development. His methods serve as a valuable example for educators seeking to implement effective corrective feedback strategies in second language instruction.

"I focus more on correcting students' writing ideas, rather than correcting grammar errors, or other features. I think students should be encouraged to write ideas first. Grammar mistakes that are not too fatal can be ignored first".

3.1.2 Teacher's Rationale for Implementing Corrective Feedback

The second research question aims to explore the underlying reasons behind the teacher's choice of corrective feedback strategies. The analysis of the interview with Pak revealed two primary factors influencing his approach: teaching experience and personal beliefs. These factors played a crucial role in shaping how he provided feedback and interacted with his students in the writing classroom.

Pak's teaching experience significantly influenced his decision to use oral corrective feedback. Having taught for more than a year, he observed that students responded more effectively to oral feedback compared to written feedback. He explained that providing oral feedback allowed for immediate clarification, reducing the chances of students misinterpreting the corrections. Through his experience, he realized that when he handed back written feedback, many students either failed to read it carefully or struggled to understand the suggested corrections. As a result, misunderstandings persisted, and students were less likely to apply the feedback to improve their writing.

During classroom interactions, Pak noticed that students were more engaged when he provided oral corrective feedback. Unlike written feedback, oral feedback created opportunities for real-time discussion, where students could ask questions and receive immediate responses. This interactive process helped students grasp the concepts better and facilitated a more dynamic learning experience. His observations were in line with studies suggesting that oral feedback can be more effective in language acquisition, as it encourages active participation and allows learners to process and apply corrections more effectively.

Additionally, Pak found that using oral corrective feedback helped maintain a positive classroom environment. Written feedback, especially when heavily focused on grammatical errors, could sometimes be discouraging for students. However, through oral feedback, Pak could adjust his tone, provide encouragement, and ensure that students did not feel demotivated by their mistakes. This approach allowed him to foster a supportive learning atmosphere where students felt comfortable making mistakes and learning from them.

Apart from his teaching experience, Pak's personal beliefs about language learning also played a significant role in shaping his corrective feedback strategies. He firmly believed that feedback should not only focus on grammatical accuracy but also encourage students to develop their writing ideas. Pak stated that his priority was to help students articulate

their thoughts clearly before refining their grammar. He argued that overly emphasizing grammatical corrections too early in the writing process could hinder students' creativity and confidence. By prioritizing the development of ideas first, Pak allowed students to express themselves freely, gradually refining their grammatical accuracy over time.

Pak's personal experiences as a university student also influenced his approach. He recalled that when he received oral feedback from his supervisors, he felt more valued and motivated to improve. The opportunity to discuss his writing with his mentors helped him gain a deeper understanding of his errors and strengthened his writing skills. Inspired by this experience, he aimed to create a similar environment for his students, where oral feedback would encourage dialogue and build confidence.

In summary, Pak's corrective feedback strategies were shaped by his teaching experience and personal beliefs. His preference for oral feedback stemmed from its effectiveness in engaging students, preventing misunderstandings, and creating an interactive learning environment. Moreover, his belief in prioritizing idea development over grammatical accuracy reinforced his feedback approach, ensuring that students felt supported and motivated in their writing journey.

"So, based on my experience so far, students understand better when given oral feedback. I can use a language that is easily understood by students. Hhmm, and students can also directly ask questions if they don't understand what I mean..."

Pak's preference for oral corrective feedback is largely informed by his teaching experience. With over a year of experience in teaching ESP writing, he has observed that oral feedback, when delivered in clear and accessible language, significantly enhances students' comprehension. He believes that immediate verbal feedback allows students to better grasp the material and make necessary corrections in real time. Additionally, oral feedback creates an interactive learning environment where students can ask for clarification or additional explanations, helping them understand their mistakes more effectively.

Throughout his teaching experience, Pak has experimented with different types of feedback. In the past, he implemented written corrective feedback as an alternative approach. However, he encountered several challenges that made him reconsider its effectiveness. One major issue he observed was the lack of student engagement with written feedback. Many students either ignored the feedback or failed to fully understand the corrections provided. Consequently, they struggled to apply the necessary improvements to their writing, leading to recurring mistakes.

Pak noted that when students received written feedback, they often focused solely on surface-level corrections, such as fixing spelling and punctuation errors, while overlooking more complex structural or grammatical issues. This limited their ability to develop a deeper understanding of language use and composition. Additionally, students sometimes misinterpreted the written comments, leading to further confusion rather than improvement.

Given these challenges, Pak opted for oral corrective feedback, which he found to be more effective in ensuring students' engagement and comprehension. By discussing errors verbally, he could provide immediate clarification and demonstrate correct usage in context. This approach also allowed him to gauge students' reactions and adjust his explanations based on their level of understanding. Moreover, the interactive nature of oral feedback encouraged students to participate actively in the learning process, fostering a more collaborative classroom environment.

Another key reason for Pak's preference for oral corrective feedback is his personal belief that students benefit more from direct interaction with their teacher. His own educational background has shaped his perspective on feedback. As a university student, Pak experienced the positive effects of receiving oral corrective feedback from his supervisors. He recalled that verbal corrections made him feel valued as a learner and

encouraged open discussions, which ultimately boosted his confidence and motivation to improve his writing. He found that having a space for dialogue with his instructors allowed him to understand his mistakes better and refine his writing skills more effectively.

Because of his own experiences, Pak aims to create a similar learning environment for his students. He believes that by offering oral corrective feedback, he is not only correcting errors but also building a rapport with his students. This approach helps students feel supported and motivated to improve their writing. Additionally, oral feedback provides opportunities for personalized instruction, as Pak can tailor his explanations to each student's needs, ensuring that they receive the guidance necessary for their individual learning progress.

Pak's approach aligns with the broader educational perspective that emphasizes the importance of interactive learning in language acquisition. Studies in second language learning suggest that immediate and direct feedback can have a significant impact on students' ability to internalize language rules and apply them effectively. By engaging students in discussions about their writing, teachers can help them develop critical thinking skills and become more self-aware of their language use.

Despite the advantages of oral corrective feedback, Pak acknowledges that it may not always be feasible in every classroom setting. Large class sizes or time constraints can sometimes limit the ability to provide individualized verbal feedback to each student. However, he believes that incorporating oral feedback whenever possible can significantly enhance students' learning experiences and improve their writing proficiency over time. In conclusion, Pak's preference for oral corrective feedback is driven by both his teaching experience and personal beliefs. Through his observations, he has found that verbal feedback is more effective in engaging students and ensuring they comprehend the necessary corrections. His past experiences as a student have further reinforced his belief in the value of direct interaction between teachers and learners. By prioritizing oral feedback, Pak aims to create a supportive and interactive classroom environment that fosters student growth and confidence in writing.

"...I used to use written feedback too. The problem is that students sometimes don't read what I write, don't understand what I write, and sometimes they even misunderstand what I write. So, I don't think it's effective in my class."

The following excerpt illustrates the second reason based on personal beliefs:

"I think when teachers give corrective feedback orally, students feel more valued. This is based on my experience when I was at university. When my lecturer corrected my writing, I felt appreciated, and it made me feel motivated and confident. It also made me more open with my lecturer. I can convey my complaints in writing and my lecturer will provide solutions".

Pak's preference for providing oral corrective feedback in writing instruction is influenced by his own experience as a university student. He recalled that receiving oral feedback from his supervisors made him feel acknowledged and encouraged open discussions. This interaction boosted his confidence and motivation to improve his writing. Drawing from this personal experience, Pak aims to implement the same approach in his classroom, fostering an interactive learning environment where students feel comfortable engaging in discussions about their writing.

3.2 Discussion

Teaching writing in an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) setting requires strategies that effectively support students in developing their language proficiency, particularly in describing products. One key aspect of this process is the implementation of corrective feedback, which helps students recognize and improve their writing errors. This study

investigates how an ESP teacher applies corrective feedback in teaching descriptive writing and examines the underlying reasons behind the chosen feedback strategies.

The study focuses on the case of Pak (a pseudonym), an English teacher at SMKS Muhammadiyah 3 Singosari, who teaches eleventh-grade students in the Office Administration and Business Services department. The analysis is based on data collected through interviews, classroom observations, and student writing documentation. By exploring Pak's approach, this study aims to provide insight into the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback and its impact on student learning.

Corrective feedback is a fundamental element in second language learning, particularly in writing instruction. It serves to help students identify linguistic errors and refine their language skills. Previous research by Nassaji (2015) and Fadzil et al. (2021) suggests that oral feedback can positively impact student motivation and confidence in language acquisition. Similarly, studies by Roothoof and Breeze (2016) and Ha et al. (2021) emphasize that explicit oral feedback enhances grammatical accuracy, particularly for novice learners (Sermsook et al., 2017; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014).

In this study, Pak utilized various corrective feedback strategies, including implicit correction, metalinguistic correction, and recast. His approach aimed to balance grammatical accuracy with idea development, ensuring that students not only wrote correctly but also conveyed their thoughts effectively. The study further explores how these strategies align with existing literature and the specific needs of vocational students learning English for business purposes.

One of the key findings of this study is that Pak primarily relies on oral corrective feedback in teaching descriptive writing. During interviews, he mentioned that he prefers oral feedback over written feedback due to its immediate impact and interactive nature. He noted that oral feedback allows students to clarify misunderstandings in real-time, reducing confusion and promoting active engagement in the learning process.

The classroom observations confirmed that Pak follows a structured approach to implementing oral corrective feedback. The lesson typically begins with an explanation of the writing task, where students are asked to describe a product in written form. Once students complete their writing, they read their texts aloud to the teacher, who then provides oral corrective feedback. The feedback process involves highlighting grammatical errors and guiding students in refining their ideas.

Pak employs three main corrective feedback strategies:

- a) *Explicit Correction*: This strategy is used for students who make frequent grammatical mistakes. Pak directly points out the errors, provides the correct forms, and asks students to correct similar errors in subsequent sentences.
- b) *Metalinguistic Feedback*: For students with fewer grammatical errors, Pak provides metalinguistic explanations. Instead of directly correcting the mistakes, he poses questions and comments that prompt students to reflect on their errors and make self-corrections.
- c) *Recast*: When addressing issues related to idea development, Pak uses the recast strategy. He reformulates students' sentences to model correct language use without explicitly pointing out the errors. This approach helps students refine their writing structure while maintaining fluency.

These strategies align with research indicating that explicit and metalinguistic feedback enhances grammatical accuracy (Roothoof & Breeze, 2016; Ha et al., 2021), while recasting supports conceptual development in writing (Sermsook et al., 2017). The second research question examines the reasoning behind Pak's preference for oral corrective feedback. Two key factors emerged from the analysis: teaching experience and personal beliefs.

Pak's experience as an ESP teacher has shaped his preference for oral corrective feedback. He observed that students often struggle to engage with written feedback, either overlooking comments or failing to understand them. In contrast, oral feedback allows for immediate clarification, ensuring that students grasp the intended corrections. He also noted

that oral feedback fosters a more interactive learning environment, encouraging students to actively participate in the revision process.

Pak's preference for oral feedback is also influenced by his personal learning experiences. As a university student, he found that receiving oral feedback from his supervisors made him feel valued and motivated to improve his writing. This experience reinforced his belief that oral corrective feedback can have a similar positive impact on his students. By creating an open dialogue in the classroom, he aims to build students' confidence and encourage them to engage in self-improvement.

These findings align with Borg's (2019) research, which highlights the role of teachers' personal beliefs in shaping instructional practices, particularly in language learning. Pak's approach reflects his conviction that corrective feedback should be constructive and supportive, helping students grow as writers.

4. Conclusion

This study investigated the practice of corrective feedback in an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) writing classroom, with a particular focus on the strategies used by the teacher and the rationale behind these choices. The findings indicate that Pak, an ESP teacher, predominantly employs oral corrective feedback to address students' writing errors, particularly when teaching descriptive text related to product descriptions. His feedback strategies include explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and recasting, each serving different pedagogical purposes. Explicit correction is mainly used to address significant grammatical errors, ensuring that students receive direct guidance on how to correct their mistakes. Metalinguistic feedback, on the other hand, is employed to prompt students to self-correct by providing clues or explanations about the nature of their errors. Finally, recasting is used to refine students' writing ideas and structure, offering reformulated sentences that better align with the intended meaning.

The rationale behind Pak's preference for oral corrective feedback stems from both his teaching experience and personal beliefs. Over a year of teaching, he has observed that students respond better to oral feedback as it allows for immediate clarification and discussion. In contrast, he noted that written corrective feedback was often ignored or misunderstood by students, limiting its effectiveness. His personal beliefs further reinforce this approach, as he perceives oral feedback as a means to foster student engagement and motivation. Drawing from his own learning experience, Pak recalled how oral feedback from his supervisors made him feel valued and encouraged him to engage more actively in the writing process. This personal connection influences his decision to adopt similar practices in his own teaching.

The study contributes to the existing literature on corrective feedback by highlighting its application in vocational education settings, where the emphasis is on practical language use tailored to professional contexts. While previous research has extensively examined corrective feedback in general ESL and EFL settings, fewer studies have explored its role in ESP classrooms, particularly within vocational schools. The findings align with studies conducted by Nassaji (2015) and Fadzil et al. (2021), which suggest that oral feedback enhances student motivation and confidence in second language acquisition. Additionally, research by Roothoof and Breeze (2016) and Ha et al. (2021) supports the effectiveness of explicit oral corrective feedback in improving grammatical accuracy among novice learners.

Despite its contributions, this study has some limitations. It focuses on a single teacher's feedback practices, which may not be representative of broader ESP teaching contexts. Additionally, the study primarily examines the teacher's perspective without considering students' views on corrective feedback. Future research could address these gaps by exploring the long-term impact of oral corrective feedback on students' writing proficiency. A comparative study examining students' preferences and responses to different types of feedback—oral versus written—would provide a more comprehensive

understanding of effective feedback strategies in ESP contexts. Furthermore, investigating the role of corrective feedback in different vocational disciplines could offer valuable insights into how feedback strategies can be adapted to meet diverse language learning needs.

By understanding the factors that influence teachers' feedback practices, educators can develop more effective methods for supporting student learning in ESP classrooms. Implementing well-structured corrective feedback strategies can enhance students' writing skills, boost their confidence, and ultimately prepare them for professional communication in their respective fields.

References

- Borg, S. (2019). *Language Teacher Cognition: Perspectives and Debates*. 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_59-1
- Brown, J. D. (2016). *Introducing needs analysis and English for specific purposes*. Routledge.
- Fadzil, I. M., Ehsan, N., & Said, M. (2021). Exploring ESL teachers' insights on corrective oral feedback in a Malaysian secondary education context. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 6(9), 504–512. <https://doi.org/10.47405/MJSSH.V6I9.993>
- Farida, S. (2017). Analisis Historis Terhadap Kurikulum Pendidikan Iskam Pada Masa Habasiyah. *Kabilah, Journal of Social Community*, Vol 2/2.
- Ha, X. Van, Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7(7), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.HELIYON.2021.E07550>
- Hidayah, N., Suparno, S., & Haryati, S. (2021). EFL teachers' beliefs and practices in using teacher written corrective feedback on students' writing. *English Education Journal*, 10(1), 1–12.
- Huhta, M., Vogt, K., Johnson, E., & Tulkki, H. (2013). *Needs analysis for language course design: a holistic approach to ESP* (M. Huhta, K. Vogt, E. Johnson, H. Tulkki, & D. R. Hall, Eds.). Cambridge University Press (CUP).
- Isa, Q. N. M., Risdaneva, R., & Alfayed, A. (2017). An analysis of Acehese EFL students' grammatical errors in writing recount texts. *Englisia Journal*, 5(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v5i1.2301>
- Khanlarzadeh, M., & Nemati, M. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of EFL students: An improvement over previous unfocused designs *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 55–68. www.urmia.ac.ir/ijltr
- Kim, Y., & Mostafa, T. (2021). Teachers' and students' beliefs and perspectives about corrective feedback. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 561–580. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108589789.027>
- Kubro, R. A., & Suyitno, I. (2019). Persuasive language in advertisement discourses (business advertorial analysis). *ISLLAC: Journal of Intensive Studies on Language, Literature, Art, and Culture*, 3(2), 296–304. <http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/jisllac>
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000390>
- Masykar, T. (2019). Analisa kebutuhan English for Specific Purpose untuk pendidikan vokasi. *VOCATECH: Vocational Education and Technology Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.38038/vocatech.v1i0.9>
- Nassaji, H. (2015). *The Interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: linking theory, research, and practice*. Bloomsbury.
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2013). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339855>

- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness*, 25(4), 318-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The impact of teacher corrective feedback on EFL student writers' grammatical improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), p43. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ELT.V10N10P43>
- Sobhani, M., & Tayebipour, F. (2015). The effects of oral vs. written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' essay writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(8), 1601. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0508.09>
- Surani, D., & Fatoni, A. U. (2019). Students' strategy in describing a product: the case of ESP writing. *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v13i01>
- Vadakalur Elumalai, K. (2019). Teacher constructed corrective feedback enhancing students writing skills in EFL classroom. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(5), 103. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.10n.5p.103>
- Wajdi, M. (2018). *Classroom Discourse: A Model of Classroom Language Research*. Surabaya: CV. Jakad Publishing.
- Zhu, H. (2023). Measures for instructors to provide corrective feedback in L2 writing classes in high school. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(10), 634-639. <https://doi.org/10.4236/JSS.2023.1110036>
- Zohrabi, K., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit and explicit corrective feedback in Persian-speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2018-2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.637>