CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Written Feedback: Definition and Types

Feedback in the context of assignments can be understood across various dimensions, such as complexity, individual or group performance, and forms of written or numerical notation (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Specifically, Irwin (2017) defines written corrective feedback as comments, guidance, error corrections, and encouragement tailored to the individual needs of students. Additionally, Donnelly and Kirk (2010) emphasize the importance of constructive feedback in fostering self-reflection, while Stracke and Kumar (2011) highlight that such feedback can boost students' confidence in writing and research.

Five types of written corrective feedback, each with distinct purposes were identified (Ellis, 2008). Ellis also points out that well-designed feedback can promote deeper learning. Thus, a targeted approach to providing feedback is crucial for enhancing students' writing abilities and confidence, as well as supporting collaborative dialogue in the learning process.

2.2. Teachers' Beliefs on Written Feedback and Its Influence

Teachers' beliefs about written feedback significantly influence their teaching practices and students' learning outcomes. Effective feedback is essential in helping students identify errors and improve their skills (Shute, 2008). However, classroom practices often do not align with these beliefs. AlBakri (2016) notes that contextual factors, such as institutional policies, classroom dynamics, and time constraints,

may hinder teachers from consistently applying their beliefs, leading to discrepancies that negatively impact student learning.

Ten specific mismatches between teachers' beliefs and their feedback practices highlight the importance of addressing these gaps to improve the effectiveness of feedback in education, (Lee, 2009). Teachers who prioritize formative assessment tend to provide more constructive and personalized feedback, whereas those who view feedback as a formality are more likely to give less meaningful comments, potentially hindering student progress.

Furthermore, experienced teachers often develop more thoughtful strategies based on their understanding of students' needs, while novice teachers tend to follow predetermined methods (Veenman, 1984). Contextual pressures, such as high-stakes exams, may also force teachers to prioritize results over meaningful engagement, resulting in superficial feedback (Brown & Wyatt, 2015). Therefore, reflecting on beliefs and engaging in professional development is crucial for improving teachers' feedback practices.

2.3. Challenges in Giving Written Feedback

To maximize the effectiveness of written feedback, teachers must overcome various challenges in its delivery. One major challenge is time and relevance, which are critical aspects of providing effective feedback. Delayed feedback or feedback unrelated to recent student actions may lose its effectiveness (Ilgen, Fisher, & Taylor, 1979). Moreover, the unique characteristics of each student, such as prior knowledge, learning preferences, and attitudes toward feedback, add complexity to delivering effective feedback (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Teachers must

recognize and address the diverse needs of students, which can be challenging in diverse classroom settings (Bogdanova & Snoeck, 2019).

Additionally, finding the ideal balance between constructive criticism and positive reinforcement is challenging. Overly positive feedback does not provide the necessary direction for improvement, while overly negative feedback can undermine student motivation (Sadler, 2010). Boud and Molloy (2022) emphasize the importance of maintaining a balance between critique and positive reinforcement to sustain student engagement and encourage a growth mindset.

Furthermore, feedback should be specific enough to guide improvement while remaining clear for students to fully understand the criticism. Overly general or ambiguous feedback can confuse students and reduce its effectiveness (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Shute (2008) found that learning outcomes are less optimal when feedback is vague and often neglects critical areas for development.