Pre-service English Teachers' Responses to Writing Online Instruction and Critical Teacher Feedback

Haerazi
Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika, Indonesia
Email: haerazi@undikma.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The use of online learning facilitates pre-service teachers to attain effective learning activities with proper teaching materials. This study is aimed at investigating pre-service English teachers' responses to online instruction and responses to critical teacher feedback. This study is categorized as a descriptive qualitative study. This kind of study is chosen because researchers need to attain data relating to responses, attitudes, or opinions. The data of this study cover the pre-service teachers' opinions on their writing online instruction and their critical teacher feedback during the teaching of writing fully online. The data are analyzed in qualitative ways and the data are presented in the form of percentages and reasons for their responses to the research issues. The percentage data are used to strengthen the pre-service teachers' opinions or responses to writing online instruction and critical teacher feedback. The research findings showed that the implementation of online writing instruction and giving critical feedback are proper to help pre-service English teachers reformulate their texts. The pre-service English teachers gave positive responses. It is proven that they are able to manage their time in writing activities during online learning. The kinds of feedback given include oral recast, oral metalinguistic correction, written direct correction, and written metalinguistic correction. They feel more comfortable with those types of critical feedback provided by lecturers. The implication of the study practically shows that the findings suggest teachers' critical feedback and online learning may work together to aid writing development.

Keywords: *critical teacher feedback; online learning; writing online; writing skills; written corrective feedback.*

INTRODUCTION

Online language instruction in ELT takes place in web-based, blended learning, hybrid courses, or fully virtual learning (Blake, 2011). The delivery format is done online in which pre-service teachers do not meet each other in a face-to-face context (Méndez-Carbajo & Wolla, 2019). A face-to-face course has affordances that are different from online language instruction. Online language instruction can foster autonomous learning and can reach broader participants than face-to-face learning (Gacs & Spasova, 2020; Tarone, 2015). Online language learning can be carried out virtually in different places such as using teleconferencing in Google Meet and Zoom meeting media. Online learning has been met as efficiently as face-to-face teaching (Moneypenny & Aldrich, 2016). Fully online instruction is mostly done in the ELT context nowadays. In this context, all teachers or lecturers must teach their subjects through online instruction. This compulsion happens not only around Indonesia but across the globe.

EFL teachers are demanded to engage pre-service teachers in online learning using various learning tools. The use of online learning aims to help pre-service teachers attain effective learning activities with proper teaching materials (Gacs & Spasova, 2020; Saeed & Ghazali, 2016) and to diminish covid-19 outbreak around students' and teachers' environment. Learning tools commonly used by Indonesian teachers are google classroom,

google meet, email, and WhatsApp devices (Haerazi et al., 2020; Sukmawati & Nensia, 2019; Mospan, 2018). The use of various online devices is oriented to facilitate students to practice writing and give effective written feedback to pre-service teachers.

In the EFL writing literature, extensive studies have been conducted on the influence of feedback in teaching writing skills (Ellis et al., 2008; Baker & Hansen-Bricker, 2010; Benson & DeKeyser, 2019), types of feedback given by teachers (Kim et al., 2020; Karim & Nassaji, 2020), and students' perception on feedback forms (Bonilla López et al., 2018; Tan et al., 2020). Unfortunately, there is a limited number of focusing on teachers' perception of critical feedback of online learning and how pre-service teachers respond to critical teacher feedback. It remains quite unmapped. This study aims to gain insight into how English pre-service teachers' perception of writing online instruction and how their responses are toward critical teacher feedback of writing online learning at higher education.

In the present study, critical feedback refers to information that asks or asserts whether there is a need to replace aspects of pre-service teachers' performance or understanding (Bjørndal, 2020). It also can refer to grammatical structures even though pre-service teachers' mistakes are certainly not limited to grammatical structures (Kim et al., 2020; Sippel, 2019). It is in connection with Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) who argue that

students made mistakes and they received critical feedback on errors regarding grammar, phonology, lexis, and semantics. The current study addresses readers to pre-service teachers' perception on critical feedback of online learning and critical mentor feedback strategies. Commonly, in offline learning, pre-service teachers are provided with feedback while they are writing. It is also can be given by teachers in online learning.

Critical feedback in ELT is corrective feedback provided by teachers critically in order that pre-service teachers have the desire to change or revise what teachers request and suggest (Alshuraidah & Storch, 2019; Storch, 2010). Critical feedback also concerns the need to modify the pre-service teachers' practice in the form of delivering questions. It aims to encourage pre-service teachers to reflect and think about their comprehension of practice (Crutcher & Naseem, 2016). It is the same tone as Bjorndal (2020) who defines critical feedback as information given by teachers who are asking or asserting a need to revise or change pre-service teachers' understanding or understanding. Therefore, critical written feedback in this article refers to corrective feedback provided by teachers to reflect and think about pre-service teachers' writing products. It is oriented to change pre-service teachers' writing practice and comprehension. In addition, feedback in ELT always refers to two types of feedback

that are direct and indirect feedback (Lee, 2019).

Giving critical feedback for pre-service teachers is a challenging one because it can develop their competences through reflection (Crasborn et al., 2011; Crutcher & Naseem, 2016). English teachers encourage them to reflect on their writing processes and products. The writing processes refer to activities in which pre-service teachers correct the processes of making drafts, revision, editing, and publications. The writing products refer to activities in which pre-service teachers accomplish a certain type of text such as complete descriptive text or exposition text (Rostamian et al., 2018; Du & List, 2020). For teachers, encouraging them is a key task in improving both writing processes and products (Haerazi, Irawan, Suadiyatno, & Hidayatullah, 2020).

In online instruction, English teachers give their feedback to pre-service teachers in the form of oral and written feedback (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2010). These two feedback forms can differ in practice. Oral corrective feedback occurs online. The feedback is provided after pre-service teachers carry out errors, while written corrective feedback is inevitably offline, and pre-service teachers are provided feedback in which there is a delay between those who make errors and receiving the feedback (Ellis, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010). In the present study, English teachers conducted the writing classes in fully online. They bring their learners in online

instruction using some learning tools. By investigating the efficacy of feedback types on writing classes, the current study is started from pre-service teachers' responses on writing online learning. Thus, it is continued to find out their responses to critical teacher feedback in online learning.

In this study, the language skill is focused on writing skills because writing is the most difficult language skill to be acquired by English learners because it needs various competences such as cognitive, sociocultural, and linguistic competences (Haerazi et al. 2020; Sukesi et al., 2019; Haerazi et al., 2018). Because of this, English lecturers or teachers are demanded to provide pre-service teachers with appropriate teaching-learning methods, materials, and media. In pandemic, teaching writing is done in online or synchronous learning. Teachers strive to provide pre-service teachers with technology-based writing tasks (Kim et al., 2020). It helps them to practice writing with various tasks. During the writing learning-teaching synchronously, teachers give feedback for them in the form of oral and written feedback (Ellis et al., 2008). In addition, teachers applied learning activities such as small collaborative writing activities virtually. Collaborative writing activities help pre-service English teachers to create simple sentences and facilitate them in generating creating texts requested by teachers (Alshuraidah & Storch, 2019). The learning tools employed to facilitate pre-service teachers in carrying out writing processes include google classroom, google meet, email, and WhatsApp application.

This article also elaborates on some types of oral feedback provided by English teachers such as oral recast and oral metalinguistic correction. In written feedback, researchers also investigate feedback of such written direct correction and written metalinguistic correction. In the teaching of writing in some higher educations, teaching writing skills is carried out through online instruction. Therefore, the present study sets out to investigate pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction and critical feedback provided by English teachers. The following two research questions guided the study: (1) how English pre-service teachers respond to writing online instruction are; and (2) how pre-service teachers respond to critical teacher feedback in online learning. The novelty of the current study lies in deep analysis or understanding of pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction, and the results become a consideration to find out their greater responses to critical teacher feedback in the teaching of writing skills in online learning.

METHOD

This study aims to investigate English pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction and critical teacher feedback in the higher education institutions at West Nusa Tenggara,

Indonesia. This study is categorized as a descriptive qualitative study. This kind of study is chosen because researchers need to attain data relating to responses, attitudes, or opinions (Miles et al., 2016). The data of this study cover the pre-service teachers' opinions on their writing online instruction and on their critical teacher feedback during the teaching of writing in fully online. The data are presented in the form of percentage and reasons as their responses to the two issues. The percentage data are used to strengthen the pre-service teachers' opinions or responses to writing online instruction and critical teacher feedback. There are 99 pre-service teachers involved in filling out questionnaire items and 30 pre-service English teachers are involved in deep interview activities in the current study.

The current study employs a questionnaire and interview technique to attain the data relating to the pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction and critical teacher feedback. The two instruments permit researchers to measure and summarize pre-service teachers' attitudes and opinions as their responses to the two issues investigated (Miles et al., 2016); (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The questionnaire covers statements corresponding to the writing online learning activities, and the efficacy of online learning processes. It is presented with adapting Likert Scale that has five options to be marked by pre-service teachers. The options include the Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The questionnaire contains ten statements distributed to pre-service teachers, and it is close-ended questions or statements. The answers are visualized in the form of percentage, and the results are also continued by conducting interview sessions. In the interview sessions, 30 pre-service English teachers are purposively asked to provide their reasons or responses to the two main issues in the present study. The results of interview activities are performed in descriptive or narrative responses.

The data of this study are collected using a questionnaire and interview sheets. The questionnaire is distributed at the end of semester because the fully online learning is carried out in the whole semester. The data are then analyzed by measuring and calculating the percentage of each option of the Likert Scale. To make the data stronger, researchers do the process of describing, abstracting, and transforming the option that has been chosen by pre-service teachers in the form of narrations (Cohen et al., 2018). The data of pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback are attained through interview activities. The results are then analyzed in qualitative ways. The data analysis of this comprises the process of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification (Miles et al., 2016). In the step of data condensation, researchers select and simplify the interview results in line with the research

problems. The data are then organized in the form of extended paragraphs which contain an assembly of information in accordance with each aspect of the questions. It is then called the phase of data display. Afterward, the data are verified and concluded in terms of a complete description.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This study is aimed at investigating pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction and critical teacher feedback in the teaching of writing skills at higher education institutions in West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The issues of pre-service teachers' responses to online learning are gained through the questionnaire distribution and interview sheets. The findings are presented in the form of percentages and pre-service teachers' answers or reasons on each item.

Meanwhile, the data of pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback in the teaching of writing skills are grouped into tables. The data are attained through themes asked to pre-service teachers. Themes are classified according to the respectful inquiry theory in the context of feedback.

Pre-service teachers' responses to the writing online instruction

To gain data on pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction, researchers distribute questionnaires to 99 pre-service teachers and interview 30 pre-service teachers of writing classes. The interview is conducted to support questionnaire results. There are 11 items to be marked by English pre-service teachers around West Nusa Tenggara. The result of the questionnaire is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Pre-service Teachers' Responses to Writing Online Instruction

No	Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I can administer my time of learning when I have to practice writing in online instruction.	-	-	11%	20%	69%
2	I can adjust my learning to accomplish my writing in online learning.	-	-	45%	46%	8%
3	Online instruction is convenient for writing activities.	-	-	19%	76%	5%
4	Online instruction allows the lecturer to provide feedback to my writing.	-	1%	6%	28%	63%
5	Online instruction was effectively employed in writing processes.	-	-	20%	33%	46%
6	Online instruction was effectively implemented for exploring writing exercises.	-	-	14%	29%	56%

7	Online instruction activities allowed me to write a good text.	-	7%	30%	60%	2%
8	Online instruction was used effectively for doing richer learning activities (Individual work, pair work, group work).	-	-	22%	14%	61%
9	Writing Online instruction requires using various learning tools (Google classroom, google meet, Email, WhatsApp, e-Dictionary).	-	-	7%	24%	67%
10	Writing online instruction requires a lecturer's digital literacy.	-	-	9%	24%	65%
11	Online instruction is effective for boosting motivation and engagement in EFL classrooms.	-	-	9%	18%	71%

Table 1 provides a visual presentation of questionnaire results of writing online instruction marked by 30 pre-service teachers. The items consist of 11 questions. Findings are presented in the form of percentage of each item. The statements of the targeted responses are classified into four big issues (time management, feeling, effectiveness, writing activities, and lecturer's professionalism). The responses indicate writing online instruction can facilitate pre-service teachers to practice writing effectively by using various learning tools. However, these pre-service teachers' responses are continued by conducting interviews to know reasons of their responses marked in the questionnaire. Ten pre-service teachers are involved in interview activities. The result of interview activities is demonstrated in Table 2.

Table 2. Pre-service Teachers' Responses to Writing Online Instruction by Interviews

No	Questions	Reasons (Sample Excerpts)
1	Can you administer your time of learning when you have to practice writing in online instruction?	S4: "…my lecturer gives me a schedule of writing subject. Due to this I can adjust my time of learning to practice writing and do exercises in online learning…" S10: "…my lecturer gives me google classroom website to be accessed, I can open it and adjust my time to practice writing in online instruction…".
2	How do you adjust your learning to accomplish writing exercises in online learning?	S3: "…when my lecturer provides me with writing exercises, I can find other resources of how to write topic sentences or supporting sentences…When I do not understand what the lecturer commands, I ask a help to my friend to explain it…". S9: "…I always accomplish my writing tasks because I use e-dictionary to accomplish my writing tasks. I must understand the lecturer's instruction first and then I create some drafts in line with the exercises requested…".

No	Questions	Reasons (Sample Excerpts)
3	Is online instruction convenient for your writing activities?	S2: "…composing sentences in online learning enables me to accomplish my writing tasks quickly…I enjoy my learning style and I feel easy to find out some examples of texts to be imitated…" S6: "…writing online instruction facilitates me to practice writing easily…I can open e-dictionary and access Grammarly devices to check my writing projects…"
4	Does online instruction allow the lecturer to provide feedback to your writing?	S1: "…online instruction makes me and my lecturer can communicate easily…I can receive direct critical feedback in online learning…" S5: "…my lecturer can provide me with direct feedback in google meet while writing exercises and he also gives me the written critical feedback about my text…"
5	Is online instruction effectively employed in carrying out writing processes?	S9: "…in online learning, my lecturer gives me an explanation of how we arrange a complete text by doing drafting, editing, revising, and presenting processes…I can do it well through online…" S10: "…in composing a full paragraph, using online learning tools make me easy to create ideas to compose sentences…"
6	Is online instruction effectively implemented for exploring writing exercises?	S6: "…in google classroom, my lecturer provides me with various writing exercises to generate a complete exposition text…this helps me to express my opinions of certain problems…" S7: "…using mobile phones helps me access and explore my writing exercises in an online way…"
7	Does online instruction activities encourage you to write a good text?	S1: "…with various exercises provided by the lecturer, I can generate a complete text…" S3: "…in online direct and indirect feedback, the lecturer provides me with some teaching materials of writing…It helps me to understand certain generic structures of the text…"
8	Is online instruction used effectively for doing richer learning activities (Individual work, pair work, group work)?	S4: "…when we are in online learning, we always generate various introductory paragraph of the exposition text because we work in a group. S5: "…we can produce a complete exposition text because we work in pairs. We always discuss our writing tasks via WhatsApp application.
9	Does writing Online instruction require using various learning tools (Google classroom, google meet, Email, WhatsApp, e-Dictionary)?	S7: "…when we are in online learning, most of us use google classroom to see our writing tasks…we utilize WhatsApp to communicate…e-Dictionary is useful for us to translate some difficult words"
10	Does writing online instruction require a lecturer's digital literacy?	S8: "…According to me, my lecturer has enough digital knowledge in carrying out online instruction…he asks their students to check Google classroom and email… we sometimes conduct the writing class via Google meet. S10: "…I believe my writing lecturer has enough digital knowledge so we can operate online learning classes…"

No	Questions	Reasons (Sample Excerpts)
11	Is online instruction effective for boosting motivation and engagement in EFL classrooms?	S1: "…online learning makes us enable to accomplish our writing projects or tasks effectively because we have good motivation to do those…we are involved in each writing activity individually or in group…" S4: "…online learning gives us many chances to accomplish our writing tasks…the lecturer provides us good feedback toward our texts…It make us encouraged of completing writing tasks…"

From 30 research participants, 10 pre-service teachers are involved in interview activities. Most of them argue that online instruction helps them accomplish their writing tasks or project effectively. Table 2 presents that online instruction can encourage pre-service teachers to work collaboratively. It can be done in individual work, in pairs, and in groups. When they do not understand the writing tasks or teaching materials, they endeavor to communicate with their partners. It can be done via email, WhatsApp application, and google meet. However, there are others who encounter hindrances to learn individually in online learning, and they couldn't perform the learning activities well. In addition, most students admit that in order to deliver the appropriate writing materials and to give critical feedback and correction to their writing tasks, a professional lecturer is required. A qualified lecturer is needed to provide critical feedback and input on pre-service teachers' writing products.

Pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback

The data of pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback are gained through interview activities. The critical teacher feedback is provided by the teacher on pre-service teachers' texts. The teacher gives critical comments on their texts not only dealing with linguistic aspects but also with perception of a crucial aspect of writing practice. The feedback of linguistic aspects refers to knowledge of grammars, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Non-linguistic feedback deals with the organization, content, and topical elaboration of the written text. In the present study, feedback can be given by the teacher through oral and written ways in online learning. The pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Interview Results of Pre-service Teachers' Responses to Critical Teacher Feedback

No	Themes	Pre-service English teachers' responses (S)
1	Oral recasts (grammar, vocabulary, language use)	S5: "…when the lecturer provides me in oral recast, I often fail to notice what he suggests to me…in the grammar correction case, I can revise it directly…" S7: "…when the lecturer corrects my text orally, I understand directly what I should do then about my text…"
2	Written direct correction (grammar, vocabulary, language use, organization, content, elaboration)	S3: "…I can develop my text in detail when my lecturer provides me written correction…I can understand in detail what the lecturer suggests through written direct correction on my text…" S8: "…written direct correction given to me makes my learning better than before because the lecturer gives me correct forms, and how to express ideas into writing pieces…"
3	Oral metalinguistic feedback (grammar, vocabulary, language use, organization, content, elaboration)	S1: "…I am pleased to hear my lecturer when giving linguistic information toward my text… he also gives a correction of the forms of language use…" S4: "…when the lecturer gives me metalinguistic information of how to use 'articles', I become more careful in using those in creating paragraphs…"
4	Written metalinguistic correction (grammar, vocabulary, language use, organization, content, elaboration)	S2: "…when I make errors in my text, the lecturer gives me linguistic explanation in detail why it is stated error, and he provides a correct form in it…" …it makes me more understand how to express correct forms and word use…" S6: "…the written metalinguistic correction makes me more understand what was wrong and how to correct it…the lecturer's explanation helps me to finish my writing works…"

The critical feedback given by the lecturer in various ways. Table 3 provides a visual description of the lecturer's critical feedback. It consists of four critical feedback treatments or techniques. Those include oral recast, written direct feedback, oral metalinguistic feedback, and written metalinguistic feedback. The oral recast takes place when the pre-service teacher makes an error using recast online learning. In addition, the lecturer provides pre-service teachers with metalinguistic explanation (oral metalinguistic feedback) or correction getting along with oral recast. These two techniques of feedback happen when pre-service teachers accomplish their writing exercises supervised by the lecturer. Thus, the written corrective feedback takes place as pre-service teachers make errors in their texts. In the same time,

the lecturer provides them with written metalinguistic information. These two types of feedback are given after they accomplish their complete texts. The first two techniques of giving feedback are different from the last two ones of feedback in the form of medium and time of providing the feedback.

Discussion

Critical feedback is essential for developing pre-service teachers' writing products through reflection based on feedback provided. The current study is aimed at investigating pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction and responses to critical lecturer feedback in the teaching of writing skills. The two key issues are presented in this section in line with the research findings.

Pre-service teachers' responses to writing online instruction

Some issues relating to writing online instruction are distributed for students to be answered in the form of questionnaire. Pre-service teachers' responses dealt with how they administer learning time when they practice writing in online instruction. Mostly, they gave positive responses. It is proven that they can manage their writing activities during online learning. When lecturers provide their writing tasks to produce a complete text, they can learn the generic structure of the text and discuss it with their friends or ask lecturers about it through online.

Online learning enables them to raise their quality of higher-level writing. It is in line with Ozgur (2020) who argues that online learning facilitates learners to learn teaching materials fast and effectively. They can also improve their writing quality and enhance their sense of self-control over online learning (Curwood et al., 2017; Xianwei et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2021).

Online learning in the teaching of writing skills gives pre-service teachers to open many kinds of learning tools to check and revise their writing texts effectively and accurately. For instance, Grammarly application employed is very familiar for learners in checking their writing texts (Li & Zhu, 2017; Saeed & Ghazali, 2016). Through online learning activities, they access some resources to support their ideas or topics to write (Chapelle, 2012; Son, 2018). Because of this, they can adjust their time to practice writing and do a lot of exercises in online learning. It was supported by interview results in which they can access Writing Checker program in online learning to see whether their complete paragraph was written well or not. Compared with offline writing activities, online learning activities are able to facilitate pre-service teachers to adjust their time and accomplish writing tasks efficiently.

Writing activities in the current study refer to process-based and product-based learning activities. In the process-based activities, pre-service teachers are asked to focus on the control of technique.

The control of techniques tends to learner-centered writing activities in which they carry out brain-storming, planning, multiple drafting, and peer collaboration before writing. These stress more cognitive aspects (Bakla, 2020; Haerazi, Utama, et al., 2020). In brain-storming activities, they can generate some ideas to write. Through online learning, they perform interactive brainstorming in groups. During the brainstorming, lecturers lead them to creates some draft writing that can be used as topic sentences and supporting sentences later on. In product-based learning activities, pre-service teachers are directed to focus on language structures. They are asked to pay attention to arrangement of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs. It makes them easy to see whether their formal text units and grammatical features of the text are arranged and written well. It is in accordance with Biber et al. (2011) and Gao and Ma (2019) who inform that writing activities should be oriented to language structures because writing relates to grammatical and lexical knowledge. Also, writing improvement is considered as the result of imitating and manipulating processes provided by lecturers (Haerazi, et al., 2020; Haerazi & Kazemian, 2021).

In the process-based and product-based writing activities, lecturers provide pre-service teachers with various writing activities. The familiarization process of the text going to be written is subjected to pre-service teachers during writing activities.

According to their responses, familiarization of the text directs them to comprehend what grammar forms and vocabulary are applied in a certain text. It is in line with Haerazi et al. (2018) who reported that texts are usually regarded as a series of appropriate grammatical structures, and learners can generate various sentences with manipulating and imitating the model text. In online learning, pre-service teachers conduct the familiarization process through a peer collaboration. As the result, they can produce a complete descriptive text. During producing a complete descriptive text, they manipulate fixed patterns from a substitution graphic organizer provided by lecturers. In peer collaboration, they explore the model text to be imitated. In doing so, the lecturers' role is controller. These activities are then called the controlled-writing activity.

As a controller, lecturers have chances to provide pre-service teachers with various feedback. The process is done in online writing learning. The kinds of feedback given by lecturers consist of linguistic aspects and non-linguistic. The feedback of linguistic aspects refers to knowledge of grammars, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. It is in line with Curwood et al. (2017) who found the linguistic aspects are essential to be assessed in the teaching of writing. It aims to provide learners with understanding of how the lexical and syntactical forms are combined as a demonstration of knowledge

to create texts (Sheen, 2010; Storch, 2010). At the same time, non-linguistic feedback deals with the organization, content, and topical elaboration of the written text. In the present study, feedback is given by lecturers through oral and written ways in online learning. The feedback is carried out in the oral recast, written direct feedback, oral metalinguistic feedback, and written metalinguistic feedback. The research findings indicate that giving these kinds of feedback encourage pre-service teachers to accomplish their writing assignments easily.

Pre-service teachers compose their writing tasks effectively with utilizing online learning platforms such as Google classroom, google meet, email, WhatsApp, and e-Dictionary. Many studies reveal that these flatforms are helpful for English learners to develop their linguistic competences (Haerazi et al., 2020; Haerazi & Kazemian, 2021). In the study, pre-service teachers are facilitated with these learning tools in the online writing classes. The findings showed that the learning processes run well. It is proven by which they have great motivation to follow the online learning and are able to accomplish their writing tasks. For instance, they create a WhatsApp group to conduct a discussion. In group, they carry out Google meet session to decide what they have written linguistically accurate or not. At the same time, they consulted their writing to lecturers to give good feedback. The

feedback is often given in the form of oral and written direct feedback.

Pre-service teachers' responses to critical teacher feedback

Feedback is carried out by lecturers during pre-service teachers do writing tasks online and after they completes their writing. The kinds of feedback given include oral recast, oral metalinguistic correction, written direct correction, and written metalinguistic correction. Synchronously, lecturers provide pre-service teachers with those kinds of feedback. It takes place online while pre-service teachers are in the process of composing their writing and after completing their texts. The feedback is afforded to make their writing to be better and linguistically accurate. It is in accordance with Sheen (2010) who reveals that written feedback or oral feedback is aimed at helping learners develop and increase their linguistic competence and accuracy. Giving that feedback was responded in various responses by pre-service teachers.

Dealing with oral recast feedback, pre-service teachers feel that they can notice a number of grammatical features, and they can make correction explicitly and directly. Synchronously, lecturers provided them with some correction and correct forms. It is often in the form of clarification and elicitation. According to some pre-service teachers, oral recast feedback can contribute to develop their implicit

knowledge of writing processes and linguistic competence. It is in line with Gao and Ma (2019) & Shintani and Ellis (2013) who inform that recast feedback is effective for learners to conduct cognitive comparison on how they reformulate their utterances into written forms. They are able to eliminate the interlanguage effects when they practice to write. Oral recast feedback can also promote learners to acquire linguistic knowledge and recognize their corrective force (Ha et al., 2021). Nevertheless, pre-service teachers often fail to notice well what lecturers suggest to them. When this happens, lecturers announce some mistakes that should be corrected.

Oral feedback differs from written feedback. As written in the literature review of the current study, oral corrective feedback is afforded online and directed at individual pre-service teachers (Lyster & Saito, 2010; Xu et al., 2017). One of oral feedback types provided for pre-service teachers is oral metalinguistic correction. This feedback helps pre-service teachers reformulate their texts. The correction is focused on correct forms following errors, and at the same time they are given linguistic information. According to research findings, some pre-service teachers feel more comfortable by giving linguistic information along with the correct forms toward their texts. Linguistic information provided refreshes their memory of the grammatical accuracy, coherence, discourse features, and language structures. Synchronously, lecturers explain the linguistic information, and learners notice the correction. For instance, lecturers explore to them how English articles (a, an, the) are applied as noun marks. Nevertheless, oral metalinguistic correction often fails to encourage learners to notice deep linguistic correction and improve grammatical awareness, as noted by some researchers (Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2010; Shintani & Ellis, 2013). It is supported by interview results. Some pre-service teachers feel fail to notice the metalinguistic feedback given by lecturers.

Differed from oral feedback, written direct correction is provided for pre-service teachers to help them correct their writing texts in terms of grammatical accuracy. Written direct correction feedback is the most effect in helping learners to improve their writing quality. It is supported by some pre-service teachers' responses in which they feel easy to compose a complete paragraph and even a text because lecturers give a written elaboration of linguistic knowledge, vocabulary choices, syntactic patterns, and cohesive devices that comprise the essential building of texts. They can imitate and manipulate the model text given in the written feedback (Haerazi et al., 2020; Haerazi & Irawan, 2019; Han & Hiver, 2018). Using Review-Tracking tool in Microsoft Word makes them easy to comprehend and understand deeply the grammatical correction. Synchronously, lecturers and pre-service teachers discuss

and communicate the writing problems and linguistic correction successfully. For instance, lecturers in composing organization of a complete descriptive text give written correction how the generic structure of the text should be paid attention. The identification paragraph or introductory paragraph of a descriptive text should be composed clearly. Based on the written feedback, pre-service teachers are able to reformulate their sentences in the part of this. In another word, they give response toward lecturers' critical feedback positively.

The pre-service teachers' responses on lecturers' critical feedback are positive because the feedback leads them to make their writing to become good coherent arrangement of words, clauses, and sentences. Besides the oral metalinguistic correction is provided for pre-service teachers, lecturers also deliver them with written metalinguistic feedback. According to pre-service teachers' responses, written metalinguistic feedback is more explicit input compared than oral metalinguistic correction. Written metalinguistic feedback is delivered through an email and often via WhatsApp devices. In doing so, lecturers comment the texts produced by individual learner. The feedback is delayed. The written metalinguistic feedback in this study refers to grammar, vocabulary, language use, organization, content, and elaboration. It helps pre-service teachers develop effective paragraphs. It is in line with Biber et al. (2011) and Haerazi and

Kazemian (2021) who argues that written metalinguistic feedback can help learners to develop different types of paragraphs through the creation of topic sentence, supporting sentences, and transition.

CONCLUSION

The research findings showed that the implementation of online writing instruction and giving critical feedback toward pre-service teachers' writing texts was proper to help pre-service English teachers reformulate their texts. The pre-service English teachers gave positive responses. It was proven that they are able administer their times in writing activities during online learning. When lecturers provide their writing tasks, they are able to arrange the generic structure of the text and discuss it with their friends or ask lecturers about it synchronously. Online learning enables them to raise their quality of higher-level writing. It emphasizes pre-service teachers to open many kinds of learning tools to check and revise their writing texts effectively and accurately. The use of Grammarly application is most familiar for learners in checking their writing texts. In the teaching of online writing instruction, pre-service English teachers are involved in learning activities focused on process-based learning and product-based learning. It was carried out in full control of techniques tending to learner-centered writing activities consisting of brain-storming, planning, multiple drafting, and peer collaboration

before writing. Because of this, pre-service English teachers feel easy to generate a complete text.

Giving various critical feedback toward pre-service English teachers was able to help them reorganize their texts to become good coherent arrangement of words, clauses, and sentences. Feedback is carried out by lecturers during pre-service teachers do writing tasks online and after they completes their writing. The kinds of feedback given include oral recast, oral metalinguistic correction, written direct correction, and written metalinguistic correction. Synchronously, lecturers provide pre-service English teachers with those kinds of feedback. The feedback is afforded to make their writing to be better and linguistically accurate. Because of this, they gave positive responses. They feel more comfortable with those types of critical feedback provided by lecturers. It was proven that they are able to revise their texts to be better than the previous writing texts.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Conceptualization and research design were carried out by the author, who formulated the research questions and objectives of the study. He was involved in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data. The author conducted interviews with participants, transcribed and coded the data, and conducted rigorous data analysis. He was responsible for critically reviewing the relevant literature, synthesizing the existing knowledge, and providing a theoretical framework for the study. The author also contributed to the writing of the manuscript, including drafting and revising the content, ensuring clarity, coherence, and logical flow of ideas.

REFERENCES

Alshuraidah, A., & Storch, N. (2019). Investigating a collaborative approach to peer feedback. *ELT Journal*, *73*(2), 166–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy057

Baker, W., & Hansen Bricker, R. (2010). The effects of direct and indirect speech acts on native English and ESL speakers' perception of teacher written feedback. *System*, *38*(1), 75–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.007

Bakla, A. (2020). A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing. *Language Learning*, *24*(1), 107–128. https://doi.org/10125/44712

Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2019). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, *23*(6), 702–726. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770921

Biber, D., Nekrasova, T., & Horn, B. (2011). The effectiveness of feedback for L1-English and L2-writing development: A meta-analysis. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2011*(1), i–99. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2333-8504.2011.tb02241.x

Bjørndal, C. R. P. (2020). Student teachers' responses to critical mentor feedback: A study of face-saving strategies in teaching placements. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *91*, 103047. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103047

Blake, R. J. (2011). Current trends in online language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511100002X

Bonilla López, M., Van Steendam, E., Speelman, D., & Buyse, K. (2018). The Differential Effects of Comprehensive Feedback Forms in the Second Language Writing Class. *Language Learning*, *68*(3), 813–850. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12295

Chapelle, C. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Mobile-Assisted Language Learning*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0768.pub2

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education (8th Edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Crasborn, F., Hennissen, P., Brouwer, N., Korthagen, F., & Bergen, T. (2011). Exploring a two-dimensional model of mentor teacher roles in mentoring dialogues. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*(2), 320–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.014

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (Fifth Edition). In *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53, Issue 9). Los

Angeles: Sage Publication. https://lccn.loc.gov/2017044644

Crutcher, P. A., & Naseem, S. (2016). Cheerleading and cynicism of effective mentoring in current empirical research. *Educational Review*, *68*(1), 40–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2015.1058749

Curwood, J. S., Lammers, J. C., & Magnifico, A. M. (2017). From Research to Practice: Writing, Technology, and English Teacher Education. In H. L. Hallman (Ed.), *Advances in Research on Teaching* (Vol. 27, pp. 121–141). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-368720170000027007

Du, H., & List, A. (2020). Researching and writing based on multiple texts. *Learning and Instruction*, *66*(July 2018), 101297. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.101297

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990544

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 353–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Gacs, A., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis - prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12460

Gao, J., & Ma, S. (2019). The effect of two forms of computer-automated metalinguistic corrective feedback. *Language Learning & Technology*, *23*(2), 65–83. https://doi.org/10125/44683

Ha, X. V., 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), e07550. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550

Haerazi, H., & Irawan, L. A. (2019). Practicing Genre-Based Language Teaching Model to Improve Students' Achievement of Writing Skills. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *4*(1), 9. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v4i1.246

Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., Suadiyatno, T., & Hidyatullah, H. (2020). Triggering preservice teachers' writing skills through genre-based instructional model viewed from creativity. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, *9*(1), 234. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i1.20395

Haerazi, H., & Kazemian, M. (2021). *Self-Regulated Writing Strategy as a Moderator of Metacognitive Control in Improving Prospective Teachers' Writing Skills*. *1*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.36312/ejolls.v1i1.498

Haerazi, H., Utama, I. M. P., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Mobile Applications to Improve English Writing Skills Viewed from Critical Thinking Ability for Pre-Service Teachers. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, *14*(07), 58. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i07.11900

Haerazi, Irwansyah, D., Juanda, & Azis, Y. A. (2018). Incorporating intercultural competences in developing English materials for writing classes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *9*(3), 540–547. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0903.13

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *40*, 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.03.001

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, *24*(4), 519–539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Kim, Y. J., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53*(1), 176–199. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443

Lee, I. (2019). Teacher written corrective feedback: Less is more. *Language Teaching*, *52*(4), 524–536. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000247

Li, M., & Zhu, W. (2017). Explaining dynamic interactions in wiki-based collaborative writing. *Language Learning*, *21*(2), 25.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis.

In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). Kean University. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How Do Learners Perceive Interactional Feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471–497. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100004010

Méndez-Carbajo, D., & Wolla, S. A. (2019). Segmenting Educational Content: Long-Form vs. Short-Form Online Learning Modules. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 33(2), 108–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2019.1583514

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2016). *Quantitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (Third). Los Angeles: Sage Publication.

Moneypenny, D. B., & Aldrich, R. S. (2016). Online and face-to-face language learning: A comparative analysis of oral proficiency in introductory Spanish. *Journal of Educators Online*, 13(2), 105–134. https://doi.org/10.9743/jeo.2016.2.2

Mospan, N. (2018). Mobile teaching and learning English—A multinational perspective. *Teaching English with Technology*, 18(4), 105–125.

Özgür, H. (2020). Improving Teachers' Qualifications for Preparing ICT Based Educational Materials. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(1), 48–69. https://doi.org/10.17220/mojet.2021.9.1.245

Rostamian, M., Fazilatfar, A. M., & Jabbari, A. A. (2018). The effect of planning time on cognitive processes, monitoring behavior, and quality of L2 writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(4), 418–438. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817699239

Saeed, M. A., & Ghazali, K. (2016). Modeling Peer Revision among EFL Learners in an Online Learning Community. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(2), 275–292.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. In *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (Vol. 32, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990507

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on

learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 286–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011

Sippel, L. (2019). The impact of peer corrective feedback on vocabulary development. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(3), 595–611. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12416

Son, J.-B. (2018). Technology in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Teaching. In J. I. Liontas, T. International Association, & M. DelliCarpini (Eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–7). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0448

Storch, N. (2010). Critical Feedback on Written Corrective Feedback Research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 29. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119181

Sukesi, E., Emzir, & Akhadiyah, S. (2019). Reading habits, grammatical knowledge, creative thinking, and attainment in academic writing: Evidence from bengkulu university, Indonesia. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(3), 176–192.

Sukmawati, S., & Nensia, N. (2019). The Role of Google Classroom in ELT. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 1(2), 142–145. https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v1i2.1526

Tan, F. D. H., Whipp, P. R., Gagné, M., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2020). Expert teacher perceptions of two-way feedback interaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102930

Tarone, E. (2015). The issue: Online Foreign Language Education: What Are the Proficiency Outcomes? *Modern Language Journal*, 99(2), 392–393. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12220

Xianwei, G., Samuel, M., & Asmawi, A. (2016). *A Model Of Critical Peer Feedback To Facilitate Business English Writing Using Qzone Weblogs Among Chinese Undergraduates*. 4, 17.

Xu, Q., Dong, X., & Jiang, L. (2017). EFL Learners' Perceptions of Mobile-Assisted Feedback on Oral Production. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(2), 408–417. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.335

Zhang, H., Southam, A., Fanguy, M., & Costley, J. (2021). Understanding how embedded peer comments affect student quiz scores, academic

writing and lecture note-taking accuracy. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, *ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-01-2021-0011