

SUPERVISORS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RESPONSES TOWARDS FEEDBACK ON UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Aridah^{1*}, Muhamad Hambali², Maria Teodora Ping³, Iwan Setiawan⁴, Effendi Limbong⁵
¹²³⁴⁵ Mulawarman University
(aridah2707@gmail.com)

Received: April 2024; Revised: May 2024; Accepted: June 2024

ABSTRACT

This study explores the types of feedback given by supervisors on undergraduate thesis proposals and investigates how the students respond to the feedback. The data were collected from research proposal pages containing feedback and interview transcripts through a mixed method with a case study design. Four supervised students of the English Department at one university in Samarinda, whose graduation was delayed due to incompleteness of their theses, participated in this study. The quantitative data covered the total feedback occurrences and were analyzed using frequency and percentage. The qualitative data were taken from the interview transcript and were analyzed using a coding scheme based on feedback typologies by Ellis (2009), Cárcamo (2020), and Pearson (2022). The findings revealed that from a number of feedback types expected in this study, only 8 were identified, with implicit feedback being the most common. The students perceived supervisors' feedback as helpful and useful for revising their proposals, but they preferred explicit feedback because of its direct error corrections. Some supervisors' comments were unclear, making it difficult for the students to understand and do revisions. Yet, they hesitated to communicate with their supervisors because they were afraid and concerned about politeness. The study highlights the importance of aligning supervisor feedback practices with students' expectations and emphasizes the need for effective communication and good relationships to prevent delays in thesis completion.

Key Words: supervisors' written feedback; students' responses; thesis proposals

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi jenis-jenis umpan balik yang diberikan oleh dosen pembimbing pada proposal skripsi dan mengetahui bagaimana tanggapan mahasiswa terhadap umpan balik tersebut. Melalui penelitian gabungan antara kualitatif dan kuantitatif dengan desain studi kasus, data dikumpulkan dari dokumen proposal penelitian yang berisi feedback dan dari transkrip wawancara. Ada 4 mahasiswa bimbingan skripsi dari jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, yang kelulusannya tertunda karena belum menyelesaikan skripsi mereka dalam waktu yang ditentukan. Data kuantitatif meliputi semua umpan balik dan dianalisis menggunakan distribusi frekuensi dan persentase. Kualitatif data diambil dari transkrip wawancara dan dianalisis menggunakan skema pengkodean berdasarkan tipologi umpan balik oleh Ellis (2009), Cárcamo (2020), dan Pearson (2022). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa dari sejumlah jenis umpan balik yang diharapkan dalam penelitian ini, hanya ada 8 yang teridentifikasi, dengan umpan balik implisit merupakan umpan balik yang paling banyak diberikan. Mahasiswa berpendapat bahwa umpan balik dari supervisor bermanfaat dan membantu dalam merevisi proposal mereka, namun mereka lebih menyukai umpan balik eksplisit karena kesalahan bisa langsung dikoreksi. Beberapa komentar dosen pembimbing kurang jelas

sehingga menyulitkan mahasiswa untuk memahami dan melakukan revisi, namun mereka enggan berkomunikasi dengan dosen pembimbing karena mereka merasa takut dan khawatir kalau dianggap tidak sopan. Hasil penelitian ini menyoroti pentingnya menyelaraskan antara umpan balik yang dipakai dosen pembimbing dengan harapan mahasiswa dan menekankan perlunya komunikasi yang efektif dan hubungan baik untuk mencegah tertundanya penyelesaian tesis.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik tertulis, tanggapan mahasiswa, proposal skripsi

How to Cite: Aridah, Hambali, M., Ping, M. T., Setiawan, I., & Limbong, E. (2024). Supervisors' Written Feedback and Students' Responses towards Feedback on Undergraduate Research Proposals. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 11(1), 115-132. doi: 10.15408/ijee.v11i1.38427

INTRODUCTION

The thesis supervisor plays an important role in guiding students through the completion of their theses. They guide and direct students on the content and the use of language in their proposals. However, students' graduations are sometimes delayed because they are constrained by the revisions required based on the supervisor and examiner's feedback. They often do not understand what to do with the comments given by the supervisor in their thesis drafts, so it takes a relatively long time to make improvements. One major reason for students not to revise their draft in response to feedback is that they did not have a full understanding of the feedback (Bouwer & Dirkx, 2023)

In other words, they struggle to understand and implement the feedback that leads to prolonged revisions. In addition, the type of feedback given by the supervisor may be limited in scope and less varied and does not cover all aspects of writing problems, so the feedback provided can only facilitate certain students, namely those who are compatible with the type of feedback given.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) state that feedback is essential to the learning process because it gives students the knowledge they need to improve their performance and broaden their understanding. Feedback is one of the key components of teaching and learning that can help students improve the quality of their education (Ferris, 2006; Plaidaren & Shah, 2019; Mujtaba et al., n.d.; Lim & Renandya, 2020; Flushman et al., 2019; Al-Darei & Elhag, 2022; Nurcholis & Islamiati, 2022). In order to give timely, relevant, and constructive feedback that helps students improve their learning outcomes, supervisors should consider the variables influencing students' perceptions of Feedback (Nurcholis & Islamiati, 2022).

Students' postponement of their work is often associated with their struggle to revise their papers because they get confused by the feedback they receive from their supervisors. In their literature review, Chugh et al. (2022) found that overly harsh or cruel and critical feedback may negatively influence the student's motivation and confidence, leading to procrastination. Bouwer and Dirkx (2023) claimed that teachers who use difficult academic language in their feedback will make it hard for students to have adequate understanding and to use the feedback for revision.

A study conducted by Flushman et al. (2019) shows that supervisors tend to respond less frequently to important behaviors, such as helping develop the bilinguals, and more frequently with praise rather than ideas for improvement. This discrepancy becomes another potential reason why students usually postpone their revisions. In addition, students may be overwhelmed by the complexity of revisions or the lack of clarity of feedback, making it hard to implement it effectively.

Although feedback is believed to improve students' performance, it does not mean that all who have received feedback successfully make uptake and can revise their writing.

In responding to the teacher's feedback, students use different strategies. The strategy they use may affect the result of their revisions. A review by Li and De Luca (2014) revealed that of 37 studies selected from 363 articles and 20 journals published from 2000 to 2011, only little was found that students provided actual follow-up on their teachers' feedback. This finding may become one of the reasons why many students still do not make significant improvements even though they have been given much feedback from their teachers. In addition, there was a very limited number of studies addressing the response of the students to teacher written feedback, especially at the university level (Lee et al., 2017)

In reaction to the limited number of students who gave actual responses to the teacher feedback, Lee et al. (2017) then conducted a study on how students responded to the teacher feedback. They found that the way the students respond to teacher feedback is distinctive from one individual to another. Some strategies for responding to teacher feedback used by students in this study included reworking the text according to the teacher's direction, changing the highlighted errors, and using a software program.

This study aims to offer important insights into the various kinds of feedback frequently provided and whether that feedback helps students improve their work. This can assist in identifying areas that could be improved, such as giving more detailed feedback tailored to individual students' goals. This study is also expected to enhance our understanding of the types of feedback and the function of supervisors in helping students improve their proposals by providing them with necessary feedback. It can spotlight the types of feedback the supervisors offer students, how successful certain types of feedback are, and the circumstances in which feedback usually works. This study will also help supervisors or lecturers identify what feedback is effective and preferred by students, including how to balance critical and positive criticism, how to give feedback in a timely and encouraging manner, and how to utilize feedback to enhance student learning and growth.

METHODS

Research Design

This study applied a mixed method, combining quantitative and qualitative methods with a case study design. Given (2008) said that a case study is a type of research in which one or a few examples of phenomena are investigated in depth. (Lune & Berg, 2017) also defined a "case study as a method involving systematically gathering enough information about a particular person, social setting, event, or group to permit the researcher to understand how the subject operates or functions effectively." (p. 170).

Population and Sample

The study participants were selected using a purposive sampling method. Munhall (2008) stated that participants are chosen for a procedure known as purposive sampling if they meet requirements that the researcher has previously established to be relevant to answering the research question (e.g., people of a particular age or other demographic categories). There were 4 supervised students whose graduation was delayed because their thesis had not been completed by the end of their study timeframe.

Data Collection and Analysis

Table 1. Typology of Written Corrective Feedback by Ellis (2009)

Strategies	Description
Direct CF	The teacher points out the mistake and corrects it
Indirect CF	The teacher only points out the mistakes, but does not offer the correction.

Metalinguistic CF	The teacher gives a metalinguistic cue about the nature of the mistake by using an error code or writing an explanation.
Focus CF (Unfocused or Focused)	It refers to whether the teacher corrects all types of linguistic mistakes or the teacher focuses on only one aspect of linguistic errors.
Electronic Feedback	The teacher indicates the error and offers a hyperlink where the students will find more information about it.
Reformulation	A native speaker or teacher rewrites the part of the text to make it read more naturally. It is up to the student to accept the suggestions offered.

The six methods for providing feedback above were not employed consistently as criteria for categorizing the different forms of written feedback. For example, electronic feedback, considered one feedback strategy, appears to overlap with other types of feedback. Electronic feedback may include direct, indirect, or metalinguistic feedback. Another issue with this typology is its lack of systematicity. According to Cárcamo (2020), the typology "does not seem to be systematic enough, since not all feedback techniques seem to be mutually exclusive, which is not clarified by the investigator" (p. 215). He then offered an alternative typology of feedback such as follows:

Table 2. Comprehensive Written Corrective Feedback Typology by Cárcamo (2020)

Criteria	Categories
Specification (What)	Direct (correction) <i>Example: He was try to write a good essay. (<i>was trying</i>)</i>
	Localized indirect <i>Example: I <u>seen</u> her trying to talk to her friend about her situation</i>
	Unlocalized indirect <i>Example: Peter and Mark was looking for the best cars. (<i>2 mistakes</i>)</i>
Focus (What)	Focused on form and function <i>Example: They <u>was</u> not trying har overcome challenge, so Peter <u>were</u> very angry. "You were trying?", asked Peter.</i>
	Comprehensive focused (One structure, multiple uses) <i>Example: They <u>was</u> not trying har overcome challenge, so Peter <u>were</u> very angry. "<u>You were trying?</u>", asked Peter.</i>
	Unfocused (holistic) <i>Example: They <u>was</u> not trying <u>har (x)</u> overcome <u>(x)</u> challenge, so Peter <u>were</u> very angry. "<u>You were trying?</u>", asked Peter.</i>
Scope (What)	Micro (lexical-syntactic)
	Macro (structure, content)
	General (micro and macro)
Source (Who)	Teacher
	Classmate
	Student (self-assessment)
	External (native speaker, external examiner, computer, researcher)
Mode of delivery (How)	Mediated by computer
	Mediated by writing
Notes	Metalinguistic (explanations or symbols) <i>Example: People <u>is(1)</u> starting to realize the importance of voting. (1) People is a collective noun, so you should pay special attention to subject-verb agreement.</i>

(How)	Affective <i>Example: Although all the members work hard, it was not possible to convince congress. (1)</i> <i>(1) There is a problem with grammar, but I believe you'll be able to correct it quite easily. Excellent use of a concessive clause. You are doing a great job so far!</i>
	No comments

Pearson (2022) also classified written feedback based on the characteristics of teacher written feedback commentary on L2 writing.

Table 3. Typology of characteristics of teacher written feedback commentary on L2 writing (Pearson, 2022)

Commentary Characteristics	Description
Range of Focus: General, Discourse, Form Range of Focus: Focused, mid-focused, unfocused	A variety of textual elements the teacher highlights, which may include the overall text quality (generic), the text's substance and organization (discourse), or lexis, grammar, and mechanics (form).
Mode and Tone: Advisory, correction, criticism, description, giving information, "need to," praise, question posing, and reader reflection	Comments can be positive, neutral, or negative. Teacher commentary may vary widely.
Syntactic Structure: Declarative, imperative, exclamative, interrogative	Comments might have a declarative, imperative, or interrogative grammatical structure.
Text specificity: Text specific and generic	Comments are related to the specific text being read or very general and applicable to any text.
Location: Marginal, interlinear, and end comment	Comments could be written in anywhere in the text: beneath the text, in the margins, or in the spaces between lines of text.
Explicitness: Explicit and Implicit Written Corrective Feedback	Comments may be expressed explicitly or implicitly through a direction, correction, and identifying a textual issue.
Length: Short to Very Long	Comments can be short, average, or long.
Medium of Delivery: Pen and paper, computer-mediated feedback.	Comments can be handwritten or typed onto a document or e-document
Temporality: Synchronous, asynchronous, and anticipatory	The written feedback can be given to students as they write (synchronously) or when they finish writing. (asynchronously).

Content analysis and thematic analysis were employed to find patterns and themes in the feedback given by the supervisors. Content analysis is the methodological technique of grouping comparable objects or concepts to find regular patterns and connections between variables or themes in qualitative textual data (Munhall, 2008).

The following steps were taken to analyze the data:

1. Analyzing the questionnaire results given to students who were writing their thesis proposals. This questionnaire aimed to determine the participants who met the purposive sampling criteria, namely those who had written proposals, received

feedback from their supervisors and had not completed their thesis by the study timeframe.

2. Analyzing the types of written feedback provided by the supervisors on the proposal documents of the students selected as the participants.
3. In analyzing the documents, a coding scheme was developed using deductive coding based on the typology proposed by Cárcamo (2020), Pearson (2022), and Ellis (2009). The thematic analysis generated the following categorizations:

Category 1: Error Identification

It refers to the method used by the supervisor to mark the error in writing. This category comprised two types of feedback: explicit and implicit feedback.

a. Explicit Feedback

The errors were highlighted or indicated and then corrected. Some errors were made directly, placing the corrections next to the errors or on the top of the errors without giving explanations. This type of error identification is the same as the direct Feedback in the Ellis (2009) typology.

b. Implicit Feedback

Using underlines, symbols, brackets, circles, question marks, parentheses, and arrows, the errors were identified or indicated but not corrected or explained.

Category 2: Rule Explanations

It refers to explaining the identified error or problem. This is similar to the metalinguistic explanation in the typology of Feedback (Ellis, 2009). The difference is that in the rule explanation, the feedback focuses on the language use, content, and organization. There are two types of this Feedback: Rule Explanation without correction and Rule explanation with correction.

a. Rule explanation without correction

The feedback offers a grammatical rule or metalinguistic explanation, guidelines, and direction to help students understand the errors and problems, but it does not provide correction.

b. Rule explanation with correction

The feedback contains an explanation followed by the correct form or acceptable way to improve the proposal. It may also start with a correction followed by an explanation. Lastly, the feedback may contain alternative corrections that can be offered along with an explanation of the differences, providing multiple options for rectifying the error.

Category 3: Elicitation

Elicitation is a technique used to indicate errors by prompting students to self-correct. This technique promotes the learner's active participation in correcting errors based on prior knowledge and experiences. The supervisors try to elicit output from the students. It can take the form of revision prompts and error challenges.

a. Prompting for Revision

This refers to requesting the learner to reflect carefully on a particular error-related issue. Prompting for revision encourages learners to revisit and correct errors by themselves. This can be done by asking the learner to directly revise or fix the identified problems, prompting them to actively revise and encourage them to think critically about the underlying issue.

b. Error Challenges

This strategy requests students to identify the error themselves. Error Challenge involves strategies to encourage learners to engage with errors and develop their problem-

solving skills actively. In this case, the feedback challenges the student to identify the error independently, promoting critical thinking and self-assessment.

Category 4: Evaluative Feedback

Evaluative feedback comments on how well the students perform in writing, but it neither directs nor guides them in correcting or revising their work. It can take the forms of grades positive and negative evaluations.

a. Positive Evaluation

Positive evaluation refers to the supervisors' comments that focus on students' successful behaviors conveyed in their writing. It can take the form of praise, approvals, and encouragement on the students' documents.

b. Negative Evaluation

Negative evaluation refers to constructive comments that focus on unsuccessful behaviors that must not be repeated in the future. It can take the forms of preemptive and reactive Feedback (Farrokhi & Gholami, 2007; Asadi & Gholami, 2014). In preemptive feedback, the supervisor tries to guide the student in the right direction to prevent potential problems that will occur in the future. Meanwhile, in reactive feedback, the supervisor responds to the mistakes the students have already made, which can be implicit or explicit, with or without explanation. It is commonly termed as corrective Feedback (Ellis, 2009). Reactive feedback was not analyzed under this category because it was covered in the error identification, both explicitly and implicitly.

1. Coding the written feedback using the coding scheme specified above.
2. Making a categorization based on the coded data using content and thematic analysis techniques. Braun and Clarke (2006) explained that thematic analysis is methodically locating and examining themes in the data collection.
3. Interpreting the findings and identifying the patterns and themes of the supervisor feedback.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing all of the documents submitted by the students and the interview transcripts, the findings are presented as follows.

Types of Feedback Identified on Students' Thesis Proposals

Four thesis proposal documents were analyzed to determine the types of written feedback the supervisors gave. Based on the coding scheme developed according to the typology of written feedback used in this study, only four feedback categories were identified in the student's thesis proposals, including error identifications, explanations, elicitations, and evaluation. The frequency of occurrences of each category and its subsequent strategies is presented in Table 4.

Table 4. The Types of Feedback Identified on Students' Thesis Proposals

Categories and Subcategories of Feedback		DC	DC	DC	DC
		1	2	3	4
Error Identification	Explicit	3	2	1	4
	Implicit	15	4	5	1
Explanation	Rule Explanation without Correction	-	-	5	1
	Rule explanation with correction	-	1	-	-
Elicitation	Prompting for Revision	8	5	-	2
	Error Challenges	3	2	-	2

	Positive Evaluation	-	1	-	1
Evaluation	Negative Evaluation (Preemptive)	-	1	-	-
Total		29	16	11	11

Table 4 shows that from the 4 documents investigated, the total number of feedbacks that can be identified was relatively limited, with only 67 occurrences. One document received a lot of comments, and others were limited. The supervisors corrected some of the errors but did not give sufficient explanations about the errors. Only one problem received an explanation. The supervisors also did not provide comments if some similar errors occurred in the students' texts. They only commented on the most fundamental problems, leaving other problems un-commented. It was found that the thesis proposals contained a considerably high number of problems, such as organization, content, and other language problems, but the supervisors did not seem to comment on the problems. Implicit feedback was found to be the most dominant type of feedback given by the supervisors. The explanation of the occurrence of each type of feedback is presented as follows.

1. Error Identification

The first category of feedback is error identification. This refers to the method of marking the error in the text. The error in the text can be underlined, highlighted, using symbols or notes, or even enclosing the error in brackets, cross marks (x), arrows, question marks, and different types of lines. The documents showed that the supervisors provided explicit and implicit feedback on students' papers.

a. *Explicit Feedback*

The explicit feedback occurred 10 times in all documents. It means that explicit feedback was used in 14.9% of the total feedback. Supervisor 3 gave 1 explicit feedback only. All supervisors provided direct corrections on the student's papers. The errors were directly corrected on the student's paper. Similar patterns can be observed in the other documents, such as in DC2 and DC4, in which the supervisors directly pointed out and corrected the errors without any comments or explanation. Compared to implicit feedback, explicit feedback was provided with a limited occurrence. Even though this type of feedback became students' preference, it did not seem to be mostly practiced by supervisors. Zhang et al. (2021) stated that students tended to choose a more explicit type of written corrective feedback for most errors, regardless of their proficiency level in writing.

b. *Implicit Feedback*

Implicit feedback was the most frequent type found in the documents (37.3%). Examples of this feedback can be seen from the feedback given by SP1 in DC1. SP1 employed implicit feedback by highlighting mistakes using circles, arrows, symbols, underlines, and different types of lines. Implicit, usually termed indirect feedback, is identifying errors without giving corrections, and it can take the forms of underlining, using symbols, or circling (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ellis, 2009; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). These patterns consistently occurred in DC2 and DC3, mirroring the method used by SP1 in DC1. However, DC4 received only one instance of implicit feedback, showing that the supervisory approach utilized by S4 leaned more toward explicit feedback on the student's thesis proposals.

2. Explanations

There are two types of explanation (rule explanation without correction and rule explanation with correction) were investigated in this study.

a. Rule Explanation without correction

Rule explanation without correction was found in two documents (DC3 and DC4), and it comprised 9% of the total feedback. It appears that the supervisors also preferred to give an explanation without being followed by correction. In the explicit type of feedback, the supervisors corrected the error without explaining why it was erroneous. Alternatively, they gave an explanation but without correction, except for one found in DC2, where the supervisor provided an explanation on the reserve page and then wrote an example of the acceptable form. Therefore, only one problem in the document was fixed and then explained.

The example of rule explanation was observed in DC3, where the supervisor directed the students to the reference list that did not follow APA style. The supervisor explained how to create a reference list according to the style. Similarly, another instance in DC4 briefly addresses the use of capital letters for the title of the proposal written in the middle of the text. The supervisor explained when to use uppercase and lowercase letters in this case. By explaining only, the supervisors let the students correct their errors by studying the rules or metalinguistic explanations on the documents. Although the rule explanation was not comprehensive, it illuminated specific writing conventions or expectations.

b. Rule explanation with correction

While several feedback comments showed rule explanations without correction, only one with correction was found in DC2. In this case, the supervisor explained how to organize the theories in the review of related literature, put the explanation on the reverse page, and then wrote an example of the acceptable literature review order.

3. Elicitations

There are two types of elicitation observed in the students' thesis proposal: prompting for revision and error challenges.

a. Prompting for Revision

Another strategy used by the supervisor in giving feedback to the students' proposals was prompting for revision. The supervisors directly asked the students to revise or correct the identified errors and to reconsider a specific treatment related to the problems they have in their writing, encouraging them to think critically about the underlying issue. The use of questions and instructions showed a supervisory nuanced strategy for guiding students toward comprehensive revision. There were 15 (22.3%) occurrences found in three documents. In the example in DC2, the supervisor wrote, "Whose obstacles?" commenting on the sentence that did not provide clear information about the obstacles' belonging. In this case, the supervisor was prompted to revise by specifying to whom the obstacles belong. Another example of prompting for revision using questions found in DC2 was the question, "What will your research offer?" In this case, the student was asked to provide information about the significance of the research. It seemed that S2 preferred using questions to prompt revision.

Unlike S2 in DC2, S1 in DC1 rarely used questions to prompt revision. He or she mostly used instructions to ask students to revise their proposals. The examples of this strategy can be shown as follows:

"Add theories related to the concepts of obstacle in blended learning....."

"See your definition of key terms."

The first instruction indicated that the proposal did not have sufficient theories about the concepts of obstacles, and the supervisor asked the students to add more

theories. The second instruction asked the students to compare their definitions of the key terms and the terms they used in the subsequent explanations, which were similar to those used in the definition.

Prompting for revision may consist of various dynamic strategies used by supervisors, but only two methods were found in this study (questions and instructions). Whether through questions, instructions, or other strategies used by the supervisors, this type of feedback demonstrates a commitment to improving students' writing and enhancing their overall academic growth. According to (Wilkes et al., 2022), prompts that focus on the error-based learning process have been proven to be a favorable approach to promoting knowledge acquisition.

b. Error Challenge

Error challenge was found in DC1, DC2, and DC4 with a limited quantity. Although error challenges were found in the three documents, the supervisors used only two strategies. One gave an X mark next to the sentence containing errors or problems to indicate something was wrong with the sentence but did not explain why it was wrong and how to correct it. Another was using "(.....)" to indicate something was missing in the sentence, but the supervisor did not provide sufficient clues to revise the sentence. The students were challenged to find the problems independently and supply the correct ones. Error Challenge feedback is in line with the principles of metacognition and self-regulated learning because this kind of feedback requires "learners to transform their mental abilities into academic skills" (Zimmerman, 2002, p.65). This also encourages students to critically reflect on their writing, developing awareness of their strengths and weaknesses. By encouraging students to find and correct their errors actively, this error challenge feedback strategy helps develop invaluable skills not limited to the specific task of writing a thesis.

Unfortunately, the supervisors did not provide a large quantity and variety of error challenge feedback on the students' proposals. There were only 7 or 10.4 % instances found. When providing error challenge feedback, a supervisor should set a challenge level suitable for developing students' self-regulation and metacognitive abilities (Quigley et al., 2021).

4. Evaluations

There are two types of evaluative feedback intended to investigate in this study: positive Feedback and negative Feedback. From the four documents observed in this study, only three instances of evaluative feedback were provided by the supervisors, two positive and one negative evaluative feedback.

a. Positive Feedback

Positive evaluative feedback indicates that the students have performed well in their writing. There were a lot of indications that the students performed well in their proposals, but the supervisors did not give sufficient positive comments on the students' work. The only instances that showed positive feedback were the use of the tick mark symbol (\checkmark) and the abbreviation "Acc." which stands for "*accedere*" in Latin or "*accede*" in English. Both the (\checkmark) symbol and the abbreviation of *accedere* (Acc.) were used to signify that the paper or document was approved.

b. Negative Feedback

While positive evaluative feedback was found in a very limited quantity (3%), negative feedback seemed to dominate the students' papers. This phenomenon was also found in other studies where students reported that they received more negative or corrective feedback than positive Feedback (Plaindaren & Shah, 2019). Receiving negative feedback after performing a task is a common situation in everyday life, for example, a

student who learns that he or she did not perform well on an examination (Raftery & Bizer, 2009). The negative feedback investigated under this category was preemptive feedback. Reactive feedback was not included in this analysis because it has been covered in the error identification.

Of the four documents, preemptive feedback was found only in DC2, and it was the only negative preemptive feedback provided on the student's paper. The preemptive feedback was written on the proposal's cover, which reads as follows: "Check the template from prodi." In this case, the supervisor asked the student to check the proposal template provided by the study program to prevent problems related to the proposal format. There was also a comment which reads similarly but constitutes a different purpose. The comment reads, "Check the grammar, typos, referencing, and plagiarism." This comment indicated that the document contained grammatical errors, typos, and problems in referencing and plagiarism. The supervisor asked the students to read through the document, find the problems, and fix them.

To sum up, not all types of feedback were utilized by the supervisors. Certain types of feedback were prominent, like implicit feedback, and others were subordinate or even nonexistent. This finding aligns with previous studies conducted in which teachers mostly preferred implicit or indirect feedback (Ferris, 2003; Fatima Zohra & Hamitouche, 2022; Aridah et al., 2017).

Students Responses

1. Usefulness of Feedback

This study discovered that the feedback received from supervisors was very helpful. One student mentioned that the feedback helped her improve or develop her thesis proposal. She appreciated the thoroughness and clarity with which the feedback was provided. The following excerpt shows how the student perceived the feedback given by the supervisor.

I chose to describe the feedback from my supervisor as very helpful because, based on my experience, my supervisor was very thorough in providing feedback and clearly explained what needed to be reviewed. (Translated)

The excerpt above emphasizes the feedback's thoroughness, paying attention to the way her supervisor interacted with her work. The attention to detail gave off a feeling of care and greatly aided her comprehension of the areas that require revisions. The statement above also shows that the supervisor's assistance helped her understand what needed fixing. She found this especially helpful because she had never written a thesis proposal before.

Another student also found that the feedback given by her supervisor was useful. She said:

I think it's very clear because my supervisor immediately gave an example. I felt I was guided directly. (Translated)

The two excerpts above show that the supervisors provided direct feedback, showing they are engaged and active in assisting. The supervisors showed commitment and involvement in helping students improve their thesis proposal. In this case, the quick response received from the supervisor indicates that the supervisor is attentive and willing to help immediately. The way her supervisor provided feedback can also indicate the usefulness of the feedback she received. She further said:

My supervisor also told me directly by speaking so that it would be very clear, and she also gave an example of the structure so that I would be more thorough in writing my thesis on the following pages. (Translated)

This excerpt indicates that the supervisor not only corrects the mistakes but also

provides an example of the correct structure. In addition, the supervisor provided not only written feedback but also gave more explanations orally. This is especially useful for the students as it guides them in improving their work and ensures they understand what needs to be revised. This shows that supervisors believe in the individual's potential for improvement and invest in their progress.

2. *Feedback Impact on Revision*

Another student's response towards their supervisory feedback is its impact on revision. The students reported that their supervisors' feedback contributed to the improvement of their thesis proposal. The following student excerpts describe how the supervisor's feedback impacted their revisions.

I think the feedback my supervisor gave me has helped me revise my proposal.There were many things that I did not understand...and my two supervisors helped me solve the problems I encountered very well. (S1) (Translated)

It helps me because, in my opinion, any feedback given by my supervisor can help me The feedback that is very helpful for my thesis is feedback about my research question because it will be the foundation of my thesis, which I was a bit confused about. Especially about the purpose of my thesis, so my supervisor offered me a clear research question by giving direct written feedback, giving an example of a research question by writing, "This one might be more suitable for the purpose of the thesis" (S2)

S1 and S2 perspectives highlighted how important feedback was in helping them improve their thesis proposals. Both students had a variety of difficulties and uncertainties as novice researchers in the field of thesis writing. This shows us how feedback serves as a compass, particularly in the challenging process of thesis writing, which also can be seen from this statement. Through their supervisors' guidance, they overcame the challenges she faced in her thesis. However, the students also stated that besides receiving helpful feedback, they also received confusing feedback.

Based on my experience, everything recommended by the supervisor is very helpful except for the revisions that seem too far from the context of the thesis proposal that I made, such as feedback that is not related to the contents of my thesis proposal. (S1) - Translated

Maybe the one that was a bit unhelpful from all the feedback I got was the written one. Because sometimes, the supervisor's comments were hard to understand, especially if, for example, I revised it two or three days after the feedback was given. I sometimes forgot what my supervisor's written comments meant. So it's like I just made a guess (S2) - Translated.

Student 1 found the supervisor's feedback unrelated to the proposal's context, making it less useful and confusing. This case highlights the need for feedback to be relevant and tailored to the specific content and goals of the thesis proposal. Irrelevant feedback might lead to confusion and hinder the revision process. In addition, Student 2 found the feedback hard to understand because the comments may have been difficult to read or unreadable. This situation hindered the revision process and rendered the feedback somewhat unhelpful. This also indicates that the supervisory feedback may contain irrelevant comments, which can lead to poor-quality feedback. Poor quality

feedback is one of the feedback attributes that can adversely affect students' writing practices and learning emotions (Yu et al., 2021). However, the student was aware that she found it difficult to understand the supervisor's comments because she had procrastinated in revising her paper. She reviewed and examined the comments in her paper after two or three days after the feedback was given and this made her confused; as a result, she revised her paper based on her interpretations.

3. Preferred Type of Feedback

From a number of feedback types investigated in this study, the students had their preferences. One student said:

I prefer to be given direct and written feedback directly and in writing... In my opinion, the type [of feedback] that helps the most is the written type, which directly crosses out [the errors] and immediately corrects them. (S1)
Translated

Other students expressed the same preferences. She also preferred direct written Feedback or explicit Feedback. She said:

The crossing out and immediately correcting them because as I said before, I was a forgetful person, so I think it will be better if my supervisor provided her feedback by crossing out [the errors] and immediately correcting them so I know what was wrong with my thesis, what went wrong then, what it should be like and how it should be corrected. (S2) Translated

The students' statements above confirm that what the students preferred may not be what the supervisors provided. The data in Table 4 showed that implicit or indirect feedback was much higher in number than explicit Feedback or direct Feedback. In the explicit feedback, the supervisor indicated the error and corrected it. Although the students preferred this type of feedback, the supervisor did not mainly practice it. A study by Aridah et al. (2017) also showed that students and lecturers prefer receiving or giving direct feedback. However, the data showed that students prefer to get direct feedback more than the lecturers could provide. The lecturers were also found to provide more indirect feedback than students expected.

Another lecturer's perspective on giving feedback was found in the study conducted by Wei & Cao (2020). This study revealed that university teachers predominantly used indirect feedback in three Asian countries, and there was an inconsistency between teachers' beliefs and practices. They further stated that by providing indirect feedback, the teachers expected their students to learn from their mistakes and correct them themselves, but none of the teachers seemed very confident in their students' ability and motivation to apply metalinguistic knowledge to fix their own mistakes, even though the teachers understood from professional training that indirect feedback strategies could be more beneficial in the long term. Implicit feedback has a larger long-term effect than its short-term effect (S. Li, 2010).

4. Communication with Supervisors

It was observed in this study that the students were very happy and demonstrated a heightened level of respect towards supervisors who engaged in direct and detailed explanations concerning their problems in their thesis proposals.

I really respect lecturers who can provide direct feedback and also want to write down revision points on student thesis proposals. (S1)

Despite feeling pleased with the feedback the student received during the supervision process, the students experienced confusion once the supervision ended. The confusion stemmed from the fact that they did not communicate well with their supervisors about the types of feedback they like to receive.

I never discussed any type of feedback that helped me because I'm kind of afraid to talk about that with my supervisor. So I'm just "a let it go person." And it happens that my supervisor gives me helpful feedback so I never talk about that feedback to them. (S2)

I prefer to be given direct and written feedback, so I mean directly and in writing, then students meet the lecturer in person or offline and provide verbal guidance. So, as a student, I can ask for clarity on the context of the revisions that the lecturer gave so that I won't get stuck there. I don't know that I won't be stuck with my ignorance, so I can ask further what this means.... Even though I might acknowledge that saying something like this could be considered impolite. (S1)

Communicating with supervisors was an important factor influencing students' success in revision. Interview data showed that feelings of fear and concern about being impolite hindered the students from further communicating with their supervisors to inquire about revising their thesis proposals. Consequently, they addressed only the issues they understood and disregarded unclear feedback. "Effective communication between the student and the supervisor is crucial during the supervision process" (Bayona-Oré, 2021, p.569). If the communication between supervisors and students is not well established during the supervisory feedback provision, it might result in the student's reluctance to continue completing their proposal. This will also affect the students' motivation to finish their research within the study timeframe, leading to delays in completing their research. (Masek, 2017). Therefore, to ensure high-quality education related to research, it is necessary to significantly increase communication between students and researchers through written Feedback (Nurie, 2018). Supervisors should give more direction to make the written feedback process simpler and more engaging (Spear et al., 1997).

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Among various types of written feedback available in the literature, only 8 types were identified in the student's thesis proposals. The supervisors did not address the problems in the students' thesis proposals. They seemed very selective in giving feedback, focusing only on the most critical and fundamental problems. While the supervisors tended to provide implicit feedback, the students expected to receive more explicit feedback. The students believed that if the supervisors pointed out the mistakes and gave explanations and corrections, it would help them revise their thesis proposals. However, the supervised thesis proposals did not contain rich explanations and corrections expected by the students.

The interview data showed that the students were reluctant to ask their supervisors about the unclear feedback because they felt afraid and considered it impolite to do so. This indicates that a communication barrier between supervisors and students prevents students from finishing their thesis on time. Effective communication between students and supervisors is crucial to provide an opportunity for students to seek clarification and deepen their understanding of the revision comments. Effective communication fosters positive learning relationships between students and supervisors,

enhancing feedback and contributing to academic growth. Finally, this study analyzed a limited number of documents; therefore, future studies should consider creating a comprehensive feedback guideline and including more documents and students in the analysis. It is also suggested that thesis supervisors provide various local and global feedback.

REFERENCES

- Al-Darei, I. S., & Elhag, A. (2022). The effect of feedback type in the e-learning environment on students' achievement and motivation. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 5(3), 694–705.
- Aridah, A., Atmowardoyo, H., & Salija, K. (2017). Teacher Practices and Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback and Their Implications on Writing Instruction. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(1), 112. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n1p112>
- Asadi, B., & Gholami, J. (2014). Incidental Focus on Form in an EFL Talk-show Class. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 267–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.416>
- Bayona-Oré, S. (2021). Perceptions of Postgraduate Students on the Relationship Between Thesis Development and Performance of a Supervisor. *Turkish Journal of Science Education*. <https://doi.org/10.36681/tused.2021.90>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 409–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>
- Bouwer, R., & Dirckx, K. (2023). The eye-mind of processing written Feedback: Unraveling how students read and use feedback for revision. *Learning and Instruction*, 85, 101745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2023.101745>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Cárcamo, B. (2020). Classifying written corrective feedback for research and educational purposes: A typology proposal. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n2.79924>
- Chugh, R., Macht, S., & Harreveld, B. (2022). Supervisory feedback to postgraduate research students: a literature review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(5), 683–697. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1955241>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. In *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Farrokhi, F., & Gholami, J. (2007). Reactive and Preemptive Language-Related Episodes and Uptake in an EFL Class. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 58–93.
- Fatima Zohra, R., & Hamitouche, F. (2022). Exploring Learners' and Teachers' Preferences Regarding Written Corrective Feedback Types in Improving Learners' Writing Skill. *Arab*

- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second-Language Students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.007>
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Flushman, T., Guise, M., & Hegg, S. (2019). Improving Supervisor Written Feedback: Exploring the "What" and "Why" of Feedback Provided to Pre-Service Teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 28(2), 46–66.
- Given, L. (2008). Empowerment Evaluation: The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Lee, H. H., Leong, A. P., & Song, G. (2017). Investigating teacher perceptions of feedback. *ELT Journal*, 71(1), 60–68. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw047>
- Li, J., & De Luca, R. (2014). Review of assessment feedback. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(2), 378–393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709494>
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 24(3), 1–26.
- Lune, H., & Berg, B. L. (2017). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* (9th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Masek, A. (2017). Establishing supervisor-students' relationships through mutual expectation: A study from supervisors' point of view. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 226, 012200. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/226/1/012200>
- Mujtaba, S. M., Kaur, M., & Singh, M. (n.d.). The Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in ESL/EFL Context: A Synthesis of Present and Past Studies 1. In *MEXTESOL Journal* (Vol. 47, Issue 1).
- Munhall, P. L. (2008). Volumes 1&2. In L. Given (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (1st&2nd ed.). Rolf A. Janke.
- Nurcholis, I. A., & Islamiati, S. (2022). Students' Perception toward Supervisors' Written Feedback in Writing Thesis Proposal. *Teaching English and Language Learning English Journal (TELLE)*, 2(1), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.36085/telle.v2i1.3331>
- Nurie, Y. (2018). Higher Education Supervision Practices on Student Thesis Writing: Language

Function and Focus of Written Feedback. *The International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 30, 522–553. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:150660996>

- Pearson, W. S. (2022). A typology of the characteristics of teachers' written feedback comments on second language writing. *Cogent Education*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2024937>
- Plaindaren, C., & Shah, P. M. (2019). A Study on the Effectiveness of Written Feedback in Writing Tasks among Upper Secondary School Pupils. *Creative Education*, 10(13), 3491–3508. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1013269>
- Quigley, A., Muijs, D., & Stringer, E. (2021). *Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning: Guidance Report*.
- Raftery, J. N., & Bizer, G. Y. (2009). Negative Feedback and performance: The moderating effect of emotion regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(5), 481–486. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.024>
- Spear, M., Lock, N. D., & McCulloch, M. (1997). The written feedback mentors give to student teachers. *Teacher Development*, 1(2), 269–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13664539700200019>
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (Katherine). (2020). Written Corrective Feedback Strategies Employed by University English Lecturers: A Teacher Cognition Perspective. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 215824402093488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934886>
- Wilkes, T., Stark, L., Trempler, K., & Stark, R. (2022). Contrastive Video Examples in Teacher Education: A Matter of Sequence and Prompts. *Frontiers in education*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.869664>
- Yu, S., Geng, F., Liu, C., & Zheng, Y. (2021). What works may hurt: The negative side of feedback in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54, 100850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100850>
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a Self-Regulated Learner: An Overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

