Madina Kazybay [1], Akmarzhan Nogaibayeva [2] , Didik Hariyanto [3]*
Gulzhaina Kassymova[4]
[1]Abai RMMI, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[2]SDU University, Kaskelen, Kazakhstan
[3]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[4]Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
*e-mail: 231323004@sdu.edu.kz

TEACHER FEEDBACK ON WRITTEN WORKS: KAZAKHSTANI EFL TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES

Abstract. This qualitative study aims to explore Kazakhstani English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' perspectives on teacher feedback on written works, as well as exploring their feedback provision practices, and challenges. The data was collected using semi-structured interviews with teachers from public, specialized, and international schools in Almaty, Kazakhstan. Transcribed collected data was analyzed through thematic analysis. The findings of the study demonstrate that feedback on written works is crucial in improving students' writing skills. Participants favored selective feedback or feedback that is provided following the goal of the writing assignment. It was also revealed that some teachers favored direct feedback while others prioritized indirect feedback, believing it would encourage students in deep and independent learning. Additionally, insufficient time and a large number of written works to check, confusing handwriting, and cheating acts as plagiarism and overuse of AI tools are reported to be challenges faced by participants.

Keywords: Teacher feedback, teachers' perspectives, written works, writing skill, feedback practices, error correction in writing, independent learning.

Introduction

Effective writing proficiency is a fundamental skill in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Many studies have demonstrated that effective feedback is a crucial component of foreign language acquisition, as well as improving learners' ability in any type of writing.

Over the years, there has been continuous research on the effective methods of feedback and how students can derive benefits from feedback on their written works (Ellis, 2009). Piece of students' written work can inform teachers about their students' understanding of their course (Adrefiza & Fortunasari, 2020). Qin and Karabacak (2013) stated that feedback in different forms plays an important role in helping students improve their EFL writing skills. Similarly, Salih and Rahman (2013) emphasized that feedback on student writing is a key teaching strategy that strengthens communication between teachers and students in EFL writing.

However, this can be difficult because it requires considering many factors, such as the course content, assignments, writing style, classroom performance, individual student progress, past work, and even the work of other students. As a result, teaching writing becomes challenging and stressful (Chen & Zhang, 2019). According to Ferris (2004), although providing feedback represents a lot of time consumption for teachers, positive feedback for students may be a critical component that contributes to their success as writers. Writing proficiency improvement takes place when teachers build confidence and demonstrate efficient ways of developing writing abilities through feedback (Khan, 2003).

Although a significant number of research were conducted on written feedback in L2 writing, not many of them considered EFL settings and teachers' perspectives on feedback provision practices on written works. Most studies studied the long and short-term effects of teacher feedback on students' writing skill improvement, as well as exploring students' attitudes and reactions towards it. However, teachers' opinions, preferences, and experiences are often left without consideration. Since there is

limited research on this topic, it is difficult to fully understand instructors' perspectives on feedback on student writing. Because each teaching context is different, and various factors influence writing development. Focusing more on teacher-centered studies, particularly in EFL settings, could enhance our understanding and help instructors improve their feedback practices (Ghanbari & Abdolrezapour, 2021; Ghalib, 2018). There was experimental research at Nazarbayev University by Naghdipour (2023). The study compared two groups of first-year students from different degree programs. Total number of participants were 63. These students were taking a compulsory essay writing course at a university   in   Oman.

One group received traditional teacher-written corrective feedback, while the other group of students tried to get feedback using different sources on their own. The study lasted for 16 weeks. The results show that both groups improved their writing, and there was not a big difference between the two groups in terms of scores. Nevertheless, the study demonstrated that although students in the second group did not receive feedback from their teacher, they managed to improve and reduce their mistakes in writing. However, this study was not conducted in the context of Kazakhstani educational institutions and did not consider teachers' perspectives on feedback given on written works. Instead, it compared the effects of student-initiated and teacher-initiated feedback in EFL writing. Additionally, the review of previous studies demonstrates that there is a lack of research conducted in Kazakhstan on teachers' perspectives on feedback. Therefore, this research gap requires investigation within the context of Kazakhstan.

The aim of the study is to explore teachers' perspectives on feedback on students' written work, as well as their feedback provision practices and challenges.

This study will focus on the following research questions:
1. How do teachers view feedback on students' written work?
2. What are teachers' practices for providing feedback on students' written work?
3. What are the challenges of providing feedback on students' written works?

Literature review

This part of the research paper discusses previous studies related to the topic of teacher feedback on written works. It includes the definition of feedback types, previous research conducted on teacher perspectives, and some challenges that are reported by teachers in the process of providing feedback on students' written work.

Types of teacher feedback

Teacher feedback on students' writing has been studied in different educational contexts emphasizing its importance in students' writing skill and overall academic development. Sukha and Listyani (2022) define good teacher feedback as feedback that contains thorough information about not only students' work and academic performance but also behavior and achievements.

Furthermore, Park (2006) categorizes teacher written feedback in second language writing classrooms into three types: form-focused, content-based, and integrated feedback. Integrated feedback combines grammatical correction with content-specific feedback. Form-focused feedback focuses on the linguistic aspects of written work, such as grammar, punctuation, spelling, language use, sentence structure, and other formatting errors. This feedback helps students to improve their accuracy in writing skills. Content-based feedback deals with clarity of the writing, which includes ideas, arguments, and organization of the writing. The purpose of the content-based feedback is to enhance student's critical thinking and clarity of their ideas.

According to Hosseiny (2014), teacher feedback on writings can be categorized into two types: direct feedback and indirect feedback. Direct feedback clearly indicates errors and provides the correct linguistic forms. In contrast, indirect feedback is given when teachers indicate errors in student writing by underlining, circling, or using codes without providing corrections. This type of feedback allows students to figure out how to correct the mistakes in their writing themselves (Sukha & Listyani, 2022).

Teachers' Perspectives

Although teachers perceive feedback as the means of improvement for writing, teachers possess quite different perspectives. Zhan's (2016) study explored teachers' perspectives on feedback regarding its focus and effectiveness in improving students' abilities in EFL writing. The study results showed that the teacher did not provide feedback focused on one area but instead changed the feedback she provided depending on the genre of the writing assignments. For example, if it was a descriptive essay, she focused on grammatical accuracy, while in narrative essays, she focused more on content and organization. The teacher believed feedback would benefit students if they engaged with and felt students most valued honest feedback on the content, as it gave them a sense of personal attention. However, some teachers provided more feedback on grammar and structural errors as they perceived these specific types of feedback would lead to successful writing. The direct translation from the first language that resulted in unclear text and incorrect logical flow and sentence structure were among the main reasons for grammar mistakes (Abayahoun, 2016; Chang & Wei, 2022). Furthermore, teachers disagreed with students' opinions regarding comprehensive feedback, where teachers should focus on every error equally and instead favored selective feedback. Teachers think that detailed correction hinders students' abilities to think critically, identify their errors on their own, and be aware of their mistakes. Therefore, teachers find metalinguistic feedback with error codes are most useful and appropriate for students to manage their learning independently (Cai, 2024; Muliyah et al., 2020).

Challenges of providing feedback on students' written work

It was found that often teachers' feedback practices were influenced by several challenging factors. The commonly mentioned contextual challenge was the large class size and numerous papers to grade. Teachers in Chang and Wei Wei's (2022) study reported that they spend 25-30 minutes checking and grading each essay. So, the class of 13 students would take teachers approximately 5 hours to grade all written works or essays. Bigger class sizes consisting of 21 students would require a teacher to spend 7 hours checking and grading essays. An earlier study conducted by Abayahoun (2016) aligned with the previously mentioned study results. Both secondary school teachers in the study reported large class sizes, numbers of papers to grade, and limited teaching time for EFL classes as the challenges impeding effective feedback on writing.

Moreover, teachers also claimed these constraints prevent them from responding to a student's writing the way they should and want, thus leading them to focus on form rather than comprehensive written comments which they find very important. They believe written comments are useful for students in improving their writing skills by reading these comments again and again. Therefore, teachers think that there should be a limited number of students so that they could have sufficient time to provide effective feedback on all written works.

In conclusion, literature indicates that providing feedback is an important part of teaching foreign language writing skill. Although teachers agree that feedback is important, they own different opinions and preferences when it comes to feedback provision practices. Some teachers focus more on mechanics-based feedback, which includes grammar, correct use of words, structure, spelling, etc., while others focus on the content of the writing or change their feedback according to the goal of the writing task. Moreover, some teachers prefer giving direct feedback where the students' writing errors are corrected explicitly. On the other hand, some teachers prefer indirect feedback that only indicates mistakes without direct correction, allowing students to do self-study and fix their mistakes themselves. Teachers argue that time constraints and a large number of works to grade and check impede effective, high-quality feedback provision practices.

Methodology
Research Design

A qualitative research design was employed to address research questions and gain deeper understanding of teacher's perspectives regarding feedback on written works. In addition, teachers' feedback practices, preferences and challenges were also explored.

Sampling and Instrumentation

A total number of 5 (4 females and 1 male) EFL teachers participated in the study, from three public, specialized, and international schools in Almaty. Teachers were recruited through convenience sampling for the interview; thus, teachers who were willing to share their experiences participated in the interviews. Among them, two teachers hold bachelor's degrees, and the other 3 teachers hold master's degrees. Their ages range from 23 to 44 years old, with their work experience varying from 3 years to 18 years. Two teachers teach primary and young secondary school students (4-5 graders), and the other three teachers teach students in 8-11th grade. For more detailed information, see the following table:

Table 1. *Summary of Participants' Demographic Characteristics*

Participants	Gender	Age	Level of Education	Work Experience	School
Teacher 1	Female	32	Master degree	6 years	Specialized school
Teacher 2	Female	44	Bachelor degree	18 years	Specialized school
Teacher 3	Male	23	Master degree	3 years	Public school
Teacher 4	Female	23	Bachelor degree	3 years	Public school
Teacher 5	Female	28	Master degree	8 years	International school

Data Collection Tools

The data on teachers' perspectives on feedback on written works was collected using semi-structured interviews. This approach provides flexibility in exploring emerging themes and allows participants to share their experiences and thoughts in detail. Interview questions are designed to answer research questions regarding teachers' views of teachers' feedback on written works, teacher practices, preferences, and challenges when providing feedback on students' writings. The semi-structured interviews with teachers lasted between 40-55 minutes.

Data analysis

The collected data on teachers' perspectives, practices and challenges on feedback on written works was analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Audio recordings of the interviews were transcribed manually and analyzed thematically to identify common themes and patterns in teachers' responses. After the thematic analysis, three main themes were identified: "teachers' perspectives on feedback on written works", "teachers' feedback practices" and "challenges in providing feedback. The subthemes under each main theme varied based on teachers' responses, which included different examples and personal experiences.

Ethical Considerations

Before the commencement of data collection, each participant received a consent letter. Participants were provided with detailed information about the aim and implementation process of the research, as well as personal information about the researchers, possible advantages and dangers of the research, confidentiality, and refusal to participate in the research. After acquiring permission from the participants to take part in semi-structured interviews, the data collection process was allowed to start. While having an interview, all participants had the right to ask questions, clarify unclear questions, review their answer or stop the interview. The participation was fully voluntary and anonymous; any information without permission of the participants including their names were not mentioned and kept confidential in data analysis.

Findings

Theme 1: Teachers' perspectives on feedback on written works

Teachers agreed that feedback plays a crucial role in improving students' writing. Although all (N=5) teachers perceived feedback as a pedagogical tool that is useful for students' writing skill enhancement, they had different views on the purpose of feedback provision when sharing their experience.

Subtheme 1.1: Feedback as a tool for error correction

According to several teachers (n=3) feedback given on written works helps teachers and students identify students' strengths and weaknesses, as well as correct their mistakes, ultimately improving their writing skills. Teacher 2 stated, "Feedback is important to correct mistakes and ensure that students do not repeat the same mistakes next time.

"I think the main goal of feedback is to identify weaknesses and strengths of the students." (Teacher 3)

"In my opinion, the main goal of feedback in writing is to improve students' writing skills." (Teacher 4)

Subtheme 1.2: Encouraging self-correction and independent learning

Two teachers preferred indirect feedback instead of explicit correction and perceived feedback as something that could guide and support students to learn independently. For example, Teacher 3 noted ".... it (feedback) is also used to guide them (students) to correct their mistakes on their own and improve self-learning."

Subtheme 1.3: Feedback as a source of motivation

On the other hand, Teacher 1 regarded written feedback as a source of motivation to keep students engaged in the writing process. She explained, "I always try to point out what students did well in their writing and praise to motivate them to keep writing more. If you point out their mistakes and scold them all the time instead of praising them enough, they may lose their wish to write more."

In conclusion, all five teachers recognize and acknowledge the important role of feedback in improving writing skills. Nevertheless, their perspectives regarding its primary purpose were quite distinct. Three teachers used feedback to fix students' errors in writing as well as informing about their strengths and weaknesses. Two other teachers viewed feedback more as a tool to direct students towards self-correction and independent learning. They also reported that they try to motivate their students by not only pointing out errors and showing them where to practice more but also mainly using praise and positive comments in their writing to maintain their will to write.

Theme 2: Teachers' feedback practices

Interviews with teachers revealed insights into their feedback practices. Particularly, the frequency of the feedback provision process, and teachers' preferences on certain feedback types.

Subtheme 2.1: Frequency of feedback provision

Teachers demonstrated varied approaches to the feedback provision frequency. It mostly depended on factors such as their students' proficiency levels, curriculum requirements, and personal teaching styles.

Almost all teachers (n=4) said that they try to provide regular constructive feedback as much as possible. Teacher 4 reported that feedback was an essential part of her teaching process: "Since I teach high school students, feedback is an inseparable part of my teaching. Many of my students take state exams and plan to take the IELTS, so improving their English writing is very important."

Three teachers also noted that it is quite challenging to provide all students with written feedback, so, they often give verbal feedback too instead of written.

"After every writing assignment I try to provide feedback, but it mostly happens verbally in a form of short discussion." (Teacher 1)

On the contrary, Teacher 5 admitted not providing regular feedback: "To be honest, I do not provide written feedback on writing tasks. I ask them questions like, "Why did you use this sentence instead of another?" and give verbal feedback on how they can improve their writing. Another method I use is peer checking. I pair students up and have them review each other's writing to identify mistakes. It is more interactive and time-saving. "

Overall, all five teachers try to provide constructive regular feedback even though they may not manage to do so all the time. Interestingly, teachers also tend to replace written feedback with oral and peer feedback.

Subtheme 2.2: Teacher's preference for feedback types

Task and student dependent feedback. It was found that teachers (n=4) mainly considered the nature and goal of the writing task when deciding what type of feedback to provide on students' written works. Alongside the task purpose, students' needs were also considered: "[….] when students analyze novel, I focus on content and ideas. Feedback also varies based on students' needs. Some struggle more with grammar, while others need help with content or vocabulary."

Additionally, Teacher 2 pointed out the importance of having task criteria while assessing and providing feedback on students' written works: "Personally, if the writing task has specific criteria, I try to provide feedback based on those criteria." (Teacher 2)

Focus on content and form. The interview with teachers suggests three teachers pay more attention to the content of the writing but do not neglect form-focused feedback too. Teacher 2 prefers to focus more on content as she thinks the main goal of writing is to convey meaning but also considers other aspects of writing like grammar: "I also pay attention to the uniqueness of students' ideas. Even if their grammar has mistakes, if their writing content and ideas are unique, I tend to focus more on that. But this does not mean I ignore grammar or other aspects of writing."

Selective and detailed feedback. Four of the five teachers prefer to provide selective feedback that focuses on specific areas of writing. Different factors influenced teachers to choose to provide selective feedback, including their preference to check the words based on writing task goals and criteria, students' needs, and due to other convenient factors selective feedback offers. For instance, Teacher 1 stated, "I prefer selective feedback as it takes less time and detailed feedback on all aspects seems unnecessary when you point out their every error."

Teacher 4: [……] so, I choose the main focus of my feedback taking into account the requirement of the written task. However, I try to include other types of feedback if there are common or blundering mistakes.

Both teachers who teach younger learners noted that students do not like it when their written works are full of corrections as it may be overwhelming to them:

Teacher 3: "Students do not like when you overwhelm and fill up their copybooks with your corrections, making their writing messy with different colored teacher pencils. Sometimes, my students ask me not to correct their sentences completely but just show it so that they can fix it themselves."

Teacher 5: "Feedback should be appropriate to the age of the students. For example, detailed feedback can be overwhelming to primary school kids if there's too much."

Conversely, Teacher 2 thinks providing detailed feedback on all aspects of writing helps students to improve their writing skills better: "Feedback should not be limited to just one aspect. To improve writing skills, feedback should be comprehensive. If we only focus on grammar, students may fail to develop other necessary skills. Therefore, detailed feedback is the best approach."

Subtheme 2.3: Direct vs. Indirect Feedback

Teachers had different preferences regarding direct and indirect feedback due to different reasons. Some teachers (n=3) believe direct feedback is more effective, while others argue that indirect feedback (n=2) encourages self-correction and deeper learning.

Teachers who provide direct feedback showing mistakes clearly and offering correct versions of mistakes state that students may struggle to identify their mistakes on their own. Additionally, according to Teacher 1 students are reluctant to work with indirect feedback if it is not shown explicitly: "I can not sit here and tell students "try to guess what is your problem?" You know, we have some types of students who can never guess." Teacher 4 also supports direct feedback, saying that students are more likely to revise when mistakes are clearly indicated: "I believe students remember clear direct feedback rather than indirect feedback."

However, Teacher 2 and Teacher 3 found indirect feedback to be more effective than direct feedback. Teacher 2 highlights its time efficiency and effectiveness on student writing improvement:

"Since teachers do not have enough time to correct every mistake in writing, indirect feedback helps save time and be more effective. If teachers provide fully corrected work, students will not improve much because they won't engage in self-study."

Teacher 3 agrees, emphasizing that indirect feedback protects students' self-esteem and motivates them to take responsibility for their learning: "Unlike direct feedback, it motivates students to research, fix mistakes, and in the next lesson, they try to show to the teacher what they worked on and how they corrected themselves." However, Teacher 3 also acknowledges using direct feedback for summative assessments while reserving indirect feedback for formative assessments.

Overall, teachers' choices between direct and indirect feedback depend on their teaching goals, students' needs, and the assessment type.

Theme 3: Challenges in providing feedback

The responses from five teachers illustrate distinct yet interrelated challenges, leading to the identification of several factors that cause these challenges. These challenges include: time constraints and a large number of works to check, handwriting issues, and cheating.

Subtheme 3.1: Time constraints and a large number of works to check

A dominant challenge reported by teachers is the issue of time constraints and a large number of written works to check. Teacher 1 explicitly noted, "Time constraints are always an issue when it comes to checking, grading, and giving feedback on students' writing." This statement was confirmed by Teacher 4, who highlighted the extensive hours spent checking student compositions: "Sometimes, I sit until dawn checking students' written works.".

Furthermore, due to insufficient time and loads of work to check, it is hard to provide feedback regularly: "You need to check their work on time and do it regularly. If you don't make it part of the routine of your teaching, it is really hard to make progress in students' writing." (Teacher 5)

Subtheme 3.2: Handwriting issues

Another significant challenge mentioned by the teachers is difficulty in reading and comprehending students' handwriting. Teacher 4 specifically mentioned the complexity of student handwriting and how it affects the clarity of their writing, stating, "It also takes time to figure out what is written and what they tried to say." Consequently, confusing handwriting can extend the time required for carefully reading a student's work and provide effective feedback, further complicating the already time-intensive process.

Subtheme 3.3: Cheating

Furthermore, the issue of students often copying each other's work or purely using AI to complete their writing requires additional effort to compare written pieces and detect plagiarism: "Also, often students cheat, and I need to compare their works so as not to miss the works that were copied from someone or completed using AI." (Teacher 4)

"My students may copy each other's work. But I can notice it easily as they often make the same mistake in terms of grammar and spelling." (Teacher 3).

As a result, besides properly checking and grading students' written works, teachers have to verify the authenticity of student submissions too, in order to give feedback that is constructive and fair.

In conclusion, teachers face various challenges in the feedback provision process. The main issue is time constraints and numerous works to check, which hinder the quality and frequency of feedback on written assignments. Another common issue is cheating from peers or relying on AI. These challenges were followed by other issues such as confusing handwriting.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore Kazakhstani EFL teachers' perspectives on teacher feedback on written works. Also, to gain insights into their feedback provision practices, preferences, and challenges when providing feedback to students' written works. The thematic analysis of the semi-structured interview identified the following three main themes: (1) teachers' perspectives on feedback on students' written works, (2) feedback practices, and (3) challenges in providing feedback.

Teachers' perspectives on feedback on written works

Participants agreed that feedback is essential in improving students' writing skills. Nevertheless, they had few distinct perceptions of the feedback goal. The theme on teachers' perspectives on feedback on written works included three subthemes: (1) feedback as a tool for error correction, (2) encouraging self-correction and independent learning, and (3) feedback as a source of motivation. All teachers recognized that feedback helps students learn from their mistakes, which is consistent with previous research emphasizing the role of feedback in writing skill improvement (Ferris, 2004; Qin & Karabacak, 2013). The majority of the teachers favored selective feedback or chose the type of feedback to deliver depending on the goal of the written task. These findings align with a previous study by Zhan's (2016) which concluded that teachers change their feedback according to the type of writing assignment. Increasing student motivation by commenting on their strengths or the aspects of their writing which is done well was another point made by several teachers which supports Ferris' (2004) and Khan's (2003) claims.

Teachers' feedback practices

The second theme was about teachers' feedback practices based on their personal experiences. It was about what types of feedback they provide, prefer and reasons behind it providing examples. Three subthemes were identified: (1) frequency of feedback provision, (2) teacher's preference for feedback types, and (3) direct vs. indirect feedback.

Although it is not always possible, all participants noted that they try to provide feedback regularly after each writing session (Muliyah et al., 2020; Seker & Dincer, 2014). Most teachers showed a preference for selective feedback over detailed feedback, adopting their feedback based on students' lacking writing aspects and needs. Additionally, some teachers avoided providing fully explicit feedback, as it was mentioned by Cai (2024) and Muliyah et al. (2020).

Challenges in providing feedback

Lastly, the thematic analysis of teachers' interviews identified the following challenges in providing feedback: (1) time constraints and huge number of works to check, (2) handwriting issues, and (3) cheating. Many teachers feel overwhelmed by the amount of student writing they must grade in limited time which makes it hard to provide well thought effective feedback (Chen & Zhang, 2019). Another difficulty is students' confusing handwriting which impedes feedback provision practice and makes teachers spend more time trying to understand the content of the written work. Students tend to copy from each other or use AI to complete their whole writing task, which hinders their real skill development. Moreover, this forces teachers to spend extra time verifying the authenticity of students' work instead of focusing on providing meaningful feedback.

Practical Implications

The findings on teachers' view of feedback in this study may help to create organizations better training programs for teachers to increase educators' ability to provide effective feedback to support students' writing skill improvement. Moreover, the challenges mentioned in the study should be addressed to improve the quality of the writing instruction and feedback provision process. To solve this, schools may consider hiring more staff, setting clear writing guidelines, or using digital tools as well as teaching students the value of original work and independent thinking. It is also recommended to provide regular feedback for better writing skill improvement. Peer feedback was also mentioned to be time-saving and more interactive.

Limitations of the Study

Despite filling the research gap in the context of Kazakhstan, this study has some limitations. To begin with, the study only consists of 5 participants (teachers) and focuses on a certain region; therefore, findings can not represent and applied to all teachers across the country. Also, since the data collected and analyzed are based on teachers' self-report, it may lead to biased answers. They might have given answers that do not match their true opinions and feedback practices. Finally, data was collected using only semi-structured interviews. Involving more data collections tools would ensure the accuracy of the data collected.

Future research can improve this study by including more teachers from different regions to get a clearer picture of feedback practices in Kazakhstan. Comparing schools (urban vs. rural, public vs. private) could also show important differences. For collecting accurate, it is also recommended to use other tools of data collection such as surveys, classroom observation, and analysis of students' written work. A comparison of feedback practices in Kazakhstan and other countries would help to obtain insights to improve teaching strategies.

Conclusion

Feedback on written works of students plays a significant role in improving and supporting students' writing abilities. This study tried to gain deeper knowledge about teachers' perspectives on teacher feedback by exploring their feedback practices, preferences, and challenges when providing feedback.

Although teachers had different teaching contexts and feedback preferences, they all viewed feedback as a crucial part of writing instruction. Selective feedback or feedback that is adapted to the goal writing task was preferred by teachers. Feedback is seen as a motivational tool as well by several teachers to keep students writing more and practicing more. Additionally, some teachers think that indirect feedback is more useful as it allows students to fix their mistakes on their own, promoting independent deep learning. On the other hand, others think that direct feedback that indicates writing errors is more effective as students can act on it immediately.

The majority of teachers try to give feedback regularly, but it is hard to do at the same time due to different factors. The most common challenges mentioned were time constraints and a huge number of writing assignments to grade. Handwriting issues also make feedback challenging. Students' confusing writing slows down grading and can lead to misunderstandings. Cheating, which includes plagiarism and AI-generated content is another challenge. This issue hinders teachers' ability to accurately assess students' skills.

In summary, feedback is considered to be crucial in students' writing instruction. Selective feedback and feedback that is changed according to the goal of the writing tasks' are favored by Kazakh EFL teachers. However, issues such as time shortages and a huge number of writing, messy handwriting, and academic honesty are reported to be challenges faced by teachers. To solve these problems, providing teacher training, encouraging clear writing, and fostering integrity can improve feedback quality and support student learning.

This study suggests that further research with a bigger sample size needs to be conducted on teachers' perspectives on feedback on students' written works. I hope this paper will help and inspire teachers and other researchers to conduct similar research that expands the knowledge in effective feedback provision or any related important area of foreign language teaching.

References

1 Adrefiza, A., & Fortunasari, F. (2020). Written corrective feedback on students' thesis writing: an analysis of student-supervisory interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching Innovations and Materials*, *2*(1), 14-25. DOI:10.26418/jeltim.v2i1.37317

2 Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher Written Feedback on Student Writing: Teachers' and Learners' Perspectives. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(10). DOI:10.17507/tpls.0610.01

3 Altstaedter, L. L., & Doolittle, P. (2014). Students' perceptions of peer feedback. *Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 60-76. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter-Doolittle-2/publication/268388479

4 Cai, R. (2024). Attitudes and Perceptions of Teachers and Chinese Students Towards Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(5), 1328-1338. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1405.05

5 Chang, C. C., & Wei, L. W. (2022). A Self-Investigation into Thai EFL Writing Instructors' Perceptions toward Written Feedback on College Students' Writing Essay Assignment. *English Language Teaching*, *15*(3), 34-45. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v15n8p34

6   Chen, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2019). Assessing student-writers' self-efficacy beliefs about text revision in EFL writing. *Assessing Writing, 40*, 27-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.002

7   Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107.

8   Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (And what do we do in the meantime...?). *J. of second language writing, 13*(1), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005

9   Ghalib, T. K. (2018). EFL writing assessment and evaluation rubrics in Yemen. In Ahmed, A., & Abouabdelkader, H. (Eds.), *Assessing EFL Writing in the 21st Century Arab World* (pp. 261-283). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-64104-1_10

10   Ghalib, T. K. (2018). EFL writing assessment and evaluation rubrics in Yemen. *Assessing EFL writing in the 21st century Arab World: Revealing the unknown*, 261-283. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-64104-1_10

11   Ghanbari, N., & Abdolrezapour, P. (2021). Using emotional intelligence in an EFL integrated writing assessment. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *70*, 101017. DOI:10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101017

12   Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 668-674.

13   https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

14   Khan, R. (2003). Responding to student writing in the TESOL environment: Some feedback options. *The Dhaka University Studies,* June 2002, 1-16.

15   Muliyah, P., Rekha, A., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Learning from mistakes: Students' perception towards teacher's attitude in writing correction. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 44-52. DOI:1032493/ljlal.v2il.6995

16   Naghdipour, B. (2023). Teacher-initiated vs. student-initiated written corrective feedback in EFL writing. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.56040/10.56040/bana2012

17   Park, E. (2006). Review Article on" The Effectiveness of Teacher's Written Feedback on L2 Writing". *SNU Working Papers in English Linguistics and Language*, *5*, 61-73.

18   Qin, J., & Karabacak, E. (2013). Turkish EFL university instructors' practices in providing written feedback. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *70*, 95-100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.044

19   Salih, A., & Rahman, A. (2013). Peer response to L2 student writing: Patterns and expectations. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(3), 42-50. DOI:10.5539/elt.v6n3p42

20   Sukha, P. G., & Listyani, L. (2022). STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES ON THE TEACHERS' WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ONLINE PROFESSIONAL NARRATIVE WRITING CLASS. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *25*(2), 582-595. DOI:10.24071/llt.v25i2.4659

21   Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher feedback: Student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(8), 73-84. DOI:10.5539/elt.v9n8p73

Мадина Казыбай [1], Акмаржан Ногайбаева [2] , Didik Hariyanto [3]*
Гүлжайна Касымова[4]
[1]Абай Атындағы Республикалық Мектеп-интернаты, Алматы, Қазақстан
[2]SDU University, Қаскелең, Қазақстан
[3]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Индонезия
[4]Абай атындағы Қазақ Ұлттық Педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
*e-mail: 231323004@sdu.edu.kz

Аңдатпа. Бұл (qualitative) зерттеу жұмысы қазақ ағылшын тілі (EFL) мұғалімдерінің оқушылардың жазба жұмыстарына берілетін мұғалімдердің кері байаныстарына көзқарастарын, олардың кері байланыс беру тәжірибелерін және кездесетін қиындықтарын зерттеуді мақсат етеді. Деректер Алматы қаласындағы мемлекеттік, мамандандырылған және

халықаралық мектеп мұғалімдерімен өткізілген сұхбаттар арқылы жиналды. Жиналған мәліметтер тақырыптық анализ (thematic analysis) әдісімен талданды.

Зерттеу нәтижелері жазбаша жұмыстарға берілетін пікірдің оқушылардың жазу дағдыларын жақсартуда маңызды рөл атқаратынын көрсетті. Қатысушылар негізінен таңдаулы кері (selective feedback) байланыс беруді немесе жазу тапсырмасының мақсатына сәйкес кері байланыс беруді құптады. Сонымен қатар, кейбір мұғалімдер тікелей кері байланыс (direct feedback) дұрыс деп есептесе, басқалары жанама кері байланыс (indirect feedback) беруді жөн көрді, өйткені бұл оқушыларды терең әрі өз бетінше оқуға ынталандырады деп санайды.

Сонымен бірге, уақыттың жеткіліксіздігі, тексерілуі қажет ететін жазба жұмыстардың көптігі, түсініксіз жазу үлгісі, плагиат және жасанды интеллектті шамадан тыс пайдалану сияқты қиындықтар мұғалімдер үшін негізгі мәселелер ретінде анықталды.

Түйін сөздер: Мұғалімнің кері байланысы, мұғалімдердің көзқарастары, жазба жұмыстары, жазу дағдысы, кері байланыс беру практикалары, жазба жұмыстардағы қателерді түзеу, өз бетінше оқу.

Мадина Казыбай [1], Акмаржан Ногайбаева [2] , Didik Hariyanto [3]*
Гүлжайна Касымова[4]
[1]Республиканская средняя школа-интернат имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан
[2]SDU University, Каскелен, Казахстан
[3]Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Индонезия
[4]Казахский Национальный Педагогический университет имени Абая,
Алматы, Казахстан
*e-mail: 231323004@sdu.edu.kz

Аннотация. Данное (qualitative) исследование направлено на изучение взглядов казахстанских преподавателей английского языка как иностранного (EFL) на обратную связь по письменным работам, а также на исследование их практики предоставления обратной связи и возникающих трудностей. Данные были собраны с помощью интервью с учителями из государственных, специализированных и международных школ в Алматы, Казахстан. Транскрибированные данные были проанализированы с использованием тематического анализа.

Результаты исследования показывают, что обратная связь по письменным работам играет ключевую роль в развитии навыков письма у учащихся. Участники отдавали предпочтение выборочной обратной связи (selective feedback) или обратной связи, соответствующей цели письменного задания. Также было выявлено, что некоторые учителя предпочитают прямую обратную связь (direct feedback), тогда как другие считают более эффективной косвенную обратную связь (indirect feedback), полагая, что она способствует более глубокому и самостоятельному обучению учащихся.

Кроме того, среди основных трудностей, с которыми сталкиваются преподаватели, были отмечены нехватка времени, большое количество письменных работ для проверки, неразборчивый почерк, а также случаи плагиата и использование искусственного интеллекта.

Ключевые слова: Обратная связь, взгляды преподавателей, письменные работы, писательские навыки, практика обратной связи, исправление ошибок в письменных работах, самостоятельные обучение.