THE EFFECTS OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON FRENCH WRITING SKILLS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Alifia Jihan Anandani Bima*, Dadang Sunendar, and Dante Darmawangsa
French Language Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

*Corresponding Author's email address: alifiajihanab@upi.edu

A B S T R A C T

Written corrective feedback (WCF) in second-language writing studies has been conducted over the last two decades to investigate whether it has a positive or negative impact on students' writing skills. Teachers can use direct WCF or indirect WCF strategies to provide this feedback. However, conflicting views still exist on which WCF strategy is most effective in improving second language writing skills. This study aims to examine the effects of implementing direct and indirect written corrective feedback on the enhancement of French writing skills. The research employed a quantitative approach utilizing a static-group pre-test and post-test design. The participants in this study consisted of fifty-six students enrolled in the French Language Education Study Program at a public university in Bandung, Indonesia. They were divided into two experimental groups, referred to as the direct and indirect written corrective feedback groups. They were assessed through a writing test for French narrative texts. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS, employing normality and homogeneity tests, as well as the N-Gain test and Mann-Whitney U test which aimed to determine the average differences and their significance. The findings indicated that the direct written corrective feedback group exhibited a significantly greater improvement (N-Gain score: 0.3229) compared to the indirect written corrective feedback group (N-Gain score: 0.1174). Nonetheless, the statistical analysis utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test found no significant difference in the N-Gain scores between the two WCF classes ($p>0.05$). The results of this research are expected to contribute to second language writing studies and provide insights for teachers in teaching writing in French as a foreign language.

A R T I C L E   I N F O

Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa
The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on French writing skills: A comparative study

| 80

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are considered the most complex and highly difficult (Sutarman et al., 2019). Even for native speakers, writing skills are viewed to be more challenging than other language skills (Iskandarwassid & Sunendar, 2009). Proficiency in writing necessitates a holistic comprehension of diverse linguistic and non-linguistic elements that serve as the foundation for written expression. Writers must demonstrate a profound grasp of grammatical structures, vocabulary, and other linguistic components to effectively convey ideas and concepts through written communication that can be easily understood by readers. The integration of these components is essential for the creation of coherent and cohesive written texts. This challenge is not exclusive to non-native speakers or individuals acquiring a foreign language; both groups encounter similar difficulties in achieving proficiency in these areas

Learning writing skills, including in French, encourages language learners to produce well-written texts (Darmawangsa, 2015). To write a text well, three stages should be completed during the writing process: planning, drafting, and revision (Flower & Hayes, 1981). They emphasized that the planning stage is the first and most significant because the learners have to decide on the topic, the beginning of the writing, as well as the structure of the text. Following that, learners choose linguistic components (vocabulary, syntactic structure construction, orthographic representation of words, etc.) for the drafting text stage. At this stage, new ideas that are not part of the initial plan can be added. In the revision stage, learners examine the text produced after or during the writing process. When revising the text, learners can correct both the surface (spelling, syntax, punctuation, etc.) and the content (the way of expressing ideas, the structure of ideas, and the text's coherence).

One of the processes involved in teaching and learning activities, including writing, is feedback. One form of feedback known and widely applied in second language writing teaching and learning over the last two decades is written corrective feedback, commonly referred to as WCF. It is a strategy for assisting learners in correcting their errors by providing encouragement and feedback through comments on parts of the text that contain errors (Ellis, 2007). In other words, written corrective feedback allows teachers to point out to students where they went wrong with their previous work so that they can correct it. By providing feedback, teachers encourage their students to produce better and more accurate writing in the future. In addition, Ammar (2017) stated that written corrective feedback improves the quality of writing and language precision in the long term.

Many studies have been conducted to determine whether written corrective feedback positively or negatively affects the language teaching and learning process, particularly regarding writing skills. According to Truscott (1996), written corrective feedback is ineffective and does not reduce the number of errors in subsequent work. He mentioned that when learners are told about their errors, they feel stressed, hindering them from writing and making them think that writing is not a pleasant activity. This ineffectiveness led Truscott to argue that corrective feedback should be abandoned (Truscott, 1996, 2007). The argument is refuted by the statement that written corrective feedback is effective and helps learners improve their foreign language writing skills (Ferris, 1999). Other studies that showed the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in reducing errors as well as improving foreign language writing abilities lend further weight to this claim (See (Bitchener & Storch, 2016; Farjadnasab & khodashenas, 2017; Kang & Han, 2015).

Regarding teaching writing skills in French, several studies have shown the contribution of WCF to improving the quality of students' writing. Seyam (2022) stated that the group of students who received WCF made fewer errors compared to the control group, which refers to their increased ability to correct errors when rewriting the text. The revised texts had corrected morphosyntactic, lexical, and spelling errors. These experimental groups made significant progress in improving language precision, showing WCF's beneficial effect in helping students focus on proper language structure. Furthermore, Bouhlal (2019) also revealed that the WCF helps students improve their writing in the categories of nominal phrase agreement (NP), verb phrase agreement (VP), NP and VP structure, as well as grammatical homophones. Bouhlal (2019) added that providing WCF benefits students' grades more than not providing it. Furthermore, Chao & Quesada (2023) revealed that providing WCF improved students' ability to reflect on their errors, identify the origins of each error, and correct them, thereby fostering greater autonomy in the learning process.

Teachers can provide the WCF either directly or indirectly. Direct WCF is a type of feedback that involves crossing out unnecessary elements, inserting missing elements (morphemes, words, or phrases), or giving the correct form of the errors made clearly and explicitly so that the learner can immediately recognize them. Meanwhile, indirect WCF is a feedback strategy that involves identifying the error's location but not giving the correct form. The type of correction given in indirect WCF can be underlining or circling the errors made (Bitchener & Storch, 2016). In this case, the student is supposed to identify the errors made and figure out the correct form of the error location that has been shown.

Previous studies have revealed various facts concerning the implementation of these two strategies that still raise debates about which strategy is considered the most effective. According to some findings of previous studies on the implementation of direct and indirect WCF, direct WCF is more significant and influential than indirect WCF in terms of improving writing accuracy in the long and short terms with a significantly reduced number of errors when compared to indirect WCF (C. van Beuningen et al., 2008). A study by Almasi & Tabrizi (2016) also shows that direct feedback improves writing accuracy. Similar findings were found through a study by Mafulah & Basthomi (2022), which demonstrated that direct WCF is more effective than indirect WCF at improving written text accuracy. In the direct WCF class, language learners do not need to make corrections

because the teacher has provided the correct form, allowing them to notice the errors made and revise their writing right away.

On the other hand, some other research findings indicated that indirect WCF is better than direct WCF in terms of effectiveness. For instance, Khodareza & Delvand (2016) found that the group treated with indirect WCF had better results than those treated with direct WCF. This is due to the fact that learners must figure out the corrections on their own given their errors are only marked without any suggestions or explanations. Additionally, receiving indirect WCF can make students understand the errors and make self-correction more effectively than direct feedback (Rahmawati, 2017). Thananchai & Padgate (2018) discovered a related fact where indirect WCF is advantageous because it encourages students to pay more attention to the errors they commit, leading them to invest more time and effort in identifying those errors and coming up with the appropriate corrections. According to the findings of these studies, learners given indirect WCF must first recognize the types of errors made before correcting them. The phase that students go through as they fix their errors can improve their problem-solving skills. Despite this, other research findings indicate few significant differences between the two strategies (Amin & Saadatmanesh, 2018; Kang & Han, 2015; Rustipa, 2014). Thus, these studies demonstrate that there are still multiple views on which WCF strategy is most effective in improving foreign language writing skills.

Based on the reasons above, studies on implementing these two strategies are still relevant to enrich the repertoire of studies on WCF in language teaching and learning, especially in writing skills. In addition, studies on the use of both techniques to improve French writing skills in non-francophone countries, including Indonesia, also need to be conducted. A literature search of previous studies shows that they are more focused on teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL) than French as a foreign language (Français langue étrangère/FLE), especially in terms of comparing direct and indirect WCF. Indeed, studies on effective corrective feedback strategies in French writing skills teaching and learning are considered vital as many differences in the linguistic features between French and Indonesian may lead to errors. As a result, implementing direct and indirect WCF in learning French writing skills is a significant and relevant research gap that must be filled to investigate which strategy is more effective in improving French learners' writing skills. Based on this rationale, the researcher focuses on this study which intends to describe and analyze the improvement of students' learning outcomes by applying direct and indirect WCF in teaching and learning French writing skills to discover which strategy is more effective.

2. METHOD
2.1 Research Design
This study used a quantitative method in the form of experimental research with a static-group pre-test-post-test design (Fraenkel et al., 2012). In this research design, two experimental groups received different treatments, as well as a pre-test and post-test. The first group received direct WCF treatment, whereas the second group received indirect WCF treatment. The two groups sampled in this study were previously established; thus, there was no need to divide them randomly. The research design is presented in Table 1 below:

Table 1.
The Static-Group Pre-test & Post-test Design (Fraenkel et al., 2012)

Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
O_1	X_1	O_2
O_1	X_2	O_2

Note:
O_1 = Pretest
X_1 = Treatment (Direct WCF)
X_2 = Treatment (Indirect WCF)
O_2 = Posttest

2.2 Participants
The participants involved as the research sample were selected from a group of 63 students in two classes (classes A and B) enrolled in the French Language Education Study Program at a public university in Bandung - Indonesia, in the fourth semester of the 2022-2023 academic year. Out of 63 students, 56 students (28 from class A and 28 from class B) agreed to participate in the study. The students from the fourth semester were chosen based on the fact that the French learning materials of level A2 (basic - intermediate, enduring) - (*élémentaire - intermédiare, de survie*) according to the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment)/ CECRL (*Le cadre européen commun de référence pour les langues: apprendre, enseigner, évalue*r) are taught in the fourth semester.

2.3 Data Collection
This study used test instruments to collect data. The test instruments consisted of a pre-test and post-test in the form of written tests, which were writing French narrative texts on *les vacances* (vacations) themes. The selection of text types and themes was adjusted to the ability level of the research participants, which is A2 level. The

Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa
The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on French writing skills: A comparative study

| 82

theme is one of the A2 level learning outcomes, including short descriptions of events, past activities, and personal experiences (*faire une description brève et élémentaire d'un événement, d'activités passées et d'expériences personnelles)* (Conseil de l'Europe, 2018). The test assessment used the CECRL or CEFR assessment criteria, a reference used globally for learning, teaching, and assessing French. CECRL is a reference made by the Common European Framework as a reference for learners and teachers in learning, teaching, and evaluation. It is classified into six levels of language profiency (A1-C2) and explains the objectives of each linguistic competence (Tagliante, 2005). For this reason, the CECRL assessment instrument at A2 level writing skills was used in this study, as shown in Table 2 below:

Table 2.
CECRL Level A2 French Writing Skills Assessment Criteria (Tagliante, 2005)

No.	Aspect	Score								
1.	Compliance with instructions (*respect de la consigne*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2				
2.	Global performance (*performance globale*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2				
3.	Relevance of the information provided (*pertinence des informations données*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2				
4.	Correct and simple structures (*stuctures simples correctes*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2	2,5	3	3,5	4
5.	Proper lexicon (*lexique approprié*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2	2,5	3		
6.	Presence of simple articulators, such as "and", "but" and "because" (*présence d'articulateurs simples, comme «et», «mais» et «parce que»*)	0	0,5	1	1,5	2				
	Total Score	**15**								

2.4 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative data derived from the calculated test results were then processed by descriptive and inferential statistics using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. Before testing the research hypothesis, a prerequisite test was first carried out as a normality test to see whether the sample data comes from a normally distributed population, and a homogeneity test was aimed to test that each group to be compared has the same variance. The normality test used in this study was the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with a significant >0.05 that determined the normally distributed data. The Levene test was used with significant >0.05 for the homogeneity test, which determined that the data had the same or homogeneous population variance.

Data analysis took place after the prerequisite test to ascertain the improvement in learning outcomes following the implementation of direct and indirect WCF. The analysis was accomplished by calculating the N-Gain score to examine the difference between pre-test and post-test scores using the Hake formula:

$$\text{N-Gain} = \frac{Posttest\ Score - Pretest\ Score}{Ideal\ Score - Pretest\ Score}$$

The N-Gain score results from both classes are categorized by referring to Table 3 as follows:

Table 3.
N-Gain Score Conversion (Hake, 1999)

<g> Score	Categories
g > 0,7	High
0,3 ≤ g ≤ 0,7	Medium
g < 0,3	Low

After the prerequisite test and determining the N-Gain score were completed, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was used to evaluate the hypothesis. In this hypothesis test, the estimated value was the previous N-Gain score, which demonstrated the relevance of the improvement in scores gained from both classes after receiving various WCF strategies. The hypotheses for this study are as follows:

H0	There is no significant difference in learning outcomes in the implementation of direct & indirect WCF
H1	There are differences in learning outcomes in the implementation of direct & indirect WCF
Decision making	H0 is accepted if p-value > 0.05 while H1 is accepted if p-value < 0.05.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A prerequisite test was conducted before the hypothesis test, and the results obtained determined the kind of hypothesis test that would be performed. The first prerequisite test conducted was the normality test on the results of the pre-test and post-test scores from the direct WCF and indirect WCF classes using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table 4 below shows the results of the normality test:

Table 4.
Normality Test Results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			
Class	Statistic	Df	Asymp. Sig.	Notes
Pre-test Direct WCF	0.179	28	0.023	Not Normal
Post-test Direct WCF	0.191	28	0.010	Not Normal
Pre-test Indirect WCF	0.170	28	0.038	Not Normal
Post-test Indirect WCF	0.220	28	0.001	Not Normal
Pre-test Direct WCF	0.179	28	0.023	Not Normal

According to the table above, the significant value of the pre-test results for the direct WCF class is 0.023 ($p<0.05$), while the significant value for the indirect WCF class is 0.038 ($p<0.05$). Furthermore, the significant value of the post-test results of the direct WCF and indirect WCF is 0.10 ($p<0.05$) and 0.008 ($p<0.05$), respectively. If the $p>0.05$, the data can be considered normal, but the data from the direct and indirect WCF classes show that the $p<0.05$. Thus, the pre-test and post-test findings from the direct and indirect WCF classes' normality test data are considered not normally distributed.

The homogeneity test was conducted following the normality test to evaluate whether the two WCF classes have the same data variance using the Levene test. Table 5 below shows the results of the homogeneity test:

Table 5.
Homogeneity Test Result

	Levene		
Class	Statistic	Asymp. Sig.	Notes
Direct&Indirect WCF	0.306	0.583	Homogen

According to the table above, a significant value of 0.583 ($p>0.05$) is found in the homogeneity test findings based on the Levene test. If the $p>0.05$, the data is considered homogenous or derived from the same variation. Since the data gained from the two WCF classes is more than 0.05, it implies that the participants are homogenous.

After the normality and homogeneity tests were completed, the total and average score for every aspect of both the pre-test and post-test was calculated. The results obtained are presented in Table 6 below:

Table 6.
The Average Score for Every Aspect

Class	Aspect	Total Score Pretest	Average Score Pretest	Total Score Posttest	Average Score Posttest	Total Score Gain	Average Score Gain
Direct WCF	1. Compliance with instructions (*respect de la consigne*)	42.5	1.52	53	1.89	10.5	0.37
	2. Global performance (*performance globale*)	48.5	1.73	52	1.86	3.5	0.13
	3. Relevance of the information provided (*pertinence des informations données*)	48.5	1.73	48	1.71	-0.5	-0.02
	4. Correct and simple structures (*stuctures simples correctes*)	88	3.14	97.5	3.48	9.5	0.34

Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa
The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on French writing skills: A comparative study

| 84

	5. Proper lexicon (*lexique approprié*)	49.5	1.77	60.5	2.16	11	0.39
	6. Presence of simple articulators, such as "and", "but" and "because" (*présence d'articulateurs simples, comme «et», «mais» et «parce que»*)	45	1.61	51.5	1.84	6.5	0.23
	Total score	322	11.5	362.5	12.95	40.5	1.45
Indirect WCF	1. Compliance with instructions (*respect de la consigne*)	51	1.82	52	1.86	1	0.04
	2. Global performance (*performance globale*)	51.5	1.84	53.5	1.91	2	0.07
	3. Relevance of the information provided (*pertinence des informations données*)	52	1.86	51	1.82	-1	-0.04
	4. Correct and simple structures (*stuctures simples correctes*)	94	3.36	98.5	3.52	4.5	0.16
	5. Proper lexicon (*lexique approprié*)	56.6	2.02	63	2.25	6.5	0.23
	6. Presence of simple articulators, such as "and", "but" and "because" (*présence d'articulateurs simples, comme «et», «mais» et «parce que»*)	52	1.86	53	1.89	1	0.03
	Total score	357	12.75	371	13.25	14	0.5

The ratings presented in the table above demonstrate an improvement in total and average scores in nearly every category, including compliance with instructions, global performance, correct and simple structures, proper lexicon, and the presence of simple articulators. However, the relevance of the information provided is one factor that has reduced the overall average score. Within the direct WCF class, the average score for compliance with instructions increased from 1.52 to 1.89, with a total score of 2. Concurrently, the global performance category went from 1.73 to 1.89 out of a total score of 2. Furthermore, the correct and simple structures category improved from 3.14 to 3.48, scoring 4. The proper lexicon category has risen from 1.77 to 2.16, with a total score of 3. In conclusion, the presence of the simple articulator category showed an average increase from 1.61 to 1.84, based on a total score of 2.

Similarly, in the indirect WCF class, the average score for compliance with instructions increased from 1.82 to 1.86, with a total score of 2. The global performance category also increased from 1.84 to 1.91, out of a total score of 2. Additionally, the correct and simple structures category went from 3.36 to 3.52, based on a total score of 4. The proper lexicon category experienced an increase from 2.02 to 2.25, considering a total score of 3. Lastly, in the presence of the simple articulators category, the average rose from 1.86 to 1.89, based on a total score of 2.

Furthermore, the N-Gain data from the direct and indirect WCF classes were analyzed from the overall score to determine the increase in the average score obtained from the two WCF classes. The results of the N-Gain data analysis are shown in Table 7 below:

Table 7.
N-Gain Score of Direct and Indirect WCF Classes

Class	Min	Max	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	N-Gain	Category
Direct WCF	-1.5	0.82	11.5	12.95	1.45	0.3229	Medium
Indirect WCF	-2.33	0.75	12.75	13.25	0.5	0.1174	Low

The N-Gain scores for the direct and indirect WCF classes are shown in the table above. In the direct WCF class, the average pre-test result is 11.5, and the average post-test result is 12.95 out of a maximum total score of 15. These results show that the direct WCF class has an average increase of 1.45 with an N-Gain score of 0.3229, which is in the medium improvement category. Meanwhile, in the Indirect WCF class, the average pre-

test result is 12.75, and the average post-test result is 13.25. For this reason, it can be seen that the class has an average increase of 0.5 with an N-Gain score of 0.1174 in the low improvement category. The scores in the indirect WCF class are higher than the direct WCF class in both the pre-test and post-test when the two WCF classes are compared independently between the pre-test and post-test. Nevertheless, the direct WCF class outperforms the indirect WCF class regarding N-Gain.

The direct WCF class has a more significant increase in score than the indirect WCF class (0.3229>0.1174), according to the results of the N-Gain comparison. However, the N-Gain comparison test findings do not show a significant difference in the average improvement between direct and indirect WCF classes. To determine whether there was a significant difference between the two, further statistical analysis in the form of the Mann-Whitney U hypothesis test was conducted.

The Mann-Whitney U test was the hypothesis test used in this study since the prerequisite test showed that the data investigated was not normally distributed and homogeneous. Hence, a non-parametric test was used for the hypothesis testing. The score calculated for the conducted hypothesis test is the previously gained N-Gain score to determine the significance of comparing the improvement in score between the two groups. Table 8 below shows the results of the Mann-Whitney U hypothesis test:

Table 8.
Mann-Whitney U Hypothesis Test Result

	Mann-Whitney U		
	Z	**Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Notes**
N-Gain Score	-1.243	0.214	No difference

Data is considered meaningful if the significant value is less than 0.05 (<0.05). Based on the Mann-Whitney U test results shown in Table 8 above, H0 is accepted because the significant score of the N-gain test for both classes is 0.214 (p>0.05). According to these findings, there is no statistically significant difference in the increase in French writing results between direct and indirect WCF classes.

This study aims to analyze and compare the effectiveness of direct and indirect WCF implementation in teaching and learning writing skills in French. According to the results of the N-Gain score and statistical analysis, both direct and indirect WCF can decrease writing errors as well as improve French writing skills. The results of this study are in line with studies conducted by Amin & Saadatmanesh (2018), Karim & Nassaji (2020) and Fhaeizdhyall & Jerome (2020a) who discovered that classes that received WCF had better writing results than classes that received no WCF at all. According to their study, providing WCF has more remarkable outcomes than not providing it at all, regardless of the strategies used. These findings surely contradict Truscott's (1996) argument that stated if corrective feedback should be abandoned. Instead, language learners need corrective feedback which allows them to correct errors in their writing, prevent them from occurring further, and also produce better writing in the future.

Furthermore, despite the lack of a significant difference, the direct WCF class outperforms the indirect WCF class in terms of improvement results. These elements include both linguistic and nonlinguistic elements, such as respect for the instructions provided, overall writing performance, language structure (conjugation of verbs, prepositions, articles, plural and singular forms, etc.), appropriate vocabulary use, and conjunction use. These results align with the study from Rustipa (2014) who found that although there was a more significant average score improvement in the direct WCF class, there was no statistically significant difference between the direct and indirect WCF classes. Her study also found that both classes improved the overall assessment criteria for writing skills, including content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. These assessment criteria indicate that in this study, the teacher provides feedback on the student's written work as a whole, including grammatical and non-grammatical errors, known as comprehensive WC. Comprehensive WCF refers to a conventional approach where teachers "correct every error" in student writing by providing feedback (C. G. Van Beuningen et al., 2012). This is in contrast to a focused WCF that only provides corrections to one or a few errors made by the learners. The results of this study show that providing corrections to writing comprehensively affects improving the overall quality of writing. These results are consistent with the results of a study conducted by Elsayed (2019), who found that both direct and indirect WCF helped learners correct grammatical and non-grammatical errors during the revision tasks as well as in the new piece of writing. In this case, direct WCF has a stronger influence since it assists learners in recognizing errors, learning from feedback, and avoiding making the same errors repeatedly in their writing. The learners in this study also stated that they need comprehensive feedback from the teachers to assist them in improving their scores in writing. Although there are statements that comprehensive WCF can be confusing and ineffective for learners (Lu, 2023), as long as students are given enough time to understand and act on comprehensive feedback, there seems to be no reason to conclude that this kind of feedback is ineffective (McGrath, 2021). This is important to pay attention to because, in writing, quality is not only evaluated from one aspect but as a whole.

Aside from that, several factors can affect the differences in the results of the feedback process, including the implication of direct and indirect WCF; one of these is students' knowledge and proficiency in the target language (Kang & Han, 2015; Rasool et al., 2022). This is because the differences in language proficiency levels

Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa
The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on French writing skills: A comparative study

| 86

can affect learners' responses to the feedback provided. Participants in this study shared a common background knowledge of French; they were college students who had completed the A1 level of French and were now studying on the A2 level. The level of competency is still at the beginner level, according to CECRL. In accordance with another study, the direct WCF strategy showed a more significant contribution to enhancing students' writing performance when implemented for language learners at the beginner level (Esmaeeli & Sadeghi, 2020; Tursina & Chuang, 2016). It is essential to consider the language learner's level of proficiency when deciding which WCF strategy to employ. Due to their lack of language skills, beginners may need help comprehending how to fix their errors (Kisnanto, 2016). Direct WCF is more helpful since it avoids learner confusion within the feedback given and indicates the errors that were done, also how to correct them (Seiffedin & El-Sakka, 2017). In this case, If the correction is not delivered through WCF in a clearly defined structure, the students may select another incorrect form which could hinder them from learning the correction technique for future writing (Fhaeizdhyall & Jerome, 2020b). On the other hand, language learners with higher language proficiency levels can comprehend indirect WCF more effectively than language learners with lower language proficiency levels because they have more adequate knowledge and capacity to correct the errors themselves.

Apart from that, it is essential to understand and to implement not only the kind of WCF strategy used but also how language learners deal with it; that is, whether they evaluate their errors to produce better writing in the future or ignore them altogether. To make the best use of the WCF provided, the teacher's assistance in understanding the WCF provided is another essential component in ensuring that the feedback is well-received and helpful in enhancing language learners' writing skills, considering that each learner has a different level of understanding. Thus, it is crucial for teachers to arrange subsequent meetings with students who have not fully grasped the provided WCF. Teachers need to ascertain the most effective way to deliver WCF to their students, as feedback that is comprehensible to students holds greater significance than WCF WCF for evaluation (Rasool et al., 2022). Ultimately, the paramount concern lies in how the feedback can effectively assist and motivate students to enhance their writing abilities in future endeavors.

4. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of various WCF strategies, such as direct WCF and indirect WCF in the teaching and learning of French writing skills. The results show that written corrective feedback effectively improves students' French writing performance, regardless of the corrective feedback strategy employed. However, the difference in improvement between the two WCF classes is insignificant. The improvement occurs in almost all aspects of the writing assessment, i.e., compliance with the instructions given, overall writing performance, language structure (conformity of sentence structure with linguistic rules, conjunctions of verbs, prepositions, articles, plural, and singular forms, etc.), proper use of vocabulary, as well as the use of conjunctions. Hence, proficiency level has an impact on the learners' comprehension of the type of WCF provided, particularly in the case of indirect correction, as they may encounter difficulties in rectifying errors based on indirect feedback. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of the underlying factors influencing the effectiveness of the written corrective feedback (WCF) strategy, it is recommended to complement this quantitative research with qualitative investigations. Qualitative research can delve into the perceptions and preferences of both students and teachers regarding the application of the WCF strategy, providing valuable insights into the causal factors at play. Moreover, it is worth noting that this study specifically focuses on French learners at the beginner level, leaving room for future research to explore the impact of the WCF strategy on learners at higher proficiency levels.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

6. REFERENCES

Almasi, E., & Tabrizi, A. R. N. (2016). The Effects of Direct vs. Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *3*(1), 74–85.

Amin, M. M., & Saadatmanesh, S. (2018). Discovering the effectiveness of direct versus indirect corrective feedback on EFL learners' writings: A case of an Iranian context. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, *5*(2), 171–181. https://doi.org/10.1719/IJHCSS

Ammar, A. (2017). *La rétroaction corrective en écriture en L2 : effets de la technique, du niveau de l'apprenant, du genre et du type de l'erreur (Corrective feedback in L2 writing: effects of technique, learner level, genre and type of error)*. Fonds de recherche du Québec-Société et culture.

Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written Corrective Feedback for L2 Development*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095056

Bouhlal, F. (2019). *The effectiveness of written corrective feedback on French as a second language accuracy*. Université de Montréal.

Chao Chao, K. W., & Chacón Quesada, M. de la P. (2023). La retroalimentación correctiva indirecta y la corrección de estudiantes de FLE a nivel Universitario (Indirect corrective feedback and correction of FLE students at university level). *Revista de Filología y Lingüística de La Universidad de Costa Rica*, *49*(1), e52284. https://doi.org/10.15517/rfl.v49i1.52284

Conseil de l'Europe. (2018). *Cadre Européen Commun de Référence pour les Langues : volume complémentaire avec des nouveaux descripteurs (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: complementary volume with new descriptors).* https://rm.coe.int/cecr-volume-complementaire-avec-de-nouveaux-descripteurs/ 16807875d5

Darmawangsa, D. (2015). Twitter en classe de production écrite : Quelques idées pratiques (Twitter in the Written Production Class: Some Practical Ideas). *Séminaire International de l'APFI 2015*, 125–137.

Ellis, R. (2007). Corrective feedback in theory, research and practice. *The 5th International Conference on ELT in China & The 1st Congress of Chinese Applied Linguistics*.

Elsayed, A. S. A. (2019). Written direct and indirect comprehensive feedback's influence on Kuwaiti undergraduate university students' writing Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, *6*(5), 1-37.

Esmaeeli, M., & Sadeghi, K. (2020). The effect of direct versus indirect focused written corrective feedback on developing EFL learners' written and oral skills. *Language Related Research*, *11*(5), 124–189. https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.11.5.124

Farjadnasab, A., & khodashenas, M. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *2*(2), 30–42. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.2.30

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Fhaeizdhyall, A., & Jerome, C. (2020a). The effect of written corrective feedback strategies on collocation errors of low-performing ESL learners. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, *9*(2), 143. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v9i2.2755

Fhaeizdhyall, A., & Jerome, C. (2020b). The effect of written corrective feedback strategies on collocation errors of low-performing ESL learners. *Premise: Journal of English Education*, *9*(2), 143. https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v9i2.2755

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, *32*(4), 365. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-hill.

Hake, R. R. (1999). *Analyzing change/ gain score*. Indiana University.

Iskandarwassid, & Sunendar, D. (2009). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa (Language learning strategy)*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, *99*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189

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

Khodareza, M., & Delvand, S. A. (2016). The impact of written corrective feedback of grammatical points on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences I*, *6*(1), 470–475. http://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2016/01/jls.htm

Kisnanto, Y. P. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on higher education students' writing accuracy. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra UPI*, *16*(2), 121–131. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/bs_jpbsp.v16i2.4476

Lu, Y. (2023). Written corrective feedback: How can it influence adult ELLs writing performance? *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *8*, 825–831. https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v8i.4367

Rahmawati, S. M. (2017). Direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students writing skill. *Journal of English and Education*, *5*(1), 64–71. http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/9904

Rasool, U., Qian, Dr. J., Saqlain, M., & Abbasi, B. N. (2022). Written corrective feedback strategies: A systematic review. *Voyage Journal of Educational Studies*, *2*(2), 67–83. https://doi.org/10.58622/vjes.v2i2.19

Rustipa, K. (2014). The effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving EFL learners' hortatory exposition writing. *The 61 TEFLIN International Conference*.

Seiffedin, A. H., & El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2017). The impact of direct-indirect corrective e-feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(3), 166-175. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0703.02

Seyam, W. M. (2022). L'effet du feedback correctif sur le développement de la précision langagière en production écrite chez les étudiants du cycle secondaire (The effect of corrective feedback on the development of language precision in written production among secondary school students), *21,* 161-182. https://doi.org/10.21608/ssl.2022.166873.1155

Sutarman, S., Sunendar, D., & Mulyati, Y. (2019). Investigating cooperative learning model based on interpersonal intelligence on language learners skill to write article. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(4), 201–218. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12413a

Tagliante, C. (2005). *L'évaluation et le Cadre Europeen Commun (Evaluation and the Common European Framework)*. CLE International.

Bima, Sunendar, & Darmawangsa
The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on French writing skills: A comparative study

| 88

Thananchai, P., & Padgate, W. (2018). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on grammatical improvement in journal writing of grade 9 students in a Thai school. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, *11*(1), 19–27.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, *46*(2), 327-369. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*(4), 255–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003

Tursina, P., & Chuang, M.-T. (2016). Direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students' writing performance. *1st English Education International Conference (EEIC)*, 209–214.

Van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *156*, 279–296. https://doi.org/10.2143/itl.156.0.2034439

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, *62*(1), 1–41. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x