FROM CORRECTIVE TO COLLABORATIVE: UNDERSTANDING FEEDBACK PRACTICES OF INDONESIAN ENGLISH LECTURERS

RINI SUSANTI AND INDAWAN SYAHRI
Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang, Indonesia
Corresponding author: rini@um-palembang.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to investigate how Indonesian university lecturers provide feedback to students, the emotions and challenges they encounter, and the influence of culture and university regulations on feedback practices. The study employed a narrative inquiry approach, which entails listening to participants' stories and documenting their accounts verbatim. The research is conducted at four different universities in Indonesia, including both prominent institutions in the capital and smaller universities in lesser-known towns, to get a diverse range of data. Four lecturers contributed to this research, each originating from diverse locations and educational backgrounds. The data was collected through individual interviews, during which the lecturers were asked several questions on their lives and experiences in providing feedback to their students. Thematic analysis was employed to examine the data. The findings indicate that feedback serves not just to rectify grammatical errors or inaccuracies in the paper but also to enhance the interpersonal relationship between lecturer and student. The trust, caring, and culture derived from a school or nation have a significant impact. This study demonstrates that feedback is complex, influenced by the lecturer's identity, the student's emotional state, and the institutional regulations. The outcome provides novel insights into feedback literacy from the perspective of educators.

Keywords: dialogic feedback, English language teaching, feedback literacy, feedback practices, narrative inquiry

Introduction

Feedback is a crucial component of the learning and teaching process, particularly in second language or foreign language classrooms. Numerous theories indicate that feedback not only addresses mistakes but also enhances student learning, fosters critical thinking, and bolsters confidence. According to Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), feedback should assist students in becoming more self-regulated and understanding their subsequent steps. Carless and Boud (2018) elucidate the concept of feedback literacy, emphasizing that both educators and learners must possess the ability to provide, comprehend, and utilize feedback to facilitate learning, rather than only for correctional purposes.

Research indicates that effective feedback can enhance student motivation and promote active learning, particularly when the feedback is clear, prompt, and allows for student involvement (Winstone & Carless, 2019). At the university level, feedback is no longer limited to written comments on papers; it has evolved into a two-way communication process between teacher and student (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017). This concept posits that feedback is inherently social, collaborative, and context-dependent.

Despite several improvements occurring, feedback in many universities remains outdated. This continues to occur often in Indonesia. Teachers mostly provide written feedback without explanations or discussions, resulting in students' lack of understanding or utilization of the input (Winstone et al., 2017). The university structure is predominantly hierarchical, resulting in a high student-to-faculty ratio and limited time, which complicates the establishment of connections and the provision of personalized feedback (Fithriani, 2019). Many lecturers believe that students can independently read and comprehend feedback; nevertheless, research indicates that students still require substantial assistance (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Additionally, several studies have addressed student perceptions and responses to feedback, while there is a paucity of research examining the teacher's perspective. Particularly, the focus is on educators' perceptions of feedback, the modifications they implement, or lack thereof, and the factors influencing their feedback methodologies. The emotional and relational aspects of feedback are significant; nevertheless, few papers address this dimension, despite its potential impact on the efficacy of feedback (Burke, 2009; Price et al., 2010). This is a significant issue in Indonesia, as teachers are seen as authoritative figures, and students tend to be either overly polite or inactive in discussions.

This research seeks to address several inquiries from the background. The inquiries of this study are: 1) How do lecturers provide feedback to students during actual classroom instruction?; 2) What emotions and challenges do they experience when delivering feedback to students?; and 3) How do university culture and administrative policies influence the manner in which lecturers give feedback? This study aims to demonstrate that feedback functions not just as an educational tool but also relates to interpersonal relationships, cultural contexts, and surrounding circumstances. This research uses narrative inquiry to gather the narratives and significance derived from lecturers' statements. It also employs the concept of feedback literacy, which pertains to individuals' comprehension, provision, and utilization of feedback to facilitate learning. The study demonstrates how university regulations, lecturer perceptions, and cultural factors together impact the feedback process. The objective is to gain a deeper understanding of how Indonesian lecturers provide and perceive feedback in English classes. Additionally, it examines how lecturers modify or maintain their feedback methods despite unfavorable university conditions.

Literature Review

This literature aims to present significant concepts on feedback, primarily within the context of university education, particularly in English language classes. Feedback not only provides corrections but also plays a significant role in enhancing students' knowledge and fostering their confidence in studying. This analysis examines the transition from traditional teacher-centered feedback to a more interactive, bilateral contact with students. It also discusses feedback literacy, emotional responses, and cultural contexts that influence the feedback process. This concept is crucial for this study, as it aims to examine how Indonesian lecturers provide daily feedback and the emotions or thoughts they experience throughout this process.

Transitioning from previous feedback to current feedback

Historically, feedback in educational institutions was limited to teachers providing comments post-assessment, with students required to address the issues themselves (Sadler, 1989). This concept is referred to as the transmission model. Hattie and Timperley (2007) asserted in their renowned book

chapter that feedback is effective if it guides students on subsequent actions. However, frequently, teachers merely write content that students do not comprehend. Brookhart's (2017) book on providing effective feedback also illustrates this issue.

Consequently, several individuals are presently discussing dialogic feedback. It signifies that both the teacher and student engage in mutual feedback, rather than the teacher only delivering information while the student passively listens. Feedback resembles dialogue, wherein both parties contemplate, inquire, and respond. This assists students in achieving personal growth and enhances their drive. Ajjawi and Boud (2017) remains a significant publication in this field, since its paper is widely utilized. The book by Boud and Molloy (2013) provides a comprehensive understanding of how competent teachers deliver feedback in real time. This review utilizes the book to construct the primary theory, while the articles serve to provide real-world examples, such as those by Carless (2015) and Egetenmeier and Strickroth (2024).

Proficiency in feedback interpretation

Another novel concept is feedback literacy. This concept implies that students must have the ability to read, comprehend, and appropriately utilize feedback. Carless and Boud (2018) extensively discuss this in their journal, although feedback literacy is already linked to concepts in Brookhart's (2017) book, since she frequently addresses assisting students in effectively utilizing feedback. Now, this competence is required not only by students but also by teachers. Educators must also be adept at providing feedback in a manner that aligns with the student's circumstances and emotions (Carless & Winstone, 2020).

In English class, criticism consistently addresses grammar, pronunciation, and speaking skills. Teachers must assist students not merely in correcting errors but also in cultivating the courage to attempt new challenges. When feedback is dialogic and possesses strong literacy, students may engage more actively and feel less apprehensive about improvement.

Affective and cultural aspects of feedback

Feedback encompasses not just cognitive processes but also emotional engagement. Burke (2009) asserts that feedback has both emotional and moral dimensions. In Indonesia, culture is also a significant component. Students perceive teachers as parental figures, which may instill fear in them when seeking clarification or expressing confusion. Hargreaves (1998) asserts in his book that teacher emotions and relationships are crucial in the educational process. Articles such as those from Fithriani (2017) and Susanti (2023) just illustrate how this occurs in Indonesia.

Teachers also experience considerable stress. The large class size and several university regulations hinder the provision of feedback. This exhausts teachers, and at times they provide just brief comments without more discussion. Consequently, dialogic feedback is challenging to implement in actual teaching (Strickroth & Egetenmeier, 2024). The article serves solely as support for the primary theory presented in the book.

Absent in literature

Numerous studies have addressed student perceptions of feedback (Winstone et al., 2017), although there is a paucity of discourse on teachers, particularly those in Asia or Indonesia. Numerous

studies originate from the USA or UK, employing surveys and quantitative data. This type of research cannot consistently elucidate the genuine challenges teachers encounter, as culture, religion, regulations, and everyday living in Indonesia vary significantly. The teacher's voice is absent. The emotions of teachers, their decision-making processes regarding correction or encouragement, and the challenges they encounter remain unclear in several writings.

Theoretical foundation and significance of this study

This research employs two principal concepts: dialogic feedback (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017; Boud & Molloy, 2013) and feedback literacy (Brookhart, 2017; Carless & Boud, 2018). These two facilitate the comprehension of feedback not only as a skill, but as a social and emotional endeavor. When we examine feedback of this nature, we may discern its connection to culture, emotion, and the educator's cognition. The works of Sadler (1989) and Hattie & Timperley (2007) provide fundamental insights into the concept of feedback in education.

This research aims to address the gap in literature by narrating the experiences of Indonesian lecturers. The tale illustrates the events that transpire in an actual classroom when a teacher provides feedback. It also examines how teachers balance caring and punishment, their communication with students, and their own emotions. This study presents a novel perspective on feedback as a dynamic entity, rather than only text or commentary. It pertains to relationships, identity, and decision-making in actual school life. This is crucial for assisting universities in Indonesia in developing courses or policies that enhance feedback practices.

Methodology

Research design and approach of the study

This research employs a qualitative methodology, as the objective of the study is to get a profound understanding of how lecturers provide feedback in their actual teaching practices. The objective is not to quantify or evaluate, but to get deeper insights into the narratives and emotions of the lecturers when providing feedback in the university classroom. The research design is narrative inquiry. This technique is suitable for this study as it emphasizes the experiences and narratives conveyed by the participants.

Narrative inquiry assists the researchers in comprehending how individuals see their experiences in relation to time, location, and interpersonal connections. It is also beneficial to understand the rationale behind their actions in the classroom. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) asserted that narrative inquiry is beneficial for educational research since it enables researchers to engage in dialogue and reflection with participants, rather than only about them.

This research involves four English lecturers from four different universities in Indonesia. The participants were selected through purposive sampling due to their extensive teaching experience and ability to provide feedback to students. The researchers conduct face-to-face or online interviews with them in Bahasa Indonesia. Each interview lasts around 60 to 90 minutes and was recorded. The inquiry pertains to their feedback process, identifying what aspects are facile and which are challenging, as well as their emotional responses throughout this activity.

Subsequent to the interviews, the researchers composed a narrative for each lecturer in a straightforward manner. The researchers subsequently revisit the narrative and identifies themes that

illustrate the emotions, beliefs, culture, and pedagogical approaches of the lecturers. This elucidates how feedback occurs in real life and what differentiates each lecturer. This narrative approach provides richer data and elucidates that feedback encompasses not just correction but also relationship and identity.

Research site and participants

The participants in this research are four English lecturers from various institutions in Indonesia. The lecturers were selected through purposive sampling due to their diverse teaching backgrounds and their affiliations with both public and private universities, located in urban and rural locations. All of them have been teaching for over five years, particularly in subjects such as EAP, thesis supervision, and academic writing. The reason they were chosen is because they wish to share narratives and provide comments on their experiences in teaching students. Purposive sampling is employed since it assists researchers in obtaining more detailed and meaningful information on the occurrence of feedback in various academic contexts (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To maintain confidentiality, pseudonyms are assigned to all participants. Although the sample size is limited, this qualitative research employing a story technique is sufficient, as the emphasis is not on quantity but on profound comprehension. This participant assists the researchers in understanding how feedback evolves and develops based on personal and institutional conditions. The following table provides a summary of the participating lecturers' profiles:

Table 1. *Lecturer profiles*

Pseudonym	Institution Types	Teaching Focus	Years of Experiences	Feedback Challenge Highlighted
Nancy	Private University	Thesis Supervision, Writing	7	Student fear and disengagement
Terry	Public University	EAP, Classroom Instruction	10	Overload during assessment
Bryan	Regional Campus	Academic Writing	12	Repeating corrections without uptake
Ivon	Urban University	General English	6	Misunderstanding written feedback

Data collection and analysis

This study employs qualitative research via the narrative inquiry approach. Narrative inquiry is used because it may illustrate the authentic experiences of participants. Although this technique constitutes the primary design, this section just elucidates the data collection and analysis process, rather than the rationale for selecting a narrative approach. The data in this study were collected from four English lecturers at an Indonesian institution. They are from various types of universities, including private and governmental institutions, as well as urban and rural campuses. All participants were selected by purposive sampling to provide a diverse range of experiences.

Researchers used semi-structured interviews to gather data. The interview facilitates the maintenance of consistent questions while permitting the exploration of additional details (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Each interview lasts around 60 to 90 minutes. The interview was conducted either face-to-face or online, depending on the participant's preference. The languages utilized are English and *Bahasa Indonesia*, as participants often feel more at ease expressing profound or emotional narratives in *Bahasa*.

Interview questions inquire about the methods of providing feedback, the interviewee's emotional response when delivering feedback, the university policies or challenges that complicate the feedback process, and the approach taken when communicating with students during class and supervision. All interviews are recorded with consent. The interview is transcribed verbatim into text. If necessary, translate the transcript into English while meticulously preserving the original meaning. Subsequently, the researchers request participants to review the transcript or summary to ensure their concurrence with the material. This procedure enhances the accuracy and equity of the data.

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis according to the methods outlined by Clarke and Braun (2017). The initial phase involves the researchers thoroughly reading the transcript many times to comprehend the narrative and grasp the emotional nuances of the material. Secondly, researchers do open coding. This entails annotating minor concepts or labels when significant information is observed in the data. Third, the codes are categorized into broad classifications. Researchers investigate similar topics and consolidate them. This process is referred to as axial coding. Subsequently, themes emerge from this group, revealing the overarching message derived from the data.

Themes identified include: emotional challenges in feedback, the teacher's choice between written or spoken feedback, issues arising from the university system, and student responses to feedback. In this procedure, researchers also document notes and reflections to capture their feelings and thoughts, ensuring that interpretations are not solely influenced by prejudice. All steps adhere to Clarke and Braun's methodology, although are interwoven with a narrative approach, as the tale is crucial to this study.

The researchers are likewise English lecturers in Indonesia, similar to the participants. Consequently, they comprehend their circumstances, rendering the interview more amicable. However, this may introduce bias; thus, researchers consistently maintain a reflective notebook following each interview. They write about their feelings, surprises, or opinions, and attempts to assess how this may affect the statistics. This reflective activity is crucial in storytelling and aids in theme analysis as it demonstrates how researchers derive meaning from facts while striving for honesty. The procedure is more robust and reliable.

Prior to the interview, participants get comprehensive information on the study and sign a document indicating their consent. Researchers employ pseudonyms to safeguard their identities. Any detail that may reveal an individual's identity, such as the student's name or university name, is removed. All data is stored on a computer with password protection, accessible solely by the researchers. Data is utilized just for research purposes, not for any other reason.

Results

This section presents the findings from interviews with four Indonesian university lecturers who shared their experiences of giving feedback in English language teaching. Using a narrative inquiry approach, the study looked not only at what the lecturers said, but also at how they made sense of their experiences over time, in relation to students, institutions, and their own emotions. The lecturers did not view feedback as a fixed or routine task. Instead, they described it as a flexible process shaped by student attitudes, classroom situations, institutional pressures, and personal feelings. From the analysis, four main themes were identified that reflect the emotional, relational, and teaching aspects of feedback. These are: (1) feedback as emotional and relational work, (2) balancing written and oral feedback, (3) facing constraints and workload, and (4) student responses to feedback. Each theme is explained with examples from the lecturers' stories as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. *Summary of Themes and Supporting Illustrative Narratives*

Theme	Description	Sample Quotes (Condensed)	Related Research Question(s)
Emotional and Relational Work	Feedback involves trust, care, and emotions; shaped by student–teacher ties	"Sometimes students ignore feedback if they don't feel close to me."	RQ1, RQ2
Balancing Oral and Written Feedback	Oral used for clarity and rapport; written for structure and reference	"I give feedbacks, but I explain them directly too."	RQ1
Institutional Constraints	Feedback is limited by time, class size, workload	"I want to give better feedback, but there are 40 students."	RQ2, RQ3
Student Agency and Feedback Uptake	Uptake depends on trust, clarity, and delivery style	"They listen if the tone is soft and encouraging."	RQ1, RQ3

Feedback as emotional and relational work – building rapport, frustration, and navigating student resistance

For many lecturers, feedback is not merely a technical process of correction, but a deeply emotional and relational act. Participants in this study consistently emphasized that the effectiveness of feedback depends on the quality of the relationship between lecturer and student. When students feel distant or fearful, they may disengage—even when the feedback is relevant or constructive. Nancy described this dynamic by stating, "It depends on the closeness between the student and the lecturer. If students already feel anxious around the lecturer, whatever the lecturer says just passes through them. The next day, they haven't done what we asked." She candidly admitted to feeling frustrated when her efforts went unnoticed, saying, "Honestly, I do get upset sometimes." However, instead of withdrawing, Nancy responded by reaching out to a co-supervisor to better understand the student's preferences: "I tried to communicate with the other supervisor. I asked, who is this student more

comfortable receiving feedback from?" For Nancy, feedback extended well beyond written commentary—it was a process of ongoing relational negotiation, shaped by care and collaboration.

Terry also reflected on the emotional challenges of giving feedback, particularly when students reacted with discouragement. She noted, "Some students get shocked when there is too much feedback given at once. That's what makes them feel reluctant to continue." To mitigate this, she took a personalized approach, combining critique with encouragement. "I believe that kind of approach motivates them and stimulates them to do better," she explained.

Similarly, Bryan expressed both dedication and frustration when students repeatedly disregarded his feedback. He recounted one incident: "I gave the student three chances and it was still wrong. On the fourth chance, I asked the student to bring a laptop and I typed the correction myself." While the situation was emotionally taxing, his actions demonstrated a commitment to student learning, underpinned by persistence rather than punishment.

These narratives reveal that feedback is inseparable from emotional labor, trust-building, and student–teacher dynamics. Lecturers do not simply respond to texts—they respond to learners as individuals, navigating a landscape shaped by motivation, frustration, and relational distance. In this context, feedback becomes not just a corrective mechanism, but a site of connection—a space where care and pedagogy meet.

Balancing oral and written feedback – oral feedback preferred in supervision; written feedback used for structure and clarity

A second key theme emerging from the data was how lecturers balance oral and written feedback based on context, purpose, and the perceived needs of students. While written feedback remains dominant in formal coursework, participants expressed a clear preference for oral feedback in supervisory settings, where real-time dialogue fosters clarity, rapport, and deeper understanding.

Nancy shared that in thesis supervision, she often prioritizes face-to-face explanation because written feedbacks alone are not always sufficient. "Sometimes, students don't read the comments carefully, or they misunderstand. So, I prefer to explain directly what I mean." She emphasized that oral feedback allows for immediate clarification and follow-up, which supports stronger engagement and learning. Terry echoed this preference, especially when working with struggling students. "If the student is really confused, written feedback makes them even more lost. So, I call them and explain it again." She noted that this personal interaction helped reduce anxiety and often led to more productive revisions.

However, written feedback remains essential—particularly in large classes where individual follow-up is not always feasible. Lecturers use written comments to ensure that students have concrete, structured guidance they can revisit. Bryan explained, "Written feedback is important for structure and detail. I try to make it organized, so students know what to fix step by step." Even so, participants acknowledged that students often overlook or misinterpret written feedback. To address this, Ivon described combining both modes: "I give written feedback first, and then discuss it orally if needed. It helps make sure they really understand."

These experiences illustrate how lecturers strategically shift between oral and written feedback depending on the context—favoring oral feedback for depth, clarity, and personal connection, and written feedback for structure, documentation, and consistency. The combination of both is seen as complementary, reinforcing each other to enhance students' comprehension and academic growth.

Feedback under constraint – time, institutional demands, and class size affect feedback quality

The third theme highlights how institutional pressures and limited resources significantly shape lecturers' ability to deliver timely, personalized, and meaningful feedback. All participants acknowledged that while they valued high-quality feedback, their capacity to provide it was often constrained by large class sizes, tight schedules, and administrative workload. Nancy described the difficulty of giving individualized feedback when teaching large cohorts: "In one class I have 40 students. It's impossible to give detailed feedback to everyone in a short amount of time." She noted that this often resulted in more generic or abbreviated comments, especially during mid-semester assessments.

Bryan expressed similar concerns, particularly during exam marking and supervision periods. "The time is very limited. I have to finish feedback for many students while also teaching and doing admin tasks." He admitted that sometimes he could only highlight major issues, without the space to explain in depth. This constraint, he said, made him feel "guilty" because he believed students deserved more support. Terry emphasized the emotional toll of navigating institutional expectations with limited time. "I want to give better feedback, but we have so many responsibilities. Sometimes I feel bad because I know the feedback is too short." She also highlighted the pressure of balancing multiple roles—lecturer, supervisor, and committee member—while still trying to be responsive to student needs. Ivon added that institutional systems rarely account for the time and effort feedback requires. "We are expected to give feedback, but it's not calculated in our workload. That makes it hard to prioritize." This lack of institutional recognition not only affects feedback quality, but also lecturer motivation and well-being.

These accounts show that feedback, while pedagogically central, is logistically vulnerable—often competing with other demands in a crowded academic environment. The findings reveal a tension between lecturers' professional values and the structural limitations of their working conditions. Despite these constraints, participants continued to strive for meaningful feedback, often compensating with informal or extra efforts beyond formal requirements.

Student agency and selective uptake – students' responsiveness influenced by trust, clarity, and feedback style

The final theme underscores the active role of students in the feedback process, particularly in how they interpret, value, or ignore the feedback provided by their lecturers. Although much of the literature focuses on feedback delivery, these narratives reveal that feedback impact is also shaped by student agency, including their emotional readiness, motivation, and relationship with the lecturer. Participants consistently noted that students respond more positively when feedback is delivered in a style that feels supportive, clear, and personalized.

Nancy reflected on how students selectively take up feedback based on who delivers it and how they perceive the relationship: "Sometimes they only listen to the supervisor they are more comfortable with. Even if I say the same thing, they won't do it if it doesn't come from the person they trust." This observation highlights how trust functions as a filter through which feedback is either accepted or disregarded.

Terry emphasized the importance of clarity and tone in encouraging students to act on feedback. "If we give too much criticism at once, they shut down. But if we explain step-by-step and highlight

what's good too, they listen more." And some also give positive respond, like they more want to listen.) She says that when she mixes feedback that help with words that give spirit, the students more open and ready to accept. Bryan also says that some students only really pay attention if feedback is given by talking direct. "If I write it, they no read. But if I sit together and show, then they start to give reaction." This match with idea before that oral feedback is for build relation, but now it also shows that students can choose how and when they want to accept feedback.

Ivon gave other view, she said how confident students are in academic also change how they see feedback. "Some students think feedback mean they already fail. They see it like judgement, not like help." She tries to change the way student think by explain that feedback is one part of learning way, so students later start to think more positive about it.

These stories show that feedback is not something fixed, but it moving and changing interaction, where student trust, feeling, and how feedback is given together decide if students want to use the feedback or not. The lecturers in this study know that they must change their way to give feedback to follow where students are—in feeling, study level, and in how they relate. They believe the big effect of feedback not only in what is said, but in how students feel it and use it after.

Discussion

This section will elucidate the findings of the study and correlate them with the three research topics. The initial aspect pertains to the manner in which educators provide feedback to students throughout their actual instruction. The second pertains to the emotions or obstacles encountered during the feedback process. The third factor is the influence of cultural and institutional conditions on the feedback process. The data reveal four themes that elucidate these questions: feedback as emotional and relational labor, the balance between oral and written feedback, the pressure exerted by the institution, and students' responses to feedback.

Feedback as emotional and relational work, this subject addresses how lecturers provide feedback and the emotions they experience. The results indicate that feedback transcends mere error correction; it is profoundly emotional and contingent upon interpersonal relationships. As Nancy stated, if students do not have a connection with the lecturer, they will be disinclined to heed or follow the guidance provided. She feels disheartened when students disregard her criticism, however she attempts to assist them by consulting another supervisor. This demonstrates that feedback is not static. It alters due to trust and emotion. This conclusion aligns with the research conducted by Ajjawi and Boud (2017), which posits that dialogic feedback necessitates trust, empathy, and a strong relationship. Zhang and Hyland (2018) elucidate that teacher emotions and beliefs significantly influence feedback. Certain educators in this research, such as Bryan, experience fatigue and frustration; yet, they continue to assist the student. This indicates that teachers not only provide feedback but also regulate emotions and relationships, a concept referred to as "affective work" in feedback literacy by Carless and Boud (2018).

Adapting written and oral feedback, this subject also addresses the first inquiry on how lecturers provide feedback in actual classroom contexts. The participants in this study demonstrate the utilization of both written and spoken feedback, selecting one based on the context. Nancy and Terry favor oral feedback in supervision, as students often struggle to comprehend written comments. Ivon stated that she provides textual instructions initially; but, if the learner remains unclear, she will offer verbal clarification. These findings corroborate Carless (2015), who asserted that feedback must align with the task and the learner's context. In large classes, written input is beneficial for organization

and substantiation. Bryan stated that he writes comments sequentially to facilitate student comprehension. This also illustrates the assertion made by Winstone and Carless (2019) that educators may employ various feedback methods to facilitate student learning. Oral and written feedback are complementary rather than contradictory, since they may mutually enhance one another. The educators in this study demonstrate feedback literacy by discerning the appropriate timing for utilizing various types of feedback.

Institutional constraints and feedback practices, this subject addresses the second and third questions. It illustrates the problems or challenges encountered by the lecturers and how the institutional conditions exacerbate these difficulties. All lecturers reported an excessive number of students, an overwhelming number of administrative tasks, and insufficient time to provide quality feedback. Nancy stated that she instructs 40 students in a single lesson, hence she is unable to provide detailed comments to everyone. Bryan expressed feelings of remorse due to his inability to provide further explanation. Ivon stated that feedback is not included in the assignment, making it challenging to concentrate on it. This circumstance parallels earlier study conducted in Asia. Phan and Tran (2015) and Tran (2013) indicated that a large student population and a hierarchical university structure complicate the provision of feedback. Ryan and Henderson (2018) also refer to the "hidden curriculum" of feedback, indicating that universities prioritize rapid results above profound learning. Despite the lecturers' efforts in this study, the system complicates matters. Consequently, universities must modify the workload and enhance the timeliness of feedback and training support.

Student agency and feedback uptake, this subject elucidates the methods by which lecturers provide feedback and examines the influence of culture and student conduct on this process. The teachers stated that even when they provide feedbacks, some students do not adhere to it. Nancy stated that students exclusively heed the guidance of a single supervisor whom they favor. Terry stated that excessive criticism might demoralize kids. Bryan stated that students tend to disregard written criticism and are more responsive in face-to-face interactions. Ivon stated that certain students perceive feedback as indicative of failure. These findings indicate that student trust, emotions, and beliefs are significant. Winstone et al. (2017) asserted that students require feedback literacy to comprehend and utilize the feedback effectively. Molloy, Boud, and Henderson (2020) assert that feedback is interaction rather than only a message. In this study, lecturers' endeavor to alter students' perceptions of feedback, rendering it not intimidating but beneficial. They employ a gentle tone, segment their discourse, or engage in a more intimate manner. This indicates that feedback is a collaborative effort between the student and the teacher.

Cultural influences on feedback , finally, culture significantly influences the manner in which feedback is conveyed in Indonesia. In Indonesian universities, students frequently refrain from posing questions or challenging lecturers due to a sense of respect. This hinders the transformation of feedback into discourse. In this study, lecturers' endeavor to assist students through the use of gentle language or casual discourse. This approach alleviates students' apprehension. This supports Phan and Tran (2015), who asserted that in Asia, feedback must be culturally appropriate. The global feedback model originating from Western countries cannot be immediately applicable. In Indonesia, it is essential to employ a feedback method that aligns with local values. This study demonstrates that feedback is not neutral; it invariably occurs within the context of culture and relationships.

Conclusion and Implications

This study seeks to address three primary questions: how lecturers provide feedback in their actual teaching, the emotions and obstacles they encounter, and the influence of culture and institutional conditions on their feedback. This study, informed by interviews with four English lecturers in Indonesia, revealed that feedback encompasses not just corrections but also emotions, relationships, and contextual factors. The initial finding indicates that feedback constitutes emotional and relational labor. Lecturers experience annoyance, concern, or fatigue when students do not respond adequately. They adapt their approach to align with student emotions and trust. This addresses the first and second research questions. Secondly, lecturers employ both written and spoken feedback. They select based on the setting and the needs of the students. This demonstrates how feedback is provided in an actual classroom setting. Third, institutional challenges such as large class sizes, excessive workload, and limited time hinder the provision of comprehensive feedback. This elucidates the challenges they encounter and the impact of the system on their profession. Finally, students also determine the functioning of feedback. If individuals feel secure, they are more receptive. If people perceive input as failure, they disregard it. This pertains to culture and student trust, addressing the third question.

This study corroborates the assertions of Ajjawi and Boud (2017) on dialogic feedback, as well as those of Carless and Boud (2018) concerning feedback literacy. This study demonstrates that lecturer emotions, cultural factors, and local issues exert a significant impact. This implies that feedback is not only a talent, but a practice that requires diligence, adaptability, and comprehension of individuals and contexts. Consequently, teacher preparation should encompass more than only instructing corrective skills. It should assist educators in cultivating relationships, regulating emotions, and comprehending students' backgrounds. The workshop and mentoring program should encompass soft skills, empathy, and effective feedback communication. The university must allocate time and resources for feedback. Without this, the lecturer is unable to provide comprehensive or reciprocal feedback. Policy should consider feedback time as part of the workload, reduce administrative tasks, and provide rewards for teachers who deliver outstanding feedback. This study also demonstrates that feedback aids in the development of teacher identity. Numerous participants indicate that they utilize feedback to demonstrate caring, confidence, and their pedagogical intentions. Feedback is integral to their identity. Narrative inquiry facilitates the examination of feedback from both a systemic perspective and an individual narrative.

However, this study is not without limitations. Its small sample size and focus on English lecturers from select institutions in Indonesia limit the generalizability of the findings. However, the depth of narrative data provides valuable insights into how feedback is enacted within specific institutional and cultural settings. Future research could expand this work by exploring diverse disciplines, institutional types, and geographical regions, as well as integrating students' perspectives to gain a more holistic understanding of feedback as a relational and dialogic process. Such inquiry would contribute to more inclusive and effective feedback strategies across higher education contexts.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2017). Researching feedback dialogue: An interactional analysis approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(2), 252–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1102863

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013a). *Feedback in Higher and Professional Education Edited by*. 229–229.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013b). *Feedback in higher and professional education: Understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Ascd. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/monash/detail.action?docID=361035

Burke, D. (2009). Strategies for using feedback students bring to higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *34*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801895711

Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/monash/detail.action?docID=2034020

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *0*(0), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. CA: Jossey-Bass.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *12*(3), 297–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.

Egetenmeier, A., & Strickroth, S. (2024). Scalable Two-Minute Feedback: Digital, Lecture-Accompanying Survey as a Continuous Feedback Instrument. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *14*(4), 573–580. https://doi.org/10.18178/ijiet.2024.14.4.2079

Fithriani, R. (2017). *Indonesian Students' Perceptions of Written Feedback in Second Language Writing* [Ph.D.]. The University of New Mexico.

Fithriani, R. (2019). ZPD and the Benefits of Written Feedback in L2 Writing: Focusing on Students' Perceptions. *The Reading Matrix : An International Online Journal*, *19*(1), 63–73.

Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning. *Teachers and Teaching*, *6*(2), 151–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/713698714

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Fourth edition, p. 371). Jossey-Bass. https://www.ptonline.com/articles/how-to-get-better-mfi-results

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

Phan, L. H., & Tran, L. T. (2015). *Higher education in Vietnam: Flexibility, mobility and practicality in the global knowledge economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *35*(3), 277–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007

Ryan, T., & Henderson, M. (2018). Feeling feedback: Students' emotional responses to educator feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 880–892. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1416456

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, *18*(2), 119–144. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714

Susanti, R. (2023). *Toward dialogic feedback in Indonesian Pre-service English teacher education* [Unpublished Ph.D thesis]. Monash University.

Tran, L. T. (2013). *Teaching international students in vocational education: New pedagogical approaches*. Cambria Press.

Winstone, N. E., & Carless, D. (2019). *Designing efective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach*. Routledge.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). 'It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it': Barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(11), 2026–2041. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032

Zhang, Z. (Victor), & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. *Assessing Writing, 36*, 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004