

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The main role of writing teachers is to help the students improve their writing proficiency according to students' competence. Students who learn English as a foreign language usually make errors in their writings. This is because they lack of grammar concept. Teachers could help students making correction in students' writing assignment. One of the important techniques used by teachers in teaching writing is giving feedback. Providing feedback on students' writing assignment is the main method of giving response by teachers. Hyland (1998) states that giving an effective feedback is a central concern for many teachers of writing and an important area for both L1 and L2 writing research. Teachers should not treat students' writing as products but rather as work in progress.

If students' writing is treated as work in progress, students have the chance to revise and rewrite to improve their composing skills. Many techniques and strategies have been utilized by teacher. For instance, correction may be partial; that is, marking only some major patterns of errors on a student's paper rather than marking all errors in a text (Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011). Teacher makes correction on students' writing assignment based on student's competence which may be different one another. Individual differences may be due to many factors, such as students' language proficiency, motivation, and learning styles respond to teacher's feedback.

Feedback is a teacher's behavior to help the students who get difficulty in learning process by responding to the students' assignment.

Feedback is the teacher' information that is given to the learners about their performance of the learning task, usually with the objective of improving their performance (Brookhart, 2008). However, a crucial question is what this feedback should be like. A feedback type commonly used by teacher is written corrective feedback: the marking of students' errors by the teacher in the text and providing the students with a correct form. The teacher additionally summarizes the students' grammatical and lexical strengths and weakness in the form of lists at the end of the text. It is a primary technique to respond the students' writing assignment to correct the errors in their writing assignment.

Likewise, the students need feedback on their assignment to create good writing. The corrective feedback is important because it is one of the effective ways in giving feedback on students' writing assignment. Through corrective feedback, the teacher knows the development of the students' writing. Teachers' corrective feedback could cover all aspects of writing, including content, organization, and language use. Corrective feedback is expected to help students to correct their errors before they can master how to write well and rearrange writing correctly. The teacher not only guides the students to think about the content, but also knows errors on students' writing assignments. Hence, Ferris and Roberts (2001) states that grammar correction is necessary for second language writing acquisition and instruction. She offers the following grounds for giving grammatical error correction. First, feedback enables students to improve their text. Second, feedback helps students to gain accuracy over time. Third, both teachers and their students see value in giving and receiving error correction feedback.

In recent years, corrective feedback has been applied by many researchers. Corrective feedback is one of controversial issues. There are few researchers who claimed that corrective feedback is not effective to help students improve their writing skill in L2. Truscott (1996) says that there is no evidence that describes corrective feedback helps students in writing. It is contrary to Chandler (2003) and Ferris (1995, 1997, 2006)'s statement. According to them, there are improvements in grammatical accuracy following corrective feedback. A number of recent researchers also tightly control this investigation.

The first is Beuningen and Kuiken (2008) who investigated the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback. The second is Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) who analyzed the preference of different types and amount of corrective feedback for L2 writing. The third research was conducted by Tran (2013) who attempted to learn about ways to treat student's written errors. In the three related studies above, the researchers only focused on the investigation of the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Nevertheless, as explained previously, the corrective feedback has the function in foreign language teaching learning process. Therefore, it is necessary to study the function of giving corrective feedback on students' writing assignments based on their errors. This research is conducted to investigate the implementation of teacher's written corrective feedback on students' writing.

It can be concluded that corrective feedback can be implemented to create design of foreign language teaching activity. Bitchener (2012) says that written corrective feedback can help learners to have better control over targeted structures. It is our belief that if the teacher indicates a written

grammatical error on students' writing assignments and provides the correct form in one way or another, the students will realize the error and will not make the same errors in future writings. The writing would be corrected by the teacher using different types of corrective feedback. Therefore, this research aims at investigating the corrective feedback in language features used by teacher on students' writing errors.

Research Questions

Having realized the importance of corrective feedback in language features used by the teacher on students' writing errors, the researcher would like to investigate the main problem which is to what extent the teacher is able to use corrective feedback in teaching writing. Therefore, the research questions in this study are:

1. What types of corrective feedback are used by the teacher in Senior High School student's writing assignment?
2. Which types of corrective feedback are frequently used by the teacher in Senior High School?

The Objectives of the Study

Based on the research questions above, the objectives of the study are to find out:

1. The types of corrective feedback used by the teacher in Senior High School student's writing assignment.
2. Types of corrective feedback which are frequently used by the teacher in Senior High School.

Significance of the Study

It is expected that the result of this study can give both theoretical and practical contributions. The results of this study provide information for the future researchers about the use of corrective feedback in students'

grammatical errors Moreover, the teacher is expected to pay attention to use varieties of corrective feedback in teaching writing when helping their students minimize their errors.

Practically, the result of this study will give useful information not only for the teachers who teach writing but also the students who learn to write. By applying direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, or metalinguistic corrective feedback to students' writing assignment, the teacher knows the development of the students' writing. It also helps the students understand the errors they make and the students are expected not to make the same errors in learning descriptive writing in the future.

Scope and Limitation

This study aims primarily at investigating teacher's written corrective feedback on language features in Senior High School students' essay. This study would be to examine the implementation of teacher's written corrective feedback especially in descriptive writing. It is chosen because the participants write descriptive texts for their writing skill in the first semester. The researcher takes two writing classes of the tenth grade of private senior high school in Ponorogo. Each class consists of less than thirty students. The researcher selected twelve students from two different tenth grade classes which are taught by the same teacher, two students of advanced-levels, two students of intermediate-levels, and two students of novice levels. The topic of descriptive writing is determined by the teacher.

Written corrective feedback used by the teacher to students' writing errors is various. In this study, the researcher limits to teacher's written corrective feedback applied on language features to analyze the data. Language features proposed by Ferris and Roberts (2001) are

classified into three: subject-verb errors, word choice, and sentence structure errors.

Theoretical Framework

According to Hedge (1998), effective writing requires a number of things including a high degree of development in the organization of ideas, a high degree of accuracy so there is no ambiguity of meaning, the use of complex grammatical devices for emphasis, and careful choice of vocabulary, grammatical patterns, and sentence structures to create a style which is appropriate to the subject matter and the eventual readers. Therefore, most teachers of writing who are influenced by structural linguistics and behaviorists usually treat writing as a product and often put strong focus on linguistic knowledge, vocabulary choices, and syntactic patterns that are essential for the formation of written texts as a product (Hyland, 2003 cited in Azizi, Behjat, Sorahi, 2014). However, the teacher following the process approach has this possibility to intervene in the students' writing process at any stage they are involved in.

In the teaching writing process, the teachers use corrective feedback as a means to improve students' writing. By giving corrective feedback, the teacher knows the students' errors during process of writing. Furthermore, there is the main method utilized by the teacher to respond, comment on and correct the errors to improve students' accuracy in their writing assignment. Ashwell (2000) suggests that correcting the grammar of students' writing will help students improve the accuracy of subsequent writing. Research evidence on error correction in L2 writing classes showed that students who received written corrective feedback from teachers improve their accuracy over time (Ferris & Roberts, 2001 cited in Ellis 2007). It means that the corrective feedback given by the teacher can be

useful input for the students to improve their work because the corrective feedback supports grammatical accuracy improvement and idiomatic usage such as word order and word choice.

It is in line with theory proposed by Ellis (2007, 2009) and Ferris (2003), which is the focus of this research, the ways of making corrective feedback in EFL writing process. This theory posits the implementation of corrective feedback in teaching writing based on the types of corrective feedback. Therefore, in analyzing the corrective feedback given by the teacher, the researcher uses the three type's corrective feedback: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic.

Direct corrective feedback is provided when the teacher writes the correct form on the students' paper writing. The ways used by teachers to give direct corrective feedback are crossing put an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form. In another words, direct corrective feedback provided the provision of correct forms (written above or under the error).

Indirect corrective feedback is provided when the teacher indicates the location of the error on the paper by underlining, highlighting, circling, or a symbol (e.g., \surd to signal a missing word or words) without providing the correct form (Lee, 2004 cited in Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011). For editing writing with indirect corrective feedback, the student is required both to identify the type of error and to self-correct the error whereas in direct corrective feedback what the students does is only to transcribe the

teacher's corrections onto the paper (Ferris, 2003 cited in Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011).

Metalinguistic corrective feedback is provided when the teacher writes some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors students have made (Ellis, 2009). The teacher writes the correct structure using codes (e.g., given the code (V2) above or under error students' writing in using the past form of the verb). These consist of abbreviated labels or codes for different kinds of errors. It can be placed over the location of error in the writing. In the other case, the exact location of the error in the writing may or may not be shown.

Definition of Key Terms

Some terms used in this research are defined as follows:

Written corrective feedback is a standard method used by teachers to provide guidance in revising student's writing (Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad, 2012).

Direct corrective feedback refers to the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure by the teacher (Ferris, 2003). Here, the teacher gives the corrected version of the erroneous language forms to the students' errors. It means that the students receive clear correction and feedback because the teacher shows them the correct form.

Indirect corrective feedback is an implicit method used by the teacher. In indirect corrective feedback, the teacher gives the structure form in implicit way. The teacher does not show the correct form of students' error. The teacher gives marking such as circle, underline, or

question mark to the students' error. The students are expected to find out the correct form of their errors in regards to the mark given by the teacher.

Metalinguistic corrective feedback refers to the well-formedness of the student's writing, without explicitly providing the correct form. This means that metalinguistic corrective feedback is a method used by the teacher that provides some kinds of metalinguistic clues as to the nature of error. This is to urge the students to pass through a metalinguistic process which may enable them to find their errors by themselves. In metalinguistic corrective feedback, the teacher shows the correct structure to the students using code to show where and what errors should be corrected or revised (Ellis, 2007).