

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter deals with two parts namely, conclusion and suggestion. The first part presents the conclusion derived from this study. The second part presents suggestion intended for further researcher, the teacher, and the students.

Conclusion

Regarding the importance of writing, teachers, as the ones who contribute in students' success, should lead their students to be good writers. As it is impossible to be successful without facing obstacles, the students also find difficulties in learning writing process. Therefore, the teacher could help the students to correct their errors by giving corrective feedback on their writing. Giving corrective feedback is an important role of a teacher because it could significantly reduce the number of errors of a student.

This study was conducted to investigate the type of corrective feedback used by the teacher on Senior High School students writing assignment. The data of this study was teacher's written corrective feedback on language features proposed by Ferris and Roberts (2001) which classified language features into three: subject-verb errors, word choice, and sentence structure. In order to collect the data, the researcher asked permission from the teacher to copy and write the information related to kinds of corrective feedback on language features on students' writing assignment to be analyzed.

The findings of this study revealed that the teacher employed corrective feedback to correct the students' writing assignment based on typology of corrective feedback by Ellis (2009). To sum up, it can be

concluded that the teacher employed direct corrective feedback as the most frequently used corrective feedback with the occurrences 91 (84,25%), followed by indirect corrective feedback 14 (12,47%), and metalinguistic only 3 (2,78%). Through direct corrective feedback, the students receive clear correction and feedback in their writing because the teacher shows the correct form.

Suggestions

This part of the chapter presents some suggestions that will hopefully provide more insight into the teaching and learning of writing process. The first suggestion is intended for the teachers who are competent to create good atmosphere to facilitate the teaching of writing. The second is for the students who are interested in improving their writing skill. The last is for the further researcher who would conduct a research related to this study.

1. For the teachers

The result of this study could give beneficial inputs for the teacher about the teaching writing in giving corrective feedback on students' writing. It could be suggested that the teachers should be aware on language features' errors in writing so they could recognize their students' difficulties in writing. Moreover, it would be interesting if the teachers not only pay more attention to the errors made by the students but also the causes of the errors in writing. Knowing the problems would make it easier for the teachers to solve the problem. It is expected that the teacher should enhance the method and technique in teaching writing so the students are motivated to develop the ability in their writing.

2. For the students

It is better to know about this study particularly related to corrective feedback on students' writing. The students are expected to

increase their knowledge about language features so they would be aware of the errors they made. The students are expected to develop their writing proficiency to reduce the errors in learning descriptive writing in the future.

3. Further researcher

The objective of this study is to investigate the type of written corrective feedback used by the teacher on students' writing assignment. The subjects are the students from two Social classes with different program. The implementation of teacher's written corrective feedback for students' different language level is equally. The advanced-levels, intermediate-levels, and novice level are same in receiving written corrective feedback from the teacher. Therefore, the future study would be more interesting if such a comparison is made.

The further limitation of this study is that no trustworthiness was involved to systematically investigate teacher's written corrective feedback from another researcher. The researcher did not use the investigator triangulation in order to limit the subjectivity. Future studies need to triangulate the findings to become more confident with the claims made in this study.

In conclusion, in spite of its limitation, the result of this study is expected to give informative input about corrective feedback in writing. The researcher believes that there are still many phenomena that could be revealed in this study. Therefore, the researcher expects that the result of this study could inspire other researchers to conduct the study related to corrective feedback to enrich the existing study. Future researchers could investigate some more ways in giving corrective feedback to motivate the students to improve their writing ability.

References

- Adams, R. (2003). *L2 Output, Reformulation and Noticing: Implications for IL Development*. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 347-376.
- Amrhein, H.R. & Nassaji, H. (2010). *Written Corrective Feedback: What do Students and Teachers Prefer and Why?*. CJAL: University of Victoria.
- Azizi, M., Behjat, F., & Sorahi, M.A. (2014). Effect of Metalinguistic Teacher Corrective Feedback on Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Special Issue: Innovations in Foreign Language Teaching*, 2(6-1), 54-63.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Dadashi, M. (2011). *The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Spelling Errors*. University of National de Colombia.
- Barnet, M.A. (1992). *Writing as a Process*. Northeast Conference: University of Virginia.
- Beuningen, C.G., de Jong, N.H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). *The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Written Accuracy*. Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication: University of Amsterdam.
- Bitchener, J. (2012). Written Corrective Feedback for L2 development: Current knowledge and future research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4), 855-860.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation. *Applied Linguistic*, 31 (2), 193-214.

- Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. United States America.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th Ed). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd Ed). New York: Pearson Education.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Ellis, R. (2007). A typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. Oxford University Press: *ELT Journal*, 63(2).97-107.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development*. eScholarship Repository: Shanghai International Studies and University of Auckland.
- Ferris, D.R. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Ferris, D.R. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Ferris, D.R. (2011). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D.R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.

- Ferris, D.R., Liu, H.Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written Corrective Feedback for Individual L2 Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307-329.
- Goldschneider, J.M. & Dekeyser, R.M. (2001). *Explaining the "Natural Order of L2 Morpheme Acquisition" in English: A Meta-Analysis of Multiple Determinants*. *Language Learning*, 51, 1-50.
- Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd Ed). London: Longman
- Hashemnezhad, H. & Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 230-239.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some Input on Input: Two Analysis of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 287-308.
- Hedge, T. (1998). *Writing: Resource book for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The Impact of Teacher Written Corrective Feedback on Individual Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring The Pill-Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185-212.
- McMillan, J.H. (2008). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer* (5th ed). United States of America: Pearson Education.
- McMillan, J.H. & Schumacer. (2001). *Research in Education. A conceptual Introduction* (5th ed). New York: Longman.

- Mendez, E.H., Cruz, R.R., & Loyo, G.M. (2010). *Oral Corrective Feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo*. Memorias Del ViFforo De Estudios En Lenguas Internacional (FEL 2010).
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL Students Do as They Write: A classroom Study of Composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 (2), 229-238.
- Rezaei, S., Mozzaffati, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1 (1).
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Tompkins, G. E. (1994). *Teaching Writing: Balancing Process and Product*. NY: Merrill.
- Tran, T.H. (2013). *Approaches to Treating Student Written Errors*. Midtesol: Missouri University of Science and Technology.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.