

# The Students' Response Toward Indirect Corrective Feedback Used By The Lecturer In Teaching Writing At Cokroaminoto Palopo University

Ardhy Supraba <sup>1</sup>

Musfirah <sup>2</sup>

Rizal A.M. Sjachrun <sup>3</sup>

Edi Wahyono<sup>4</sup>

Universitas Cokroaminoto, Palopo, Indonesia

<sup>1</sup>ardhysupraba90@uncp.ac.id

<sup>2</sup>musfirahvire@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>amsjachrunrizal@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research aims to find out the students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing. This research was conducted at Cokroaminoto Palopo University in class VIA. This research applied descriptive quantitative method. There are 9 students as the sample of this research taken by purposive sampling technique. The result of this research shows that the mean score of students' response is 35.5. It means that students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University is very negative. It indicates that the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) is rejected. It means that the indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing does not give a positive response to students.

**Keywords:** Students' response, Indirect corrective feedback, Writing.

## Introduction

Writing is one of difficult skills in learning English as a foreign language. Writing involves some language components, one of them is grammar. Grammar is one of important part that have to be mastered in making sentence correctly. In learning foreign language, especially for writing every students usually make an errors or mistakes for their sentences, especially for their grammar. It is an usual thing in learning foreign language.

In teaching writing, the lecturers have an important role to improve their students' writing. One of the way to improve the students' writing is corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is viewed as one option for teaching of the grammar. Corrective feedback as an indication to the learners that his or her use of the target language is incorrect (Lightbown & Spada, 1999:172).

It is proven by Ammar & Spada (2006) that corrective feedback can help learners to improve their accuracy. Only a few studies have attempted to directly investigate whether the second language students who receive written corrective feedback on their

errors are able to improve the accuracy of their writing compared with those who do not receive error feedback. Moreover, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that the French teachers provided corrective feedback for most of learner's error.

Corrective feedback is clearly topic of importance in teacher education programs, not least because of the growing evidence that it can play an important role in enhancing written linguistic accuracy. Lecturers are responsible to give corrective feedback as their important role in teaching writing because it is helpful for students in improving their grammatical accuracy. Lee (2005:1) stated that the findings showed that most students wished their teachers to mark and correct error for them and believed that error correction was primarily the teacher's responsibility. Corrective feedback have three kinds, one of them is indirect corrective feedback. Indirect corrective feedback is when the teacher indicates that there are errors in students' writing by underlining errors or circling them without providing correction (Bitchener and Knoch, 2010).

Based on the researcher's observation, the students are still lack of understanding about grammar in writing, so for students' errors the lecturer gives indirect correction to improve the students' writing accuracy. That is why, the researcher is interested to do a research about indirect corrective feedback especially for students' response toward indirect corrective feedback that had been used by the lecturer. In this case, the researcher conducted the research with the title *"The Students' Response toward Indirect Corrective Feedback Used by the Lecturer in Teaching Writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University."*

## **Review of Related Literature**

### **Concept of Corrective Feedback**

Feedback is defined as teacher's input to a writer's composition in the form of information to be used for revision (Keh, 1990). Feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. In structural approaches to language teaching, feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy. Feedback is effective in helping EFL students improve the accuracy of their writing. One type of feedback that ESL writing teachers provide is error correction/ corrective feedback.

Lee (1991), along with Bailey and Celce-Murcia (1979) also believed that error correction is an indispensable part of mastery in language learning. Providing written error correction is indispensable because it plays an important role in guiding, motivating, and encouraging students to improve their accuracy in second language writing. Providing feedback is viewed-both by teachers and students as an important part of ESL writing instruction.

Moreover, corrective feedback is still frequently provided by teachers in many language classrooms (Hyland, 2006). Error correction or corrective feedback is the process of providing clear, comprehensive, and consistent corrective feedback on a student's grammatical errors for the purpose of improving the students' ability to write

accurately. The statements above in line with the statement from Ashwell (2000) stated that teachers believe that correcting the grammar of student's writing work will help them improve the accuracy of subsequent writing.

Corrective error feedback is a vital component of the second language writing instruction and teachers must prepare to execute it competently, carefully, and consistently in order to fully utilize its potential for improving students' writing accuracy (Ferris, 2004). Without corrective feedback, it is difficult for students to ascertain that a learning task has been completed correctly (Chastain, 1998), and also the students who seldom received corrective feedback produced less accurate writing than those who frequently received corrective feedback (Lightbown and Spada, 1990).

### **Concept of Indirect Corrective Feedback**

Bitchener and Ferris (2012) defined indirect corrective feedback as drawing students' attention to the locations of their errors without providing corrections. Indirect correction is when the teacher indicates that there are errors in students' writing by underlining errors or circling them without providing correction or when the teacher underlines or circles on students' original texts, indicating the location of these errors without correcting them.

In other words, indirect corrective feedback emphasizes the role of students in understanding and correcting their errors rather than being provided with the corrections. With indirect feedback, an error is called to the student's attention using various strategies such as underlining or circling errors, recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line, confirmation checks, and requests for clarification (Bitchener, 2008).

Indirect feedback is applied by underlining students' writing errors, so that students understand that there is a problem that should be 'fixed.' Teachers may use lines or circles to indicate the location of errors. They also need to decide how explicit indirect feedback should be based on the goals they want to achieve by providing feedback.

Indirect written correction (especially for located error), this type only differs from the previous one in that is located. In addition, indirect written correction (especially for using error codes) is when providing an explicit comment on the nature of the error (e.g. sp for spelling), but not giving the correct form. Indirect written corrective feedback limits teachers' contribution to students' text. Some students may not be able to identify the nature of their errors when the teacher underlines them (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). Furthermore, Chandler (2003) stated that indirect feedback provides learners with insufficient information or resolve complex errors (e.g. syntactic errors). In addition, Chandler (2003:85) concluded that making students correct their errors after receiving feedback could improve their writing accuracy.

Indirect feedback as a means to involve learners in guide problem solving and to encourage them to take more responsibility for their own progress. Besides, students

also maintained that indirect feedback could yield more beneficial results than direct written corrective feedback for it requires learners to engage themselves in a more profound form of language processing by promoting self-reflection, attention, and noticing, which ultimately helps to foster long-term acquisition (Ferris and Roberts, 2001). In the case of evaluating the success of possible strategies for effective metacognitive skills, indirect corrective feedback that requires more learners' effort may be better.

Indirect correction can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in student's text (as in the example below) or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error.

## Method

This research applied descriptive quantitative method which was aimed to express the students' response toward indirect corrective feedback that is used by the lecturer in teaching writing.

The population of this research was 40 students of semester VI class A and the sample was taken by purposive sampling technique because it is used to determine a characteristics such as the students have been given writing assignment, indirect correction in their errors of writing and who ever revise their writing after receiving indirect correction from their lecturer. Therefore the sample of this research was 9 students from class VI A of Cokroaminoto Palopo University.

In this research, there were 2 instruments. The first was questionnaire. It is a major of instrument in this research. The questionnaire consist of ten statements positive, and it was used to know the students' response toward indirect corrective feedback that is used by the lecturer in teaching writing. The second was interview. List of interview consist of five questions and it was used to support the data from questionnaire.

## Results

### 1. Questionnaire

a. The Statements about indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing.

Tabel 1. Lecturer's correction that only shows an error location such us using circle or underlined make students understand.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	2	22
3	Undecided	3	33
4	Disagree	3	33
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 1 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 2 students or 22% agree; 3 students or 33% undecided; 3 students or 33% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. Thus, it can be said that 33% students choose undecided and disagree with the statement.

Tabel 2. Lecturer's correction with no justification can be revised well by students.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	0	0
2	Agree	4	44
3	Undecided	1	11
4	Disagree	4	44
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 2 shows that 0 student or 0% strongly agree; 4 students or 44% agree; 1 student or 11% undecided; 4 students or 44% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. Thereby, it indicates that 44% students choose agree and disagree with the statement.

Tabel 3. Lecturer's correction by simply showing an error location such us using circle or underlined can make students learn grammar.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	2	22
2	Agree	5	55
3	Undecided	1	11
4	Disagree	1	11
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 3 shows that 2 students or 22% strongly agree; 5 students or 55% agree; 1 student or 11% undecided; 1 student or 11% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. So it can be inferred that most of students agree with the statement.

Tabel 4. After the student's writing is revised, the students get a change in grammar correctness.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	7	77
3	Undecided	1	11
4	Disagree	0	0
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 4 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 7 students or 77% agree; 1 student or 11% undecided; 0 student or 0% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. Thus, it can be concluded that most of students agree with the statement.

Tabel 5. Lecturer's correction that only shows an error location such us using circle or underlined make students like to learn grammar.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	1	11
3	Undecided	3	33
4	Disagree	4	44
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 5 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 1 student or 11% agree; 3 students or 33% undecided; 4 students or 44% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. Thereby, it indicates that most of students disagree with the statement.

Tabel 6. After lecturer gave correction on students' writing with just showing error location and does not provide justification form, the students gain a positive effect.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	4	44
3	Undecided	2	22
4	Disagree	2	22
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 6 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 4 students or 44% agree; 2 students or 22% undecided; 2 students or 22% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. So it means that most of students agree with the statement.

Tabel 7. After lecturer gave correction on students' writing with just showing error location without some form of justification make grammatical correctness of the students' writing increase.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	0	0
2	Agree	4	44
3	Undecided	2	22
4	Disagree	2	22
5	Strongly disagree	1	11
Total		9	100

The table 7 shows that 0 student or 0% strongly agree; 4 students or 44% agree; 2 students or 22% undecided; 2 students or 22% disagree; 1 student or 11% strongly disagree. Thus, it can be said that most of students agree with the statement.

Tabel 8. Lecturer's correction makes students like to revise their own writing because it is fun things.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	6	66
3	Undecided	0	0
4	Disagree	2	22
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 8 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 6 students or 66% agree; 0 student or 0% undecided; 2 students or 22% disagree; 0 student or 0% strongly disagree. Thereby, it indicates that most of students agree with the statement.

Tabel 9. Lecturer's correction is important in teaching writing.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	9	100
2	Agree	0	0
3	Undecided	0	0
4	Disagree	0	0
5	Strongly disagree	0	0
Total		9	100

The table 9 shows that 9 students or 100% strongly agree and the rest is 0%. So it means that most of students strongly agree with the statement.

Tabel 10. Lecturer's correction which indicates what is wrong in writing is liked by students.

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Strongly agree	1	11
2	Agree	5	55
3	Undecided	2	22
4	Disagree	0	0
5	Strongly disagree	1	11
Total		9	100

The table 10 shows that 1 student or 11% strongly agree; 5 students or 55% agree; 2 students or 22% undecided; 0 student of 0% disagree; 1 student or 11% strongly disagree. Thus, it can be inferred that most of students agree with the statement.

b. The students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing

Tabel 11. Students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University

No	Sample	Items										Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	A	5	4	5	4	2	3	1	2	5	1	32
2	B	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	5	4	37
3	C	2	2	5	5	5	3	4	5	5	4	40
4	D	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	5	5	39
5	E	4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	5	4	41
6	F	3	4	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	4	38
7	G	4	2	4	4	2	4	4	4	5	3	36
8	H	3	2	3	4	3	2	2	4	5	4	32
9	I	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	5	3	25
Total												320

Note: (+) Means positive statement from the questionnaire

In the table 11 indicates that the mean score of the students' response can be seen as follow:  $X = \frac{\sum X}{N}$

$$X = \frac{320}{9}$$

$$X = 35.5$$

Based on the table 11, the total score of the students' response is 320 and the mean score of the students' response is 35.5. It means that the interpretation of the findings about students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University is very negative.

## 2. Interview

Tabel 12. The students' answer of the lecturer's indirect corrective feedback in teaching writing

Items	Frequency		Percentage (%)	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	6	3	66	33
2	8	1	88	11
3	7	2	77	22
4	9	0	100	0
5	5	4	55	44
Total	9		100	

The table 12 shows that for item 1, there are 6 students or 66% chose yes, 3 students or 33% chose no; for item 2, there are 8 students or 88% chose yes, 1 student or 11% chose no; for item 3, there are 7 students or 77% chose yes, 2 students or 22% chose no; for item 4, there are 9 students or 100% chose yes, 0% chose no and for item 5, there are 5 students or 55% chose yes, 4 students or 44% chose no.

Furthermore, in the table 12, 100% students say that the lecturer's correction is important in teaching writing. Then, 88% students get a positive effect after the lecturer corrected their writing that does not provide the correct form, but indicate an errors' location. Moreover, 77% students like to revise their writing, 66% students like studying grammar by lecturer's correction which only indicate the location of errors, and 55% students like lecturer's correction which indicate what is wrong.

## Discussion

The mean score of students' response is 35.5. The interpretation of the finding about students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University is very negative. It indicates that the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is rejected. It means that the indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing does not give a positive response to students.



The finding also is not appropriate with theory from Chandler (2003) who stated that making students correct their errors after receiving feedback could improve their writing accuracy because after this research is done, the researcher found that the students who still less in grammar can make them do not know how to correct their errors after receiving indirect feedback from their lecturer, so their writing accuracy is not upgraded after receiving indirect correction. Based on the explanations above, the lecturer should not give more indirect correction for students who still less in understanding grammar because the students will not revise it if they do not know how to correct them.

Another finding indicate that there are 3 students who answer yes for all questions, and the students who do not answer yes for all questions are 6 students. Based on the students' answer, the students like their lecturer's indirect correction because by giving indirect correction the students can study to find out the correct form, and the students can know their errors' location whereas, the students do not like their lecturer's indirect correction because the lecturer cannot provide the correct form, so the corrections can make the students confused. In this case, it can be proven by Lindqvist (2011) that the students also prefer direct correction which provide the correct form than indirect correction which nothing the correct form on students' writing.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the result of data analysis, the conclusion of this research is the students' response toward indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing at Cokroaminoto Palopo University is very negative which the mean score of students' response is 35.5. It indicates that the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (H1) is rejected. It means that the indirect corrective feedback used by the lecturer in teaching writing does not give a positive response to students.

## References

- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One Size Fits All? Recast, Prompts and L2 Learning. *Journal Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in a Multiple-draft Composition Classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
- Bailey, K. & Celce-Murcia, M. (1979). Classroom Skills for ESL Teachers. *International Journal of English*, 315-330.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Bitchener, J. and Ferris, D.R. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Bitchener, J. and Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the Linguistic Accuracy Level of Advanced L2 Writers with Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement on the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296.
- Chastain, K. (1998). *Developing Second Language Skills (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Chicago: Harcourt Brace Publishers.
- Ferris, D. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime.....?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49-62.
- 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(3), 161-184.
- Hyland, K., & F. Hyland. (2006). *Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing*. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.
- Keh, C.L. (1990). Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44, 294-304.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error Correction in the L2 Writing Classroom: What Do Students Think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2).

- Lee, N. (1991). Notions of Error and Appropriate Correction Treatment. *Hongkong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 14, 55-70.
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on Second Language Learning. *Journal of Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12(4), 429-448.
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lindqvist, A. (2011). *The Use of Written Corrective Feedback: A Survey of Written Response from Teachers to ESL Students in English, A-Course Upper Secondary School*. (Doktoral Dissertation, University of Gothenburg, 2011). Accessed from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.469.4514&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Journal of Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.