

Improving Students' L2 Writing through Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback

Tinsi Ayu Veren¹, Abdul Halim², Azwar Abidin²

¹ Student of English Education Department, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kendari (IAIN) Kendari, Indonesia

² Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kendari (IAIN) Kendari, Indonesia.

E-mail Correspondence: halim.iainkendari@gmail.com

Article info

Submitted : 08 June 2020

Revised : 27 July 2020

Accepted : 28 July 2020

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study aims to improve students' writing skill through teacher's written corrective feedback based on 12 students' writing at one of vocational schools in Kendari. It is expected that the students' writing skill can be improved, and the students can participate actively in the English teaching and learning process. The instrument used in this study is documentation of students' writing from the first draft until the third draft. To analyze the data, the researcher uses Creswell's frame in 2009, such as: the data, displaying the data and concluding the data. The result of the study reveals that most of students improve their writing skill after being given teacher's written corrective feedback and in the third draft, they make less mistake than the first draft. This study implies that, the use of teacher's written corrective feedback in writing activity should be encouraged to improve the students' writing ability.

Keywords: *Feedback; Qualitative; Teacher; Writing.*

INTRODUCTION

Feedback is a classroom process that has been under the researchers' microscopes since the last two decades (Nematzadeh and Siahpoosh, 2017). Consistently, many researchers have found that when teachers effectively utilize feedback procedures, they positively impact the achievement of their students in constructing the text (Jamalinesari, et al, 2014). In the 1990s, when the process approach was widely adopted in the American context, the focus of teacher's written corrective feedback was broadened to include composition issues such as idea development, organization, and content, in addition to grammar (Cho, 2015).

Teacher's written corrective feedback is a standard method used by most teachers to provide guidance in revising students' writing (Abbas and Hogar, 2018). In many other important and influential approaches to writing, in fact, for most writing teachers, teacher's written corrective feedback is the most preferred and common form of feedback (Ferris, 2003) and its effectiveness has been investigated over the last twenty years, but it is still not possible to make tough conclusions about which options are the most beneficial to EFL learners (Nematzadeh and Siahpoosh, 2017).

There are several recent studies that discussed the variation of teacher's written corrective feedback. Those focus of discussion on matter such as the power of corrective feedback. (Hattie and Timperley, 2007), effect of corrective feedback (Qosayere, 2015), treatment of error (Ferris, 2011), the advantages and disadvantages (Bijami, et al, 2013), problem/solution-oriented metadiscourse (Adel, 2016), and the nature of feedback (Melissa, et al, 2016).

The importance of L2 learners' writing development is not deniable. Since one more important technique of communication is writing, it has come to be a critical language skill to be developed in second language teaching (Adel, 2016). There are several studies employing the use of teacher's written corrective feedback on student errors have been conducted to determine its effect on student writing accuracy with variable results. The studies are 60 German foreign language, 52 students in New Zealand and 92 students in the United States shows that there was strong relationship between teacher's written

corrective feedback and successful students' writing revision on the drafts of their essays (Namzateh and Siahpoosh, 2017) and many researchers have done research about teacher's written corrective feedback in Indonesia. For example, a study that involving students in Cinangka, Jogonalan and Surakarta shows the better performed of students' writing through teacher's written corrective feedback that given to revise students' essay (Suarman, 2013).

On the other hand, for teacher's written corrective feedback research itself is still lacking in Kendari. The researcher had done conducted a preliminary class observation in Southeast Sulawesi especially in one of vocational schools in Kendari. The researcher found that the students' writing skill was in low category. There are several students who could not produce some kinds of written texts, such as descriptive text, report text and recount text. They got difficulties when they were asked to write a paragraph. When they wrote some sentences, many grammatical mistakes and mechanic errors were found in their writing.

Regarding the problems faced by the students' in writing skill, there is a need to change the condition into the better one. There have been many studies conducted to improve the students' writing skill. One of the ways is through teacher's written corrective feedback since teacher's written corrective feedback has improved our understanding of the role feedback plays in student revision (Cho, 2015).

RESEARCH METHODS

This research used qualitative method to describe phenomenon about students' writing of recount text that focus on mechanical error in one of the vocational schools in Kendari. The subjects of this study were students registered in academic year 2019. There are 38 students in that class. There are ten males and 28 females. The participant was selected by their full draft of their writing. At first, there are 30 students submitted their writing and it as their first draft. Unfortunately, in final draft, only twelve students submitted their writing. The reason of choosing the school is considering the problem that occurs in school based on observation. When the researcher teaches in classroom and asks them to write, the researcher found that the students' writing skill was in low category. There are several students who could not produce some kinds of written texts. They got difficulties when they were asked to write a paragraph. When they wrote some sentences, many grammatical mistakes and mechanic errors were found in their writing.

The instrument of this research was recount text writing. The researcher administered writing test to find out whether there was an improvement of students' recount text writing ability after the implementation of teacher's written corrective feedback as the technique or not. Therefore, the students were asked to write a recount text. In this study, the researcher collected the data through students' writing. After the data collected, the researcher analyzed it through the following steps.

First is data reduction. This is part of analysis the data, in which is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, and abstracting the raw data according to 5 types of indirect feedback in writing such as punctuation, capitalization, tenses, word choice and the word that is not necessary in the sentences. The second is data display. This is the second major of analysis activity that draws the activity of researcher from draft 1 to draft 3. It is the process to organize the collection of information that permits drawing conclusion. Displays can take the form of graph, table, etc., and the display that used by researcher is table that draws from draft 1 to draft 3. Last is concluded. This is the process to conclude the result of data collection (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

Besides, the writing process started from the students wrote their first draft, followed by the revision from the teacher. After that, the students produced the draft 2 and it is being revised again by the teacher. Until the students could produce the final draft.

RESEARCH RESULT

The finding of this study reveals two aspects; first is type of teacher's written corrective feedback that the researcher used to correct the students' writing. Second is this study described the extent of teacher's written corrective feedback in improving students' writing.

Types of Teacher’s Written Corrective Feedback

The type of feedback that the researcher used is indirect feedback. There are 16 types of indirect feedback, such as word choice, word form, missing word, unclear meaning, unclear meaning, subject verb agreement, not necessary, preposition, article, word order, spelling error, punctuation, verb tense, does not support, need more and organization (Ferris, 2011). In this research, the researcher also as a teacher who has given the indirect feedback to students.

After conducting the data, researcher only uses five types of indirect feedback in writing such as punctuation, capitalization, tenses, word choice and the word that is not necessary in the sentences. The example of errors that the students produced can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Category of students’ error

Punctuation (P) Errors	Revision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two weeks ago. I went to Palu with..... When I arrived in Palu my father.... After dinner and buying some accessories. We returned to the On that day my friend met me..... In the middle of trip we stopped at the shop..... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two weeks ago, I went to Palu with.... When I arrived in Palu, my father... After dinner and buying some accessories, we returned to... On that day, my friend..... In the middle of trip, we stopped at the shop.....
Capitalization (C) Errors	Revision
<ul style="list-style-type: none">back in kendari...from Ticket, food, I saw one info about wanna one’s concerts..... <p>....to ease the pain. at 12.00 o’clock....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">back in Kendarifrom ticket, food,....i saw one of Wanna One’s concerts.....to ease the pain. At 12.00 o’clock...
Tenses (T) Errors	Revision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I was arrived there....pool to swimed.... I took a shower and play my phone... We had arrived in Toronipa at.....in there I meet many.... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I arrived there....pool to swim.... I took a shower and played my phone..... We arrived in Toronipa at.....in there I met many.....
Word Choice (WC) Errors	Revision
<ul style="list-style-type: none">and buildings. But in the night,.....people are very many The fireworks were not visible from there because they were covered by..... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">and buildings. However, in the night..... There are many people The fireworks were not visible from there because it were covered by.....

- The train station which was establish in on hundred.....
- **Day one** in Thailand,....
- The train station which was establish sinceon hundred.....
- First day in Thailand.....

Unnecessary Word ([...]) Errors	Revision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •minute, and when the lunch time..... • We went there/the reason we went there because..... •hurt anymore. Because I was hungry because I didn't eat.... • The train station which was establish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ...minute, when the lunch time..... • We went there because..... •hurt anymore. I was hungry because I didn't eat.... • The train station was establish

The Extent of Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Students' Writing

The researcher gained the data from students' writing in recount text. The researcher asked the students to write in three drafts. This aimed to ensure that the mistakes produced by the students were consistent or not. Teacher's written corrective feedback improves students' writing in which having more mistakes to less mistakes as the table below.

Table 2 Identification of Total Error

Students	Punctuation		Capitalization		Tenses		Word choice		Unnecessary word	
	Draft 1	Draft 3	Draft 1	Draft 3	Draft 1	Draft 3	Draft 1	Draft 3	Draft 1	Draft 3
S-1	4	0	2	0	4	3	0	0	1	0
S-2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
S-3	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0
S-4	3	0		0	5		6	0	4	0
S-5	2	0		0		2		0		0
S-6		0		0		2	3	0	0	0
S-7		0	3	0	1	1	2	0	1	0
S-8		0		0		0		0		0
S-9		0		0		2		0		0
S-10		0		0		0		0		0
S-11		0		0		0		0	0	0
S-12		0		0		0		0	1	0
Total		0		0		13		0	11	0

The table above showed the total mistakes that the student produced in writing a recount text. In the first draft, there are 12 students that researcher has identified have error in writing. Based on table, total of punctuation (P) mistakes in the first draft were 29, the total of mistakes capitalization (C) were 20, the wrong tenses (T) that student produce were 37, from the total wrong of word choice (WC) were 20 and the total wrong of unnecessary word ([...]) were 11. It indicates that the student still have many errors in their writing. Therefore, the students need to pay attention to their errors in the first draft. After being given the feedback from the researcher, the third draft showed good progress. The students only

made 13 total mistakes in tenses (T), meanwhile there is no mistake in another part. It indicates that the student has little more errors in the third draft after being given feedback. From the table above, the student still make mistake in part of tenses. It means the students still have the difficulty in arranging the appropriate tenses in their writing. Not as expected but at least there is good progress that can be seen.

DISCUSSION

This study describes the extent of students' writing after being given feedback especially indirect feedback that used five symbols such as punctuation, capitalization, tenses, word choice and unnecessary word. Based on the research, the researcher gave feedback to all of the students either individually or collectively. The students had writing activities in three times. The process approach consists of prewriting and the writing of three or more drafts (Zhan, 2016). The writing of more than one draft by definition entails revision of the ideas expressed and/or editing of the language used. Teacher's written corrective feedback was given after the students had finished writing task in the first draft until final draft. It is in line with Razali and Rohaiza opinions' (2014) that feedback should be given after the performance so that it does not interrupt in mid-flow of language production to point out phonological, grammatical, lexical, or interpretive errors.

Based on data from the results of student writing of the first draft of the third draft, the result is increased student writing. The result showed that students has increased their writing's ability in aspect of punctuation, capitalization, word choice and unnecessary word. In line with Hattie and Timperely (2007), they stated that feedback is "information provided by agents regarding some aspects of the performance of one's tasks to improve their abilities". Other than that, in learning, teacher's feedback is often used when helping students to improve their writing accuracy (Ferris, 2011).

From the data, it can be inferred that the use of teacher's feedback was very useful in writing process. the result showed that the student produces few errors after being given feedback. Moreover, students can learn how to revise their writing through teacher's written corrective feedback. By having teachers' feedback, the students would become aware of their error. It is expected that they would not do the same error again. So, their writing ability could be improved.

Although the average writing of students are increases and have good progress, but there is one thing that catches the attention of the researcher. It is because most students have problems using tenses. They are confused to use proper tenses for their writing. It can be seen from the result in their third draft. They still make mistakes in part of tenses while in other parts they no longer make mistakes.

CONCLUSIONS

Teacher's written corrective feedback improves students' writing in which having more mistakes to few mistakes. From twelve students as the subject of research identified, they have improved significantly. The use of error feedback can make the students understand and use their writing skill. Therefore, they could make their own sentences from the teacher's written corrective feedback. The result also showed that students has increased their writing's ability in aspect of punctuation, capitalization, word choice and unnecessary word, but there is one aspect that is still lacking in students' writing ability. The problem is in determining the use of tenses in accordance with the context of the sentence. This shows that students still need to be given more significant feedback in terms of determining the appropriate tenses in writing.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, M. A. and Hogar M. T. (2018). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on accuracy in second language writing. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 33-37.
- Adel, A. (2016). Problem/solution-oriented metadiscourse in teacher's written corrective feedback on student writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 1(2), 54-67.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Educational Research: Planinng, Conducting, and Evaluation Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Pearson.

- Ferris, Dana R. (2011). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Hattie, J. and Helen T. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Jamalinesari, A., Farahnaz R., Hasbib G. and Akbar A. "2nd Global Conference on Linguistics and Foreign Language Teaching, LINELT-2014". *The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing*, Dubai – United Arab Emirates, December 11 – 13, 2014.
- Qosayere, I. (2015). The effect of grammar correction on students' writing. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, 4(1), 258-261.
- Razali, R. and Rohaiza J.(2014). Exploring teacher written feedback and student revisions on esl students' writing. *Humanities And Social Science*,9(5), 63-70.
- Ronald, L.J., Darlene K.. Drummond and Sakile C. (2007). What is qualitative research?.*Routledge Taylor & Francis Group*, 8(1), 23.
- Suarman, A. (2013). The effect of feedback on student's writing accuracy. *ELTIN Journal*, 1(1), 44-53.
- Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher's written corrective feedback: student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 73-84.