

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTION ON ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS

Aprillia Ariyanti
(aprilliaariyanti654@gmail.com)

*Pusat Pengembangan Bahasa Inggris
Universitas Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang*

ARTICLE

Keywords:

*indirect corrective
feedback,
corrective feedback,
writing skills*

ABSTRACT

This study purposed to gain the difference between students' academic performance in writing skills who are taught by using indirect written correction and those do not. The research design used quasi-experimental design because this study did not do randomization. In this experimental design, the researcher used two classes to become the subject. One class was experimental class which treated by using indirect correction technique while the other class was control class which was not treated by using indirect correction technique. The subject of this study was seven grade in MTs Pontren Surya Buana Malang.; 7C became control group and 7D was became experimental group. Both of groups consisted 24 students. Both of groups consisted 35 students. This data used t-test to find the significant difference of both groups. The result was difference between two groups 17, 16 and the std. deviation difference is 0, 92. T-test count = 18, 591 > t- table = 1, 679 and p-value $0.000 < \alpha (0, 05)$. It applied that the technique was effective. The conclusion is indirect correction technique is effective to teach writing skills. Then, it is suggested to the teacher to apply or implement a different writing technique to practice and improve the students' writing, especially by using corrective feedback that have been practiced before. The next researchers can use another technique in their research such as direct corrective feedback because this research uses indirect corrective feedback to improve writing skills

INTRODUCTION

In several decades, the role played by corrective feedback (CF) in language acquisition has become a famous topic to be discussed. In improving students' writing skills, feedback as a teaching tool has been discussed extensively in teaching training several collages. Although it may seem like something solely positive the topic of quite controversial and interesting; and when implementing it in a classroom setting there are question to be asked and reflected

upon about the advantageous and disadvantageous about corrective feedback itself. Truscott (1996), who first started this debate, found it to be enormously ineffective and even in some cases harmful, while on the other hand Ferris (1999) argued that CF is highly recommendable and should therefore have a natural place in L2 writing classes. Corrective feedback is a topic that is of relevance or connected to both theories of second language learning and language pedagogy itself. It means that between theories and practices have connection each other. So, in chronological knowledge especially corrective feedback in Second Language Acquisition has change over time. The expansion of corrective feedback will go through the time. The theories will extent in theories and pedagogical implication. Thus far, some researchers have investigated corrective feedback in a variety of contexts, such as in written corrective feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; ; Ellis, 2008; Sheen, 2010; ; Beuningen, 2010; Guenette, 2012; Li, 2012; Guenette & Lyster, 2013; Park, 2015; Ahmad, 2015), language teaching and learning (Rassaei, 2012). From this, it can be concluded corrective feedback is an attractive topic in Second Language Acquisition.

There are controversies over methods adopted for written corrective feedback (WCF) strategies which focus on in writing skills only. Regarding the issue that how to correct the errors, Ferris (2004) argued that “there is a variety of options for error feedback from direct correction of error to some fairly indirect and less informative approaches from which the teacher must choose, again bearing in mind the needs of the students and goals of the writing course and task” (Ferris, 2004, p.124). In Ellis’ journal (2009) postulates that indirect corrective feedback better than in direct corrective feedback since it will save in long-term students’ memory. By giving indirect CF, the students will try to search or find the location of the error. Therefore, the students will learn by themselves from the error that what they have made in their paper.

Written corrective feedback has different rules than others skill. One of the theories that focus on writing skill is from Sheen (as cited in Lindqvist, 2011. p.10). She has seven categories. They are:

1. Direct non-metalinguistic written correction

Consist of simply providing the students with the form, by e.g. crossing out the error and replacing it with the correct word or adding something that is missing.

2. Direct metalinguistic written correction
Explained as providing the student with the correct form and giving a written explanation of some sort, for instance by numbering the error and giving the answer with an accompanying explanation at the end of the page.
3. Indirect written correction (non-located error)
Explained as providing the student with an indication that an error has occurred but not locating or correcting it, these indicators appear only in the margin.
4. Indirect written correction (located error)
This type only differs from the previous one in that it is located. The teacher provides the students with an indication of an error and its location, but does not correct.
5. Indirect written correction using errors codes
When providing an explicit comment on the “nature” of the error (e.g.”sp” for spelling or “voc” for wrong word choice), but not giving the correct form.
6. Indirect metalinguistic written correction
This type is similar to the direct metalinguistic written correction that it gives a metalinguistic explanation to the error, but different in that it withholds the correct form. For example, “what tense does the main verb always have in a passive construction?”
7. Reformulation
This type consists of a provision of a complete reformulation of the erroneous part in the text. This does not only address the linguistic error, it also indicates and addresses from problems and aims to improve the overall accuracy of the text, “Reformulation can be considered a form of direct CF in that it provides learners with the corrections. However, learners have to carry out a comparison of their own and the reformulated text, which places the burden of locating specific errors on them.

From those categories, the researcher took indirect written correction (located error) becoming the theory in this research. The students will know, find and understand their error that they made in their work sheet. The student will try to learn by searching the true answer from their errors.

Indirect feedback appears when the teacher give symbol or sign in error exists but

does not giving the correction on their work sheet, thus leaving it to the student to search it and revise it until the right one, language acquisition theorists and ESL writing experts alike argue that indirect feedback is better for most student writers, because it engages them in “guided learning and problem solving” (Lalande, 1982), However, the results of studies that have investigated the difference between direct CF and indirect CF are very mixed in some theories before. Some studies (Ferris & Helt, 2000.) suggest that indirect feedback is indeed more effective in enabling students to correct their errors that they made, some suggest the opposite (Chandler, 2003), and others (Robb et al., 1986;Frantzen, 1995) found no difference between direct and indirect CF.

There are four skills which students learn in the school; listening, speaking, reading writing. From those skills, writing skills is one of the difficult skills in English (Ferris, 2004). The students not only know and understand about the grammar but should develop idea, in good composition such as organization, accuracy and others aspects. Therefore, teacher should have more pay intention in this writing skill. One of technique is indirect written correction.

Indirect written correction (located error) is one of technique to correct the students’ work. This technique is proposed by Sheen (2010). This technique is special for correction in students’ writing. This technique becomes alternative way that can be used by teacher in activities in the class. This technique is suitable for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) because the students can not correct their error independently. Therefore, this technique can be helped in students’ academic performance especially in their writing.

In junior high school, the student should know and understand about several texts. One of the texts which should be understood by them is procedure text. The result of their assignment of procedure text is not satisfactory. They felt difficult in using correct grammar. A procedure text is one of kind text that has function to describe through a sequence of actions or steps. Procedure text can be found in daily life such as cooking recipes, ATM machines, operating card, games rules and etc.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher wants to conduct a research in MTs Surya Buana Malang. In order to help students, the researcher wants to help student to increase the academic performance especially in procedure text in writing context. The

second reason, the researcher wants to contribute in that University. Another reason, the theory of indirect written correction (located error) technique never use in analyze in students' writing at Business Islamic Law especially in Indonesia.

This present study, however, examines at VIII grade in MTs Pontren Surya Buana Malang. The MTs Perguruan Tinggi Surya Buana Malang is used as the object of this study because (1) the teacher does not do corrective feedback appropriately in her teaching and learning activities, (2) based on the preliminary studies between teacher and researcher, the teacher explains that the result of students writing get lower than other skills, (3) the headmaster of MTs Pontren Surya Buana Malang allows the researcher to do research that can contribute in it, (4) in the curriculum of MTs Pontren Surya Buana Malang does not include about corrective feedback which is good for their students.

Based on the explanation above, the present study has goal to know the effectiveness indirect written correction (located) on English writing skills at grade VII MTS Pontren Surya Buana Malang and to know students' essay performance on English writing skills at grade VII MTS Pontren Surya Buana Malang

METHOD

In this research, the researcher wants to use quasi-experimental design. Quasi-experimental research designed, seems experimental design, test casual hypothesis. Quasi-experimental is designed (lacks random assignment). The subjects of this study are the seventh grade students of MTs Surya Buana Malang who have low skill in writing in second semester. The researcher applies experimental study with a quantitative approach since it has purpose to solve the problem and to know whether indirect written correction is effective or not for a teaching writing process. The experimental group will teach by using indirect written correction, while the control group will teach writing by using conventional method or without indirect written correction. At the end of the treatments, both experimental and control group will give posttest

The subjects of this study are the seventh grade students of MTs Surya Buana Malang who have low skill in writing in second semester. There are 100 students in the 2016/2017 academic year. Twenty four students belong to A class and the rest of twenty

four are in B class. Before determining the sample, however the pretest on the written form is administered before in order to know whether the two groups of students have approximately the same level of proficiency. After that, one of the two groups of students will be determined, as the experimental group (A) and the one was the control group (B) the experimental group will be a group which will be given the treatment in the form of teaching writing by using indirect written correction while the control group will be a group which is not given indirect written correction.

In this study, the test is aimed to measure the students' writing on procedure text. The test given by the researcher for the students of experimental and control group covers pretest and posttest group. The forms of the tests which are used is form essay. The kind of test requires the students to write an essay based one the instruction given. Further, the researcher needs to find reliability and validity of the instruction. Another instrument which is used is questionnaire. The first aspect is about students' perceptions. The second aspect is about attitudes toward the type of errors corrected

Since this research is a quasi- experimental research design with pretest and posttest design, the data will be analyzed by using t- test in order to calculate the pretest and posttest results. The researcher used independent sample t-test since she wants to compare the means of two independent classes

RESULT

This is the results that related to the research finding in order to find answers. This result get after the researcher did the technique in experimental group and did traditional technique for control group. Before doing post-test, the researcher gave pre-test for experimental and control group. The result of the pre-test bellows:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics in Pre-test between two groups

	Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test experimental group	24	8	60	68	63.83	2.057
Pre-test control group	24	5	60	65	63.08	1.692
Valid N (listwise)	24					

From the table above, it shows that the mean between two groups is 63.83 (experimental group) and 63,08 (control group). The std. deviation 2,057 (experimental group) and 1,692 (control group). It can be concluded that the ability between two groups is same in their performance.

After knowing the ability between two groups, the researcher applied an indirect written correction technique in experimental group. Two groups got post-test distributed by the researcher. The data as bellow:

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics in Post-test between two groups

		Group Statistic			
	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test result	experiment group	24	85.3333	3.72613	.76059
	control group	24	68.1667	2.56509	.52360

Based on the table above, it shows the total of experimental group is 24 students and the control is 24 students. The mean of the experimental group is 85, 33 and the control group is 68, 16 which has std. deviation 3, 72 for experimental group and 2, 56 for control group. So it implied that the mean between two groups are different. Even the question test is same.

After the researcher found the score of post-test in experimental and control group. The researcher did computation the score by using t-test. In t-test's table, it shows the techniques is effective or not to be applied in experimental group

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper			
Post-test result	Equal variances assumed	4.999	.030	18.591	46	.000	17.16667	.92339	15.30797	19.02536
	Equal variances not assumed			18.591	40.802	.000	17.16667	.92339	15.30156	19.03177

From the table, it can be seen the mean difference between two groups 17, 16 and the std. deviation difference is 0, 92. T-test count =18, 591 > t- table =1, 679 and p-value 0.000 < α (0, 05). Therefore, there is significance difference on students' academic performance which has been taught by using indirect correction technique than students who has not been taught by using indirect correction technique.

Based on the research finding in above it is found that statistic computation from the post test support the hypothesis, and the student taught by using indirect correction technique and given feedback have better score in writing skill than those who are not taught by using indirect correction technique and given feedback. The findings mean that the hypothesis is accepted. The finding of the present study also shows that the indirect correction technique and giving feedback for helping the students writing as well

DISCUSSION

In this research, the researcher used indirect correction feedback technique as the technique. Feedback is information by a mediator. It can be teacher, parents, friends, and expertise regarding aspect of one's performance or understanding. In this case, the mediator is the teacher. According to Lalande (1982) an indirect correction technique is more effective than direct correction technique for students. Thus, the researcher takes indirect correction technique for this research.

Written corrective feedback has solution to make the students' writing better. It can be seen in Ellis (2009) research, he explained that written corrective feedback is better way to repair students' writing. For the technique, indirect correction technique is suitable which a lot of researchers are done this technique.

Based on the finding of the study, the researcher concludes that increasing student's writing by writing journal and giving feedback is effective applied in the classroom activities and it can be applied whole of semester.

Giving feedback on their work sheet is effective to build the good relationship between teacher and students. The students will think that the teacher respects or try to help them in learning English. By having it, the teacher will know the students' need and condition in learning English. The teacher is able to provide good materials and techniques in teaching them. According Ellis (2009) says that to help students in students' writing, the best way is indirect corrective feedback, so that the researcher used this as the technique.

According to Ellis (2009) the indirect corrective feedback is a better way to increase or repairs the students' writing. It is proved by this research. This research shows that indirect corrective feedback is effective in helping the students' ability in writing skills. Based on the theory and previous research conducted, shows that the result of all proven in this research. By writing journal, the students' ability is better especially in procedure text. The students remember the error that they made and they will avoid making same error again in next assignments. As well as also with giving feedback also help them to know and find their error in writing, so they can improve it better. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students has a good achievement in writing by making procedure text. Another instrument that the researcher made is questionnaire.

Based on the questionnaire, English is one of the difficult courses, so that the students felt difficult in learning English especially in writing. To help the students' difficulties, the researcher used indirect correction as the technique in teaching them. The student felt enjoy in giving feedback so that they wanted to get correction in their writing. They wanted to get correction in their writing which they produced. It means that they very respect with this technique. It showed that the result of their writing is better than before. This is the result of students' perspective about their correction.

The next questionnaire is about attitude toward to correction. The learners felt are helped by teacher in the classroom. They felt that with correction technique, their result is better and increasing. They thought that a correction technique is not only in procedure text but also should in another text or another aspect of writing. Their understanding about procedure has been deeply than before. Therefore, they can get the point of material especially in procedure text. It might be concluded that indirect correction feedback technique was a better technique for students in supporting learning writing.

Pedagogical Implications

This study has been able to provide useful information particularly to teacher on more effective ways of correcting students' error in English language essay. More importantly, English teacher would be better position to apply the indirect corrective technique properly in the class even when the textbook recommended do not confirm to the indirect corrective technique. Another pedagogical implication is there should be no hesitation to correct students' error in their L2 writing because this study proves that technique is helpful to create accuracy in L2 writing.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

The researcher presented the statistic result and the description of the finding of this study. After analyzing the data, the researcher found that the average score of both groups were different each other. The posttest score of experimental group got 85 and the control group got 68. The researcher analyzed by using t-test. $t\text{-test count} = 18,591 > t\text{-table} = 1,679$ and $p\text{-value } 0.000 < \alpha (0,05)$.

From the result of t-test, the researcher concluded that there was significance between post-test score in experimental and control group. It means the null hypothesis is rejected and the researcher hypothesis is accepted. From the explanation above, it could be said that the teaching English by lecturing and guiding by using corrective feedback is more effective than lecturing and guiding using presentation only.

Suggestion

In accordance with the above, the researcher has two suggestions to follow up the findings. The suggestions are addressed to the English teacher and the further researcher.

The first suggestion is for next English teacher to apply or implement a different writing technique to practice and improve the students' writing, especially by using corrective feedback that have been practiced before. This technique can become alternative technique which is improving students' academic performance.

The second suggestion goes to future researchers. The next researchers can use another technique in their research especially in writing by using Sheen's theories.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, S. (2015). A comparative study of effectiveness of direct and indirect feedback method for urdu efl learners' writings. *International Journal of English and Education*, 4, 225-240
- Beuningen, V. C. (2010). Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing: Theoretical erspective, Empiical Insight and Future Directions. *IJES*, 10(2), 1-27
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The Value of a Focused approach to Written Corrective Feedback. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 204-211
- 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.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT J*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ellis, R. A. (2008). Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*, 63(3). 97-107
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-10.
- Ferris, D. R., & Helt, M. (2000). Was Truscott right? New evidence on the effects of error correction in L2 writing classes. *Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference. Vancouver, BC, March, 11-14.*

- Ferris, D.R. (2004). The “Grammar Correction” Debate in L2 Writing: where are we, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49-62.
- Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 329-344.
- Guenette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written Corrective Feedback and Its Challenges for Pre-Service ESL Teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69, 129-153.
- Guenette, D. (2012). The Pedagogy of Error Correction: Surviving The Written Corrective Feedback Challenge. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30, 117-126.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: an experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Li, S., & Li, P. (2012). Individual Differences in Written Corrective Feedback; A Multi-case Study. *English Language Teaching, Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 5, 38-45.
- Park, E. S. (2015). *To What Extent Do Learners Benefit From Indirect Written Corrective Feedback? A Study Targeting Learners of Different Proficiency and Heritage Language Status*. SAGE.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-93.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). *Differential Effect of Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in the ESL Classroom*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press, 32, 203-234.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327- 369.