

DOCUMENT

SCORE

DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS WRITING PERFORMANCE

100 of 100

ISSUES FOUND IN THIS TEXT

0

PLAGIARISM

3%

Contextual Spelling

Checking disabled

Grammar

Checking disabled

Punctuation

Checking disabled

Sentence Structure

Checking disabled

Style

Checking disabled

Vocabulary enhancement

Checking disabled

DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS WRITING PERFORMANCE

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

October 2015

DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS WRITING PERFORMANCE

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih

Muhammadiyah Semarang University, Indonesia

testiana@unimus.ac.id

Abstract

Teaching writing genre especially recount, narrative, and descriptive need brief and detail correction. Moreover, students aware about their mistakes in writing genre clearly. So, they can revise themselves. Based on the background above, this research aimed to know students' achievement differences between using direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. The subject of this research was the fourth semester of English Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Semarang. It employed quasi experiment and one group pre test post test design to analyze the students' writing achievement. The result showed that there is a significant differences between direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. Hopefully this research gives benefit for lecturers to use direct corrective feedback in their teaching writing process

Keywords: direct corrective feedback , students' writing performance

Introduction

Background

Writing is one of skill which is complicated and has been mastered by students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Semarang especially in genre based-writing. It needs some components that have been mastered by them. As stated by Richard and Renandya (2002:303), there are some component of writing; diction, spelling, punctuation, and organizing. Meanwhile, the students do not aware how to write well using well components and coherence. They only write based on the steps of writing genre using social function, language features, and generic structures. In fact, lecturer often finds some students who were not able to aware with their writing. They forget to use well mechanism. To solve the problem, the reseacher tries to apply direct corrective feedback on students' writing performance. It is applied to make the students are able to revise their own writing and to assist them to acquire correct English.

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5
873

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

Statement of The Problem

—Is there any significance differences between direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback ?||

Literature Review

Writing

Writing genre is one of competencies which must be mastered by English Education students at Muhammadiyah university of Semarang. It uses detail techniques to achieve coherence level. As stated by Harmer (2004:5) the process of organizing idea, writing the idea, and revising it are called writing. It means that writing needs some stages consists of planning, drafting, editing, and final drafting. Moreover, lecturers or teachers should understand the principles of teaching writing. Based on Nunan (2003:9) cited in Spelkova and Hurst (2013:10), there are four principles of teaching writing, such as; understand the students' reason for writing, provide many opportunities for students to write, make feedback helpful and meaningful, and clarify to yourself and your students how their writing will be evaluated. The statement above means that the principles of teaching writing ask the teacher or lecturer must understand students' reason for writing, because it improves students' quality in writing. When the teacher or lecturer teaches writing, he/ she must give the opportunities to the students to explore their skill in writing. If the students always practice writing, it makes the students more creative. Moreover, students need feedback in their writing. Feedback doesn't need always written in margins. The teacher can make experiments with different form; individual conferences, taped responses, type summaries responses, etc. Finally, feedback should not entail —correcting|| a students' writing, in order to foster independents writers, the teacher or lecturer can provide summary comments that instruct the students to look for the problem and correct them on their own.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher assumes that feedback is very important to students' improvement in writing. Students' writing is not always true and perfect. So, the students need the teacher or lecturer to give feedback about what they have written. When giving

feedback, the teacher must give the explanation clearly and easy to understand. He/ she also uses nice sentences, so the students more motivated to improve their ability in

874 ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5 Testiana Deni
Wijayatiningsih

¹ Unoriginal text: 8 words
[www.ijhssi.org/papers/v5\(12\)/F05123...](http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v5(12)/F05123...)

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

writing. After the students get feedback from him/ her, they can understand their writing and write better than before.

Direct Corrective Feedback

Giving feedback for students' writing is very useful for achieving students' competency and mastery in writing especially genre or text. It is a central aspect of second language program. In a study of the improvement of learning outcomes that carried John Hattie (2009) concluded that the feedback can improve student achievement by giving effect size of 1.13 is higher than the learning method and self-correction. Types effective corrective feedback is direct corrective feedback. This is consistent with research John Bitchener, Stuart Young and Denise Cameron (2006) which concluded that the direct corrective feedback can improve student learning outcomes by 8%. Direct corrective feedback informs learners fault location on the sheet at the same test fix these errors to obtain the correct answer (John Bitchener, Stuart Young & Denise Cameron, 2009).

Based on Ellis (2009) stated that teacher or lecturer gave

his/her students with correct form called direct corrective feedback. It was beneficial in providing students with explicit guidance about how to correct their error. In this feedback, he provided the students with correct form. This took a number of different forms like crossing out unnecessary word, phrase, or clause, and writing the correct form near the error form. The example of direct corrective feedback, Ellis (2009:99) can be seen from this figure below;

Figure 1. Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback has the advantage that it provides 2 students with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors by crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme,

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5
875

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form.

Indirect Corrective Feedback

The lecturer or teacher indicated that an error existed but did not provide correction called indirect corrective feedback. As stated by Ellis (2009) stated that indirect corrective feedback providing student's error without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or ³ using cursors to show omissions in the students' text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to ⁴ show the precise location of the error. The example of indirect corrective feedback, Ellis (2009:100) can be seen from the figure below;

² Unoriginal text: 8 words
iasir.net/AIJRHASSpapers/AIJRHASS1...

Figure 2. Indirect Correctie Feedback

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded ⁵ that indirect corrective feedback is a correction which uses symbols, lines, or cross to give the students' understanding about their errors.

³ Unoriginal text: 8 words
irc.cornell.edu/events/09docs/ellis.pdf

⁴ Unoriginal text: 8 words
irc.cornell.edu/events/09docs/ellis.pdf

Method

Subject

This research was done at the fourth grade students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Semarang from April to Juli 2015. It was done because they did not aware their errors in writing briefly.

Design

It employed quasi experiment and one group pre test post test design to analyze the students' writing performance.

876 ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5 Testiana Deni
Wijayatiningsih

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

Data Souces

The data sources of this research is students' writing score and lecturer's notes.

Data Analysis

The data analysis used t-test and mean score by comparing the mean score between direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback on students' writing narrative, descriptive, and recount performance.

Scoring Rubrics

⁵ Unoriginal text: 8 words
ginaariska.wordpress.com/2014/07/2...

The researcher used the scoring guidance taken from Heaton (1975:109-111) cited in Kuku (2013: 4) in five areas. They are fluency, grammar, diction, content and spelling. The scoring is rated 1 until 5 described into the table as following:

The scoring rubrics used Heaton Grid categories

Criteria

Score

Description

Fluency

5

Excellent: flow style, very easy to understand, both complex

and simple sentences.

4

Good: quite flowing style, mostly easy to understand, and

few complex sentences.

3

Fair: reasonable style, easy to understand (but not all),

simple sentences.

2

Inadequate: bad style, hard to understand, mostly simples

sentence or compound sentences (confusing).

1

Unacceptable: very bad style, too hard to understand, all

most all simple sentences confusing.

Grammar

5

Excellent: only 15% mistakes, mastery of grammar

4

Good: 25% mistake only (prepositions)

3

Fair: only 30% mistake, but there are 3-4 minor

2

Inadequate: 50% mistake in grammar

1

Unacceptable: more 50% mistake in grammar

Diction

5

Excellent: only one mistake word, the use of extensive range

of word.

4

Good: there are 2-3 mistakes words, the use of new word

that have gotten (appropriate synonyms and

circumlocutions).

3

Fair: the use of word acquired appropriate word on whole

but there are 4 mistakes words.

2

Inadequate: the use limited word, the use of synonyms (but

inappropriate). 5 mistakes words.

1

Unacceptable: the use very limited word, use inappropriate

synonyms and confusing word, more 5 mistakes words.

Content

5

Excellent: clear progression of ideas, all sentences support

the topic, highly organized, and well linked.

4

Good: ideas well organized, communication of the sentences

is not impaired.

3

Fair: there are deficiency organization, reading required for

classification of ideas.

2

Inadequate: the ideas difficult to deduce connection with the

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih

ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5

877

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

October 2015

sentences, little connectivity.

1

Unacceptable: deficiency of organization to serve that

communication is seriously impaired.

Spelling

5

Excellent:15% errors spelling

4

Good:25% errors in spelling

3

Fair:40% errors spelling

2

Inadequate:60% errors spelling

1

Unacceptable:80% errors spelling

Result and Discussion

Based on the analysis of students' score for writing performance on narrative, recount, and descriptive text using t-test formula, it can be concluded that there is significant differences between direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback if the criteria $t\text{-value} > t\text{-table}$ (1.67). (Sugiyono, 2010: 138)

It meant that direct corrective feedback is effective for teaching writing recount, narrative, and descriptive text. They can be seen clearly in following figure;

Figure 3. The Students' Writing Mean Score

Based on the figure above, the result of students' post test score of recount text is 79.69. It is higher than the pre test result score of recount text 69.9. Next, the students' post

test result of narrative text 79.7 is higher than the pre test 71.3. Then, The students; post test result of descriptive text 79.69 is higher than pre test score 65.3. Finally, it can be concluded that the post test mean score is higher than the pre test mean score.

878 ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5 Testiana Deni
Wijayatiningsih

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

The t-test result shown that direct corrective feedback is higher than indirect corrective feedback. It can be seen from the figure below;

Figure 4. T-test Result

Conclusion

Based on the research result, direct corrective feedback is beneficial for improving students' writing performance. Finally, the researcher hopes that direct corrective feedback can be used by teachers in teaching writing.

References

Beunigen, C.G., De Jong, N.H. & Kuiken, F. 2008. The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners written accuracy. International Journal of Applied Linguistics.156: 279-296.

Bitchener, J., Young, S. & Cameron, D. 2005. The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing. 9: 227-258.

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. 1997. Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. 2008. A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. ELT Journal Vol.63/2.

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. 2004. How to Teach Writing. Malaysia: Pearson Education.

Richards J.C and Renandya W.L. 2002. Methodology in language Teaching. Boston:

Cambridge University.

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5
879

4th ELTLT CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS
October 2015

Spelkova, Inessa & Hurst, Nicholas. 2013. Teachers' Attitudes to Skills and the Writing Process. E-Journal 9 of Rezekne State Gymnasium Latvia 2013.

⁶ Unoriginal text: 8 words
iasir.net/AIJRHASSpapers/AIJRHASS1...

Sugiyono.2010. Bandung. CV Alfabeta. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan.

Wibowo, Kukuh. 2013. Improving students' writing ability In narrative text by using chronological 3D as media. Journal UNNES 2013.

⁷ Unoriginal text: 8 words
www.sciencedirect.com/science/articl..

Biodata:

Testiana Deni Wijayatiningsih, S.Pd, M.Pd was born in Purworejo in 1984. She lived in Jl.Rorojonggrang timur X RT 3 RW 10 Manyaran Semarang, Central Java. She graduated from State University of Semarang in 2002 and completed her master degree at the same university in 2009. She then took up a position at Muhammadiyah University of Semarang, where she taught at English Department of UNIMUS. Her research interests is English Education especially writing, reading, and teaching English. Her email address is testiana@unimus.ac.id.

⁸ Unoriginal text: 8 words
eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ678796

⁹ Unoriginal text: 9 words
web.letas.up.pt/nrhurst/Writing%20...

880 ISBN 978-602-73769-1-5 Testiana Deni
Wijayatiningsih