



Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

Similarity Found: 12%

Date: Jumat, Agustus 21, 2020

Statistics: 432 words Plagiarized / 3608 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING WRITING TO SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS Jaenal Abidin¹, Agung Wicaksono², Mahendra Puji P.3 University of Nusantara PGRI Kediri jaenalabidin668@gmail.com, agungwicaksono@unpkediri.ac.id, mahendrapuji@unpkediri.ac.id Abstract In language teaching, writing is one of the skills that should be mastered.

It might be a challenge for some students in learning writing, because writing is used in written context. There are some aspects that must writer be considered. The five aspects are vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, writing style, and also organizing ideas. Moreover, students also must follow several processes in writing. The process of writing includes planning, drafting, editing, and the final version. The teacher can provide feedback at the editing stage called corrective feedback.

When students learn to write, they need to know what aspects are still a problem in their writing. For that, they really need feedback from teachers. The teacher must provide appropriate feedback strategies for the student's writing. One of the strategies that can be used is written corrective feedback. Therefore, this article discusses about the types of written in corrective feedback that is able to be used in teaching writing by teachers.

Keywords: Writing, Corrective Feedback INTRODUCTION Writing is an activity to convey ideas or information in written form. For students of foreign languages, writing is the most challenging skill besides listening, speaking, and reading. This is because it requires the ability and complicated processes in writing.

In order to produce good writing products, students must give attention form lower level such as: punctuation, word choices, spelling, and so on, up to higher skills level as

well as planning and organizing (Richards and Renandya: 2002: 303). And also, to make good writing products, students **also need to know** and be involved in the writing process.

Because it is very difficult to write good writing at once the first time. Therefore, they need knowledge about how the stages and processes in writing. As mentioned above, that to produce good writing students must follow several stages and processes in writing. Harmer (2004: 4-5) divides, **the process of writing** into four steps. They are planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and final version.

In writing, starting from getting an idea to the final product, it has been arranged in such away. These stages must be carried out sequentially. Writing activity itself is not as easy as imagined. students often experience the desire to write, but they cannot do it. Students' experience a delay in expressing their thoughts or ideas through language in good and correct form, so that students experience difficulties in writing.

In addition, learning that focuses on the text book often ignores the stages and processes in writing itself. therefore, as a teacher must find the right solution in dealing with these problems. In senior high school level, the students are expected to have technical competence in interpersonal, transactional, and functional texts using a variety of oral and written English texts.

It is stated in permendikbud no 21 th 2016: Menyusun teks lisan dan tulis, agak panjang dengan menggunakan struktur teks secara urut dan runtut serta unsur kebahasaan secara akurat dan berterima. In addition to being able to compose texts verbally, a senior high school student must also be able to compose written text with the structure in sequence and using the correct language elements. In order to reach the competence, teachers must have the right strategies to teach writing.

There **are a lot of** ways that can be used by the teacher. In fact, more teachers use unappropriated techniques and even do not adopt techniques in their teaching. As explained above, teachers must be able to make senior high school students compile written texts with the structure in sequence and using the correct language elements. For example, the teacher just explains the material and gives the question and answers session, gives the related topic and asks the students to do writing.

This method usually makes students bored and not too effective. To solve the problem above, the writer believe that the teacher must find another teaching strategies which appropriate to use. One of them is written corrective feedback.

Although it looks simple and easy to use, this method requires special preparation and the teacher must know some things related to written corrective feedback, including the teacher must know **the types of corrective feedback** and have, the ability to design syllabus written corrective feedback. This paper is intended to discuss and explain about types of corrective feedback, and procedure to design written corrective feedback.

Teaching Writing Teaching writing to the students is facilitating and guiding them to learn how to write. It is supported by Brown (2006: 8) indicate, that teaching is giving guiding and facilitating students to enabling them **to learn and setting the condition for** study. Teacher, also should know about of how the students learning style in determining the teacher philosophy of education, teaching style, and the classroom techniques.

The approach, and the techniques that are used in the classroom depend on how the teacher's understanding about of what learning is. Besides, it is interpreted as same as with the learning concept itself. Graham and Perin (2007: 9) who state that learning of writing concept plays two distincts, but also complementary roles.

The difference between writing concepts is the skill that refers to the use of strategies, such as planning, evaluating, and revising texts, such as writing assignment reports or expressing opinions. Second, writing means deepening and broadening students' understanding in writing. In addition, Richard and Renandya (2002) state that **writing is a process of generating and organizing ideas into readable texts.**

Then we can conclude that the result of teaching writing is the products in the form of readable text. In concentrating the product of writing, it seems that the writers is only interested in **the main idea of** task and the end of the task. While, if they have just focused **on the process of writing**, it means that the teacher will facilitate and guide the students during the process of pre-writing, editing, and, redrafting, also publishing of students' writing. Based on the process, Harmer (2004:4-5) divides the process of writing into four steps. Those are planning, ,

drafting, editing. (reflecting and revising), and final. version. 1). Planning This **is the first step** that writers do before writing. This stage is also called pre-writing. In this first stage the author tries to find out what ideas they will write. This can be started by looking in the memories and personal experiences of the writer. 2). Drafting In this second step, drafting is **the first draft of** the piece.

After the writer has thought about what topics will be written and do the pre-writing, writing paragraphs is the next process. The author uses the first paragraph draft, the

ideas generated from pre-writing as a guide. 3). Editing A writer is almost impossible to write correctly and perfect in the first paragraph. Thus, a writer must find a way to fix it. This is called revising.

Usually, what the writers have written aims to see where it works or not. In editing process, it involves going back over the writing and making changes to its organization, style based on grammatical and lexical cohesion (Nation, 2009:120). 4).

Final Version The Final steps is when writers have edited the draft and making some correction that they consider to be done, their produce or publish their final version. This final version will be different form the first draft because of editing process. But, this final step is a sign that they are **now ready to send** their text to its intended reader.

Corrective Feedback In language teaching writing, **there are different types of** feedback teachers could use. Giving feedback to the students is one of important thing in teaching writing process. Feedback from the teacher is needed by students so they can learn and correct their mistakes.

According to **Lightbown and Spada (1999: 172)**, **corrective feedback (CF) is any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is** incorrect. This includes a variety of responses that a language learner receives. There are various forms in corrective feedback and the methodological to give correction. Furthermore, they explain **that written corrective feedback (WCF)** refers to "Various ways in reading that is able to **respond to a second language** by a reader that indicating **some usage in the writing does not conform to the** target language".

Because of **there are many different** forms of corrective feedback, Ellis (2009: 97) states that determining WCF is effective or not by identifying the options in a systematic way in primary. If it is, what types of CF is most effective. Therefore, **the types of corrective feedback** are very important to describe. Thus, the writer will discuss about types of written feedback and the effect **in writing descriptive text**.

Firstly, the types of the Correction feed back is direct feedback. ?In the problem of direct CF, the teacher facilitates the students **with the correct form. As** Ellis (1990: 99) says that **the teacher provides the** correct form to the students, and it is desirable for low level in proficiency students who are not allowed to do self-correction and do not know what the correct form might be.

Moreover, it is required **minimal processing on the part of the learners** and, it might not support in longterm learning. Furthermore, not only the teacher does assess students'

works, but also provide the correct form. Example 1 (from Yahya and Suhartono 2016) From the example above we see that the teacher gives a cross to the wrong section, then writes the correct answer on the wrong form. Secondly, on the contrary of the **direct corrective feedback is** indirect corrective feedback.

Yahya and Suhartono (2016: 53) state, "Indirect corrective feedback is a feedback of the teacher to let the students correct their error by themselves". The statement is also supported by Ellis (1990: 100), "Indirect CF involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it". Furthermore, Eslami (2014: 446) adds that indirect feedback indicates that there some ways in an error exists, but it does not provide the correction.

It is aimed for students to find the error in their writing. Thus, it is able to do by giving an underlining the mistake or **using cursors to show** it in the student's text by putting a **cross in the margin** beside the line containing the erroneous.

Example 2 (from Yahya and Suhartono 2016) From this example above **we can see that** the teacher underlined the incorrect form and then added the question mark "?". Thirdly,, other kinds **of the corrective feedback** are Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback. Ellis (1990: 100) argues that Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback involves providing the errors that the learner have made learners by some fo explicit comment.

According to Chandler in Gholaminia et, al (2014: 316), Metalinguistic **corrective feedback operates as the provision of the correct form** in the student's written texts by giving underline the error **and writing the correct** from above. In short, it is an assessment from the teacher by providing an explanation about the errors. Example 3 (from Yahya and Suhartono 2016) From the example above the teacher gives feedback by crossing words that the writing is in incorrect form.

Then, the teacher provides information above incorrect form that the spelling is error. Furthermore, Ellis (1990) writes there are various options for correcting students' written work. They are: Focused Corrective Feedback Teachers are be able to select the correction students' errors., In this case, it is known as focused corrective feedback.

In other way, they are able to choose the types of the specific error. in correction. The teacher also could have selected to assess the errors in article. The differences between focused CF and unfocused CF were implemented to all of the discussion in previously. / Example 4 (from Ellis, et. al. 2008) From the example of the student's writing above, it involves inserting articles 'a' before the word 'bone' and 'butcher' in the first sentence, and crossing out 'having' and inserting before "the" word 'bone' in the second sentence.

Up to four errors are corrected, two of which are article errors.

Unfocused Corrective Feedback ? In an unfocused CF, processing for corrections may be much more difficult. Because, students have to deal with various kinds of error. Ellis, et al (2008) argue this type is the same as for the direct / unfocused type, except that only the article's errors are corrected. The goal is to assess a maximum of four article errors.

But, what this make different is that this type does not always correct only the errors of an article or certain errors. Electronic feedback ? Nowadays, there are search engine such as Google dan Bing which have massive collection of written English. It is able to used to provide students technological assistance in their learning writing process.

Reformulation ? The last option that teachers can consider is reformulation. The aims of reformulation are to give the students with a resource that they are able to use for correcting their errors, but they also took the duty for the final stage about how to make correction in their writing. / ?Example 4 (from Sachs and Polio in Ellis 2009) Procedure To Design Written. Corrective. Feedback.

It is very important for a teacher to be able to make the steps in giving corrective feedback into syllabus. This is done to help teachers implement language teaching in the classroom. According to Bitchener & Ferrishere (2012 189) said that there is no universal approach that the teacher can use to designing a composition class syllabus that effectively incorporates language instruction.

However, they said that there are some key points that must be considered by teachers in silbus, especially on several different types of instruction and feedback, those are: 1. After students receiving WCF from the teacher, they are allowed be able to revise their writing product at least once or several times. The teacher should assign their work to analyze their own errors, and to make corrections. 2.

When students have reached the final phase in editing a paper, peer- and self-editing in the classroom will be able to help students learn and practice effective editing strategies. The workshop must be facilitated by the teacher. ?3. When students' papers have been analyzed and discussed, the teacher can summarize common mistakes made by students.

The mistakes can be listed and communicated to the students. 4. To discuss other language problems that are observed through the topic of analysis of needs at the beginning of the semester, the teacher can include it in the syllabus. 5.

Apart from considering the above, such as in-class activities or homework assignments using written CFs, the teacher can also give one-to-one error conferences with those most in need or with all students. Furthermore, the teacher may be able to create a tutorials or mini lessons for students who has a certain pattern in error. or language gaps that the others faced. DISCUSSION All types. of written corrective feedback can be used by teachers to improve students' writing abilities.

However, the teacher must be choosing what type is more suitable for students. Same as the other strategy, corrective feedback has some advantages and disadvantages in each types of correction. Those are direct WCF and indirect WCF The first is Direct WCF. In Direct WCF, teachers provide correct form such as.

crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase or morpheme, or inserting a missing word, phrase or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the incorrect form. It provides students with clear correction about how to correct their erroneous. Ferris and Roberts in Aridah (2016: 106-107) said that direct written corrective feedback is probably better than indirect written corrective feedback with writers who has of low levels of language proficiency.

In other hand, it is required minimal processing on the part of the students, However, it may help them get the correct form when revising their writing, but it may not contribute to long-term learning. Furthermore, Ellis (2009) suggests that direct WCF is able to effective in promoting acquisition for specific grammatical features (low intermediate level learners).

The second is Indirect WCF. It indicates that the learner has made an error but without actually correcting it. It can be done by giving an underline the errors or using cursors to show the mistake 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 show the precise location of the error, i.e. just indicate which line of text the error is on.

Indirect corrective feedback is not advantageous to lower proficiency second language learners, since they lack of the linguistic competence to self-correct their error. Students are not able to correct unless they do not know the correct form, Students may be able to correct but they are going not to be certain that they are not incorrect. In previous study, the results were revealed that direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback are variously.

The third is Metalinguistic WCF. It improves students' writing ability. In a study conducted by Azizi et al. (2014: 60) it can be concluded that the metalinguistic WCF had

an influence in positive way on the writing improvement of the Iranian EFL students. In the study also mentioned that the reason why metalinguistic results in improvement in writing.

Among them are metalinguistic giving learner's information about the errors they just made, so that they are prompted to think about the structures they are used and consequently take duty for them in learning. Furthermore, Azizi et al. (2014: 57) added that explicit feedback containing metalinguistic information **is more effective than** implicit feedback containing error codes.

The last is Electronic WCF. It removes the need for the teacher to be the arbiter of what constitutes a correct form. The teachers' intuition is often fallible in grammatical correctness. To encourages learner independence and **most appropriate for their own textual** intentions, it is allowed **learners to locate the** corrections.

CONCLUSION Writing is an activity that requires a lot of ability and knowledge. In the writing process, students must go through several processes. Because writing is a process, it requires repeated corrections to produce a good writing. For teachers, **it is very important** to know how to teach and give feedback in good teaching writing **Written corrective feedback is** very suitable to be applied **in the process of** teaching writing because the teacher gives corrections to writing errors.

students can also find out where the fault is to be corrected and make the writing better in the future. References Aridah. (2016). The Effectiveness **Of Direct And Indirect Written Corrective Feedback** In Efl Writing Performance. ISELT – 4. 105 – 115. Retrieved on June 7, 2020, from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/download/6917/5451> 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, 2014; 2(6-1): 54-63. Retrieved on June 5, 2020, from: <http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/ijll> Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D., (2012). Written Corrective feedback In Second Language Acquisition and Writing. New York: Routledge Brown H., D. (2007). Principle **of Language Learning and Teaching**, Fifth Edition. New York: Pearson Education, Inc Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types.

ELT Journal, 63 (2): 97-107 Retrieved on January 11, 2020, from <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article-abstract/63/2/97/440749?redirectedFrom=fulltext> Ellis, R. (2009). **Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development**. L2 Journal, 1. UC Barkeley, Retrieved on January 11, 2020, from

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3> Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context.

System, 36(3), 353–371. Retrieved on June 25, 2020, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ804984> Eslami, E. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98:445 – 452. Retrieved on December 1, 2019, from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82416208.pdf> Exdriko, Y., Tavriyanti, L., Refnita, L., (2014).

The Teaching Of Writing A Descriptive Text Using Clustering Technique For Bung Hatta University Students. Vol 3, No 5. Retrieved on February 28, 2020, from <http://ejurnal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php?journal=JFKIP&page=article&op=view&path%5B%5D=2523> Gholaminia, I., Gholaminia, A., Marzban, A. (2013). An investigation of meta-linguistic corrective feedback in writing performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 116 (2014) 316 – 320. Retrieved on January 11, 2020, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814002158/pdf?md5=8e500d13894b6392b77f877a4ea6a161&pid=1-s2.0-S1877042814002158-main.pdf> Graham, S, & Perin, D. (2007). Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools.

A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Retrieved on March 12, 2020, from <https://lincs.ed.gov/state-resources/federal-initiatives/teal/publications/writing-next> Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16: 40-53. Retrieved on December 20, 2019, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ761537> Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited. Hyland, K. (1990).

Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal*, 44: 279-285. Retrieved on December 25, 2019, from <https://academic.oup.com/eltj/article-abstract/44/4/279/2924252?redirectedFrom=fulltext> Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (1999). How Languages are Learned. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Richards, J., C., & Renandya, W., A. (2002). Methodology in Language Teaching_ An Anthology of Current Practice.

New York: Cambridge University Press PERMENDIKBUD NO 21 TAHUN 2016: Standar Isi Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Retrieved on March 10, 2020, from

<https://benjamins.com/catalog/Illt.13.09>val Yahya, M. U., & Suhartono, S. (2016). The Use Of Written Corrective Feedback To Improve The Tenth Grade Students' Writing Skill Of Descriptive Text. English Education : Journal of English Teaching and Research, 1(2), 13. Retrieved on November 28, 2019, from <https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v1i2.479>

INTERNET SOURCES:

<1% -

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7e8b/f11ab3bb49dd325ffee59b20ce4ff0622990.pdf>

<1% - <https://www.dailywritingtips.com/the-writing-process/>

<1% -

<https://www.understood.org/en/learning-thinking-differences/child-learning-disabilities/writing-issues/6-skills-kids-need-for-written-expression>

<1% - <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1066752.pdf>

<1% -

https://issuu.com/loquenenglishstudiesjournal/docs/the_use_of_inside_outside_circle_te

<1% -

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/mar/14/creative-writing-courses-advice-students>

<1% - http://chs.camias.wednet.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/forecasting_guide.pdf

<1% - <https://www.edsys.in/16-innovative-ideas-make-teaching-methods-effective/>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276464632_The_Role_of_Written_Corrective_Feedback_in_Developing_Writing_in_L2

<1% - <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/12351181.pdf>

<1% - <http://edutechwiki.unige.ch/en/Writing-to-learn>

<1% - <https://www.awej.org/images/AllIssues/Volume8/Volume8number2june/12.pdf>

<1% -

<https://opentextbc.ca/writingforsuccess/chapter/chapter-3-putting-ideas-into-your-own-words-and-paragraphs/>

<1% - <https://articlekz.com/en/article/14624>

<1% - <https://www.masterclass.com/articles/how-to-draft-ideas-into-stories>

<1% - <https://www.mailpoet.com/blog/jetpack-email-subscriptions-tutorial/>

<1% - <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1117969.pdf>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042815035673>

<1% - <http://ejournal.ukm.my/gema/article/download/27392/9393>

<1% -

https://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/bitstream/handle/1808/12284/Sun_%20ku_0099D_12694_DATA_1.pdf?sequence=1

<1% -

http://docshare.tips/managinginhealthandsocialcare2ndedition_58ba6116b6d87fc5418b47b8.html

<1% -

https://universityofibnkhaldunbogor-indonesia.blogspot.com/2011/02/improving-students-ability-in-writing_8737.html

<1% - <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/v20n1/0123-4641-calj-20-01-00079.pdf>

<1% -

<https://id.123dok.com/document/zgrpn17q-web-and-big-data-part-i-2018-pdf-pdf.html>

<1% -

http://www.asiatefl.org/main/download_pdf.php?i=217&c=1419309792&fn=6_3_10.pdf

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257170890_Written_Corrective_Feedback_in_Second_Language_Acquisition_and_Writing

<1% - <https://www.grin.com/document/494049>

<1% - <https://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/features/giving-student-feedback/>

1% - <http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/139754/1/2.%20Choi%20Jungeun.pdf>

<1% - <https://eltsupervision.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/students-writing-errors.ppsx>

<1% -

<https://www.cyberessays.com/Term-Paper-on-How-A-Learning-Support-Practitioner-May/67503/>

<1% - <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82416208.pdf>

<1% - <http://www.eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/8185/7844>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004951414603342>

<1% - <https://www.grin.com/document/437886>

<1% -

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/eeca/f2b4e0d202c1d32e18927af2668ee01783c7.pdf>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272797095_The_Effect_of_Focused_Meta-linguistic_Written_Corrective_Feedback_on_Iranian_Intermediate_EFL_Learners'_Essay_Writing_Ability

<1% - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0265659013512321>

<1% - <https://matbury.com/wordpress/author/matbury/page/8/>

<1% -

<https://writingcenter.unc.edu/faculty-resources/tips-on-teaching-writing/what-is-good-writing/>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283048541_International_Journal_of_Language_and_Linguistics_Applications_of_robot-assisted_language_learning_RALL_in_language_learning_and_teaching

<1% - <http://carla.umn.edu/strategies/bibliography.html>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278667027_ESP_learner_self-generated_feedback_as_a_technology-enhanced_task

<1% - <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1980.tb05188.x>

<1% - <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82614439.pdf>

<1% - https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carnegie_Corporation

1% - <https://sls750f07.blogspot.com/2007/08/evaluation-of-guenette-2007-by-dan.html>

<1% -

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269337866_Students'_Perception_and_Preferences_of_Written_Feedback_in_Academic_Writing

<1% -

<https://www.amazon.de/How-Languages-are-Learned-Handbooks/dp/0194541266>

<1% -

<https://www.amazon.co.uk/Methodology-Language-Teaching-Anthology-Practice/dp/0521004403>

<1% - <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/156961422.pdf>

1% - <https://benjamins.com/catalog/lia.6.1.05mif>

<1% -

<https://www.scribd.com/doc/274322401/the-role-of-corrective-feedback-in-second-language-writing>