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**ABSTRACT**

The efficacy of written corrective feedback has been an issue for the theory and the practice of teaching writing. This study aimed to examine the role of the two types of written corrective feedback namely focused direct feedback and focused indirect feedback on students’ recount text which focused on spelling, English articles and past verbs. There were 76 students of grade VIII in SMPN I Batukliang participated in this study. This study used a pre-test-treatment-post-test design which consists of three groups; two experimental groups: direct feedback (N=25) and indirect feedback group (N=25) and one control group without feedback (N=26). The students assigned to write one recount text based on the picture before treatment and one after treatment. A one-way ANOVA was applied to analyze the differences among the three groups. After analyzing the data, it found that there were differences in the mean score between the two group receiving teacher feedback and the control group without teacher feedback. The mean score in pre-test increase significantly in the mean score of post test in the two experimental groups while students in control group only made a little increase. It was found that students’ recount writing skill improved as a result of written corrective feedback provided by the teacher. This finding showed that both direct and indirect feedback were effective in improving students’ writing, but direct feedback give more contribution on improving students’ writing than indirect one.
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Peranan Umpan Balik Perbaikan secara Tertulis

terhadap Penulisan teks Recount Siswa:

sebuah penelitian eksperimental pada SMPN I Batukliang

Nurul Aini

Program Pasca Sarjana Bahasa Inggris

Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan

Universitas Mataram

**ABSTRAKSI**

Fungsi dan keefektifan dari pemberian umpan balik dan perbaikan secara tertulis telah menjadi permasalahan bagi teori dan praktik dalam pengajaran kemampuan menulis. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji peranan dua jenis dari pemberian umpan balik secara tertulis yaitu umpan balik secara langsung dan umpan balik secara tidak langsung terhadap teks recount siswa yang berpusat pada ejaan, artikel bahasa Inggris dan kata kerja lampau. Penelitian ini melibatkan 76 orang siswa kelas VIII yaitu kelas VIII 1,2,3 pada SMPN I Batukliang. Penelitian ini menggunakan pola pre- test – perlakuan – post-test yang terdiri dari tiga kelompok yaitu ada dua kelompok eksperimen: kelompok direct feedback (N=25) dan kelompok indirect feedback (N=25) dan satu kelompok kontrol (N=26). Semua siswa dari setiap kelompok ditugaskan untuk menulis teks recount berdasarkan gambar yang sudah disediakan sekali sebelum diberikan umpan balik dan sekali setelah diberikan umpan balik. Dalam penelitian ini, One –way ANOVA dipergunakan untuk menganalisa perbedaan terhadap ketiga kelompok tersebut. Hasil dari analisis data tersebut menunjukkan bahwa nilai rata-rata pre –test pada kedua kelompok eksperimen yang mendapatkan umpan balik meningkat secara signifikan pada nilai rata –rata post-test, sementara pada kelompok kontrol peningkatannya hanya sedikit saja. Hasil ini menunjukkan bahwa ada perbedaan kemampuan menulis teks recount siswa sebelum dan sesudah diberikan umpan balik secara tertulis, baik langsung maupun tidak langsung dan dapat membuktikan bahwa kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks recount meningkat akibat pemberian umpan balik perbaikan secara tertulis yang diberikan oleh guru.

Jadi, dapat disimpulkan bahwa umpan balik secara langsung maupun tidak langsung efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks recount , walaupun dalam penelitian ini ditemukan bahwa umpan balik secara langsung lebih efektif daripada umpan balik secara tidak langsung.

**Kata Kunci: Umpan balik dan perbaikan secara tertulis, umpan balik langsung dan tidak langsung, teks recount.**

**I. Introduction**

Based on some previous studies, feedback or error treatment has been crucial strategies in improving students’ writing, both in English for Second Language and Foreign Language learning as well as in instruction. The dispute over the principle of learning theories and grounding an approach has been affected by a number of mainstream theories, such as, behaviorism, mentalist, cognitive, and constructivism. These theories lead different views on how to teach, and what to teach. As a result, over the years, feedback became a pivotal part of teaching English and in designing lessons or instructing writing.

A number of studies have been conducted, addressing and examining the effect of written corrective feedback in improving students’ writing. The result of these studies whether or not feedback gave benefit and was effective in improving students writing was controversial. These following studies proposed controversial findings, such as (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2004; Ferris and Robert, 2001; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2004, 2007). Some studies also had disagreements in the area of providing feedback, such as (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener, Young, and Cameron 2005; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Bitchener and Knoch, 2008a, 2009; 2010; Sheen, 2007; Ellis, 2008; Hyland and Hyland, 2006; Ellis and Sheen, Murakami, Takashima, 2008; and Purnawarman, 2011). They found that corrective feedback is effective in supporting students’ achievement especially if the WCF is “focused”. (Ellis: 2009). All these studies and their findings brought up controversial issues in writing instruction.

There were numerous studies recently investigating written corrective feedback especially in the effect of some strategies such as direct and indirect, focused and unfocused such as Ellis, Sheen, Murakami and Takashima (2008) examined the effect of focused and unfocused written corrective feedbacks (WCF) in an English as a foreign language context, and they acquired that the focused WCF was as effective as unfocused WCF while Mirzaii and Aliabadi (2013) observed the impact of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on job application letter. They found that direct feedback is more helpful than the indirect one.

The other researchers, Fazilatfar, Fallah, Hamavandi and Rostamian (2014) also did study on unfocused WCF on syntactic and lexical complexity of L2 writing and defined that unfocused WCF was statically substantial in increasing L2 writing accurateness and whereas Frear (2014) analyzed the effect of focused and unfocused direct written corrective feedback on a new piece of writing and he established that both focused group and unfocused group were equally effective in enhancing better writing, but there were no differences between them, which one is more beneficial than other.

Regardless of recent studies that found data in written corrective feedback, another question will appear. With this in mind, I was interested in applying this strategy in improving students’ writing in the context of genre based on recount text writing in the second grade in SMPN I Batukliang. The type of feedback which is used is the combination of focused direct and focused indirect correction feedback. The term focused used here because the study just focused on correcting students’ errors of three items; English articles, spelling and past verbs. There were no studies conducted on the effects of focused direct and focused indirect feedback in promoting learners’ writing recount text for junior high school. To fill the gap, research question was devised as the following question.

**2. Research Questions**

The purpose of the study was to examine the following research questions:

1. Do the focused direct and indirect corrective feedbacks provided effective in improving students’ writing recount text?
2. Is there any difference in the efficacy of direct and indirect within the group by the type of corrective feedback?
3. Is there any interaction between the two strategies?

**3. Method**

**3.1. Design**

This research was descriptive quantitative in which the study try to analyzed the effectiveness of focused direct and focused indirect corrective feedback in improving students’ recount text writing. This was true experimental class because it was design in pre-test, post-test, experimental and control group. It consists of three groups; two experimental groups and one control group. The two experimental groups – direct feedback group (N=25), indirect feedback group (N=25) and a control group (N=26).

The treatment provided was corrective feedback based on their group. Focused direct corrective feedback as group one have been given the feedback as to the functional use of the articles, spelling and simple past tense directly by crossing out their errors on and provided the correct one above or near the erroneous. Meanwhile focused indirect corrective feedback as group two was provided with indicating errors by underlying the error and giving codes for each of the incorrect spelling, articles and simple past tense without providing the correct one. While there is no treatment for control group, only giving general comment on their recount writing. The following figure showed the design.

Writing task (task 1) → teacher feedback → writing task (task 2)

**3.2 Participants**

There are 76 students choose randomly that have been taken as sample of the study: 50 students for 2 experimental groups, that is, the focused direct written corrective feedback for class VIII.1 (N=25) as the first experimental group, the focused indirect written corrective feedback is for class VIII.2 (N=25) as the second one and class VIII.3 students have chosen for the control group (N=26) without feedback. All the students in each group were female.

**3.3 Instruments**

The instrument used to collect the data was picture of series of event of ones experience in the past. The study allowed student to write a simple and short paragraph based on the pictures given for all group for pre-test. During the treatment, for the experimental groups, they were given the treatment based on their groups; focused direct corrective feedback for the first group and focused indirect corrective feedback for the second group.

There were two series of pictures involve the instruction in English which designed in this study. The first picture is about ones experience having vacation in the beach and the second one is about camping. The first picture was for task one for pre-test and the second was task two for post test.

**3.4 Procedures**

There were some procedures applied in this study for the writing task and the session of teacher corrective feedback: (1) The teacher gave the pictures of one experience, (2) They were asked to write a short and simple paragraph about their experiences based on the pictures provided at home and submitted it in the next meeting, (3)The students were instructed to checked and asked questions about unclear pictures.

After a few days on the next lesson, teacher collected the students’ writing. The teacher gave corrective feedback on each student’s writing and distributed it back to them in the next meeting. The teacher gave chance to students to examine the feedback provided by the teacher. Here the procedures concern for the two experimental groups. (1)The teacher corrected the recount text in three items: spelling, English articles and past verbs. The strategy used for the first experimental group (DF) was direct feedback which is correcting the errors and providing the correct one in the above of incorrect word, while for indirect group, the teacher only provided the code of the errors without providing the correct one as in the following:

a. Direct

a a the

A dog stole √ bone from √butcher. He escaped with having √bone.

over a a saw a

When the dog was going ofer √bridge over the river he see √dog in the river

Ellis, R (2009)

b. Indirect

A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with having X bone.

When the dog was going X ofer X X bridge over the river

he XseeX Xdog in the river

Note : X = missing word (art)

X…X = misspelling (wrong word/verb) Ellis, R (2009)

(2)The students received their corrected recount in the next meeting, (3) The teacher asked students to paid attention to their writing and the correction given by the teacher, (4) The teacher gave explanation about the students errors and allowed them to asked some questions related to their recount text, (5) The teacher distributed the second pictures about camping and asked students to write their experience based on the pictures as the post-test, (6) The procedures above were repeated, but the teacher did not give comment and other explanation on their writing.

Control group was accepted similar procedures but they did not receive feedback and correction for their errors in their writing. As an alternative, the teacher gave general comment to their writing such as “a great experience!”, “I love the story”, “a nice camping!”, etc.

**3. 5. Data Collection and Analysis**

The data were collected based on the result of pre-test and post-test for both experimental groups and control group. Students’ writing accuracy was measured by the *ESL Composition Profile* developed by Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfel, & Hughey (1981). The *ESL Composition Profile* was used to determine the quality of students’ recount writing based on their scores of the students’ writing in using articles, spelling, and simple past tense. The number of errors on students writing will be measured two times; once before treatment and once after treatment. The maximum total score of the students’ writing is 100. The outline classify students’ writing into four criteria, excellent to very good (86-100), good to average (68-85), fair to poor (47-67), and very poor (34-46).

The scores of pre-test and post-test were analyzed into statistics to find out the effectiveness and significance of difference of focused direct and focused indirect on recount writing.

The level of significant of all statistics is 95% or α (0.05). The statements are:

a. If p- value < α (0.05) it means that there is significance difference within the group

b. If p- value > α (0.05) it means that there is no significance difference within the group

**4. Results**

To investigate the answer of research questions, it used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). This analysis used to find out whether corrective feedback provided effective in improving students recount writing.

| **Table 1 ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 3539.636 | 2 | 1769.818 | 43.882 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 2944.154 | 73 | 40.331 |  |  |
| Total | 6483.789 | 75 |  |  |  |

The table 1 above performed that the p- value (0.00) < α (0.05), it means that there was significant differences between groups after giving feedback. It revealed that both direct and indirect corrective feedback is effective in improving students’ recount writing.

**Table 2 Statistic Descriptive Analysis**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Statistic | CLASS VIII.1 (Direct Feedback) | | CLASS VIII.2 (Indirect Feedback) | | CLASS VIII.3  (No Feedback) | |
| Test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test | Pre-test | Post-test |
| Mean | 65.00 | 88.00 | 64.00 | 85.00 | 62.00 | 73.00 |
| Variance | 33.50 | 33.50 | 73.75 | 43.25 | 74.15 | 44.08 |
| Max | 80.00 | 97.00 | 80.00 | 95.00 | 75.00 | 85.00 |
| Min | 45.00 | 74.00 | 50.00 | 70.00 | 40.00 | 55.00 |

The data in this study were taken from the scores of pre-test and post-test of experimental classes, direct feedback and indirect feedback. The data analysis in this study was intended to analyze the scores of both experimental classes and control group to measure the role of written corrective feedback on students’ recount writing. The data descriptive of both experimental and control groups in general found the fact as illustrated in Table 2.

As shown in Table 2, the mean score of pre-test in the experimental group increases significantly in the mean score of post – test (e.g. DF group), it maintains considerably from 65.00 in the first recount writing before any feedback to 88.00 after feedback given. It is also occurs in the second experimental groups (IF group), the mean score of pre- test improves from 64.00 before any treatment to 85.00 after giving treatment. On the other hand, the means score of pre-test in control group with no feedback at all is just increase in a little number from 62.00 to 73.00. From this figure, it can be easily noticed that the mean score of pre- test in experimental groups (DF and IF) receiving different types of feedback are significantly higher than the mean score of the control group without feedback. Although the mean scores of both direct and indirect group were increase, but they were different. The means scores of DF is higher than IF, it showed that direct feedback gives contribution more than indirect feedback. More details of the difference can be seen in the graph below.

**Graph 1 Means score of groups**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3 Multiple Comparisons** | | | | | | |
| (I) kelas | (J) kelas | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Direct | Indirect | 2,80000 | 1,79624 | ,303 | -1,6885 | 7,2885 |
| No feedback | 15.58462\* | 1,77888 | ,000 | 11,1395 | 20,0298 |
| Indirect | Direct | -2,80000 | 1,79624 | ,303 | -7,2885 | 1,6885 |
| No feedback | 12.78462\* | 1,77888 | ,000 | 8,3395 | 17,2298 |
| No feedback | Direct | -15.58462\* | 1,77888 | ,000 | -20,0298 | -11,1395 |
| Indirect | -12.78462\* | 1,77888 | ,000 | -17,2298 | -8,3395 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table above informed that the p-value between Direct feedback group (Group 1) and Indirect feedback (Group 2) is (0.303) > α (0.05). The result of One-Way ANOVA illustrated there was no significant differences between the two groups. The contribution of focused direct and focused indirect feedback is not significantly different. It means that both direct and indirect feedback is effective in improving students’ recount writing.

While the comparison between control group (Group 3) and Group 1 and Group 2, the table showed that the p-value (0.00) is < α (0.05), it revealed there is significant differences among the groups which means that no feedback has no effect compared with focused direct and indirect feedback.

The analysis above proved that interaction between the two strategies simultaneously improves students’ recount writing.

**5. Discussions**

This research was intended to fill a gap in the previous study on the role of written corrective feedback on students’ recount writing especially in providing different types of written corrective feedback which is focused on the grammatical accuracy; English articles, spelling and past tense verb. Teacher feedback was provided after pre- test on the students writing. They asked to write a simple recount text based on the picture given. Types of teacher feedback were different based on their group. The first experimental group was received focused direct feedback strategy; the second experimental group received indirect feedback and one control group without feedback. In treatment session, teacher marked all errors on the three grammatical aspects; English articles, spelling and past tense verb and directly provides written corrective feedback and giving it back to the students and asked them to revise it. After giving feedback, the students asked to write new recount text based on the pictures given on the same topic and then submit it to the teacher. The errors on recount text produced by the students in each group were examined. These texts were corrected by an English teacher from MAN I Praya who has high competence in writing.

This study takes on Ellis (2008) typology of written corrective feedback (CF) types. There are some basic types of written corrective feedback generally used in improving students’ writing as follows: (1) Direct CF, (2) Indirect CF, (3) Metalinguistic CF, (4) Focused and unfocused CF, (5) Electronic CF, and (6) Reformulation. This research used the combination between focused direct CF and focused indirect CF.

After analyzing the data, I found that there were differences in the mean score between the two group receiving teacher feedback and the control group without teacher feedback. The mean score in pre-test increase significantly in the mean score of post test in the two experimental groups while students in control group only made a little increase. The Direct CF group who received direct feedback increases their writing by 67% in post test compared to Indirect CF group (34%) and NF control group (22%). The percentage here can be interpreted as the percentage of the improvement in recount writing especially for grammatical items. From these results it can be conclude that the specification of teacher written corrective feedback in this study was facilitate students’ recount writing. It means that written corrective feedback is effective and has an important role in improving students’ recount writing. These findings are in line with the finding of the previous study by Ellis et al. (2008), Sheen et al. (2009), Frear (2014) and Van Beuningen et al. (2008).

Another finding in this study is that there is difference in the mean score of the two experimental groups and control group in post test after treatment. It can be proved with the increasing the mean score of Direct CF group and Indirect CF group. The minimum score of pre test in Direct CF was 40.00 increases significantly in the post test score to 60.00; while in the Indirect CF group the minimum score of pre test is as the same as the score of post test and so does the control group as illustrated in Table 2. It is probably occurs because of different teacher feedback. The first group not only receives feedback from the teacher but also the correct forms of the error while the second experimental group only accept the indication of the errors without giving the correct forms. It means that, providing direct feedback is good for creating the revision and it is easier for students to make the revision, as suggested by Chandler (2003). It is also beneficial for students especially for beginner writing as in Junior high school.

This finding approves the result of previous studies by Beuningan et al. (2008), Ferris and Robert (2001), and Mirzaii and Aliabadi (2013). These studies gave evidence that direct corrective feedback is more effective in helping students to correct their errors in their writing. This finding also rejected the previous research by Truscott (2007) who stated that grammar correction has no effect in improving the accuracy in L2 writing.

**6. Conclusions**

This present study clearly found that students in the feedback group established to have learned effectively from written corrective feedback which teacher provided. Thus, students in experimental groups decreased their spelling, English articles and past verbs errors in the post test. This result gives evidence that teacher feedback has an important role in improving students’ writing especially in Junior High School in which direct feedback is more effective than indirect feedback. On the other hand, students in the control group did not make any significance differences in their writing.

With all the finding of the research illustrated above, further research is required in applying different strategies of teacher written corrective feedback in improving students’ writing which related to grammatical items and writing quality as well. In the current research, direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback were employed as teacher corrective feedback in improving students’ recount writing which focused on three grammatical item; English articles, spelling and past tense verb. Another research probably needed to find the effectiveness of this strategy in other kind of genre and another grammatical item or other aspect of writing, maybe more focused in content, organization or mechanic. This study just focused on grammatical item, additional research may be essential in considering unfocused feedback involving all aspects of writing.

In general, some factors that influence teaching and learning process should be a consideration of the researcher such as student’s motivation and student’s characteristic in learning English. The latest study would facilitate to explain whether the effectiveness of teacher written corrective feedback can be applied in different genre and different aspect of writing.

The findings of this research can be important to give information to English teachers who interested in applying difference strategies of written corrective feedback as used in this study in improving students’ writing. It also suggested that English teacher implements this written corrective feedback to their students as an alternative strategy to motivate his/her students to write as we know that writing is very important in this era and needed when the students want to continue their study to the higher level and for finding the job in the future.

However, providing written corrective feedback is a long process, it needs teachers’ commitment and enthusiasm. Besides, teacher’s knowledge and experience in writing should improve in order to give correct feedback to our students.
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