



Analysis of Student's Response Toward the Types of Written Corrective Feedback Used by The English Teachers At SMAN I Tiumang

Widia Siska¹, Nidya Fitri²

^{1,2}STITNU Sakinah Dharmasraya, Padang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Oct 22, 2022
Revised Nov 14, 2022
Accepted Nov 27, 2022

Keywords:

Response
Types Of Written Corrective
Feedback
Writing

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the type of written correction used by the teacher in the writing of class XI students of SMAN 1 Tiumang, Dharmasraya Regency and student responses to feedback corrections. This type of research is qualitative. The data collection technique used is Cluster Random Sampling. Research instruments are documents and questionnaires. The sample taken in this study was students XI IPA 1, a total of 26 students. The document "Writing Assignments" is used to find the type of written correction used by the teacher. Researchers analyzed 26 student documents and asked students to fill out a questionnaire. This document is analyzed according to the type of correction used by the teacher, namely, direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. The questionnaire is formulated on the basis of indicators in the component of student responses to the written correction of the teacher. The results of this study are 1) Teachers use both types of direct and indirect corrections to provide feedback on student writing, but more predominantly teachers use indirect corrections and 2) students have a good response to corrections to feedback given by the teacher.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Widia Siska,
STITNU Sakinah Dharmasraya,
Jl. Lintas Sumatera No.99, Koto Baru, Padang, Sumatera Barat, 27651. Indonesia
Email: widiasiska194@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a crucial activity that always exist in the classroom. It is an essential skill, and mastering it is the most important skill for successful English learning. However, writing can be a challenging activity for students because writing is a complex task and the most difficult language skill to master (Jannah, 2017). Therefore, students should find the best way to develop their writing skills. In this case, teachers are often faced with the responsibility of evaluating students' writing during the

learning process (Mulati et al., 2020). One of the common ways to help students improve their writing is providing feedback (Putra, 2015).

Feedback is used to measure students' authority and attainment. Writing activities use feedback to help students improve their writing. The purpose of this feedback is to determine the student's ability by evaluating the student's writing (Gaol, 2020). The two aspects of feedback are teacher feedback and student feedback (Yunus, 2020); (Prawiro & Kholisma, 2021). Teacher feedback is the teacher's response to student activity. Students' feedback is related to students' response. In writing process, teacher's feedback is very important to increase students writing skill and students should have response toward teacher feedback.

Additionally, correction is an essential activity that teachers perform as feedback on student activity in the classroom (Bhuana, 2021). Corrective feedback plays an important role in the language learning process. Aghaei (2013:233) states that corrective feedback can help EFL learners ensure that they internalize what they have learned in the correct form (Ariyanti, 2022). This means corrective feedback decisions to correct students' writing errors (Zhang et al., 2021). Corrective feedback is divided into oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback. Oral and written corrective feedback serve the same purpose but differ in form (Sa'adah, 2021)

Written corrective Feedback usually always entails off-line corrections of the mistakes that students have made in a written work (Hinkel, 2011). Written corrective feedback can successfully address some error categories (Bitchener & Ferris Dana, 2011). It means, written corrective feedback is one of the types of corrections teachers use to provide feedback on student writing errors (Yuliawati et al., 2021).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research, all data are taken from in the writing of class XI students of SMAN 1 Tiumang, Dharmasraya Regency and student responses to feedback corrections. This writing of class XI students of SMAN 1 Tiumang, Dharmasraya Regency is chosen as the data source, because of the know of student responses to feedback corrections. In addition, the data source shows the student responses to feedback corrections that can be analysis as written corrective feedback used by the English teacher (Sugiyono, 2017).

The design of this study is a qualitative study. Qualitative research is research that reports phenomena that occur during the research process and collects data to answer research questions (Gay et al., 2018). The researcher used qualitative research because he wanted to know what types of written corrective feedback teachers used and how students responded. The researcher selected participants in the class to collect data. The researchers took XI IPA 1in which 26 students participated as participants for information. This class is selected using cluster random sampling. Cluster random sampling is the random selection of a group rather than a sample of individuals.

The researchers used documents and questionnaires to collect data. The researchers obtained 26 documents from participants. The researchers then shared a 20-item questionnaire with all students (26 students). Finally, the researchers analysed the result of the questionnaire and documents by applying techniques of data analysis which were proposed by Gay and Airasian (data reduction, displaying data, drawing conclusion) (Gay et al., 2018). The result helped the researcher to find out teacher written corrective feedback types and students' response toward that correction (Gay et al., 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

There are two sorts of written corrective feedback, according to Ellis (2009:98). Both direct and indirect written corrective feedback are available (Ellis, 2009). Giving the pupil the proper form is known as direct corrective feedback. Without actively correcting, indirect corrective feedback just states that the student made a mistake. So, it is important to understand the type of written correction

feedback that students prefer. Related to students' interest to correct their error, the appropriate type that teacher used should be considered. However, the effective kind of written corrective feedback will stimulate the students to act. In other words, students' opinions and preferences for specific types and amounts of written corrective feedback can influence their use of learning. Hemmati and Soltanpour (2012) states students frequently fail to understand the need of taking serious responsibility for their own writing improvement and frequently ignore teachers' feedback (Hemmati & Soltanpour, 2012).

According to Ferris (2003), students prefer the following responses to feedback: 1) Students read feedback and paid attention to it. 2) Favorable and grateful responses. 3) categories of students are created: receptors, semi-resistors, and resistors. 4) In general, students are satisfied with teachers' comments and requested feedback on all aspects of their writing. 5) The students appreciated and were pleased with the professors' input. 6) "Positive" attitude toward teachers' criticism. 7) Teachers' feedback that emphasizes grammatical faults, hints, and better than corrections is preferred by students; 8) Students are "very involved" in reading the teacher's comments and acting on them. 9) Students are really grateful for and find the feedback from teachers to be useful. Therefore, it is important to understand how students respond to teachers' written corrective feedback. When mistakes are corrected, it gives the learner the opportunity to change (Ferris, 2003).

In conclusion, writing is an important activity that students always carry out in the learning process. Writing is not an easy task and students sometimes make some mistakes. Therefore, teachers play an important role in helping students to write. Written corrective feedback is one way to help students. Teachers use it as a tool to measure students' abilities. But student responses to teacher feedback are also important. Because if the student reacts negatively or doesn't respond to the feedback, it's useless. Thus, the goal of this research is to examine the various types of written corrective feedback from teachers and how students react to the correction.

In order to respond to the research questions, the researcher explained the findings of the study. 1) What kinds of written corrective feedback does the teacher at SMAN 1 Tiumang's eleventh grade learners apply on their writing assignments, and 2) How do the students respond to that written corrective feedback? (Elhawwa et al., 2019) In each case, the data were explained as follows:

Firstly, in this research, the researcher found that the teacher combined direct and indirect corrective feedback. From 13 documents out of 26 were corrected, the teacher was combining both direct and indirect correction feedback, in addition, 2 documents were discovered that had been modified using direct only. Then, only indirect corrections were made to 11 documents. According to the previous explanation, students' errors were mainly corrected using a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback. Thus, indirect corrective feedback, as opposed to direct corrective feedback, was more frequently used.

Secondly, students' responses to written corrective comments were (1) Read and attend to feedback, with an 87% read and attend response rate being considered a very high response. It indicates that most pupils read and pay attention to input from teachers; (2) Positive and grateful responses: 79% of responses were favorable and grateful. It is noted as the pupils' great receptivity to teachers' constructive criticism; (3) Semi-resistors, resistors, and receptors: This indicator's percentages are as follows: receptor 79%, semi-resistor 53%, and resistor 53%. It indicates that the medium category for semi-resistor and resistor and the strongly reaction for receptor; (4) Pleased and wanted the feedback: The percentage of pleased and wanted the feedback is 66% and it was categorized as highly response. It means that a student often asks and want teacher feedback; (5) Happy with teacher feedback and found it valuable: The percentage of happy with teacher feedback and found it valuable is 87%. It is included as very high category. It means that students feel happy with the feedback that teacher gives and know that feedback is useful for them; (6) A favorable attitude toward instructor comments, 81% of students reported feeling positively about their teachers' input, which was deemed a very high response. It indicates that a majority of pupils feel positively about instructor feedback; (7) Feedback preference: It was discovered that direct corrective

feedback (88%), indirect corrective feedback with indicating and pinpointing the fault (90%), and indirect corrective feedback with indicating just (48%), were the three most preferred types of feedback. This indicates that students respond extremely well to direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback that includes both indicating and locating, compared to a medium reaction to indirect corrective feedback that includes only indicating; (8) Quite invested in reading and acting on teacher feedback, The percentage of quite invested in reading and acting on teacher feedback is 70%, it was categorized as highly response. It shows that most of students take action toward feedback as soon as impossible; (9) Very appreciative with teacher feedback: The percentage of very appreciative with teacher feedback is 67%. It was included as high categorized of students' response. It means that students appreciate with teacher feedback.

CONCLUSION

In this study, the teacher used a combination of both types of correction to address student errors. However, one document was only edited using direct corrective feedback while other texts were corrected using indirect corrective feedback. Thus, Indirect correction is more valuable than direct correction. It happens because indirect corrective feedback guided the students to think about their errors and revised it by themselves. However, the researcher clearly sees that students' response toward written corrective feedback of grade eleventh at SMAN 1 Tiumang was categorized as a good response. The researcher found that students have positive response in feeling and reaction toward written corrective feedback. It is advised that in order for students to write better content, teachers should correct their writing assignments. Every student requires feedback from the teacher since they want to be aware of their writing errors. The teacher's feedback on the students' assignments had a favorable impact on the students' writing abilities.

References

- Ariyanti, N. (2022). *English Lecturers' Perceptions On The Use Of Written Corrective Feedback In Online Thesis Supervision*.
- Baharun, H. (2017). Pengembangan kurikulum: Teori dan praktik. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Nurja*.
- Bhuana, G. P., & El Fauziah, U. N. (2021). Affective damage from teachers' written corrective feedback. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 6(2), 287-299.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.
- Elhawwa, T., Rukmini, D., Mujiyanto, J., & Sutopo, D. (2018). Providing written corrective feedback on students' writing assignments at IAIN Palangka Raya. *Proceedings of International Conference on English Language Teaching (INACELT)*, 2(1), 158-168.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.
- Gaol, J. L. (2020). The Ability of Students Develop Narrative Paragraphs by Using Flash Card. *Cendikia: Media Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, 10(2), 56-64.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Merrill/Pearson.
- Hemmati, F., & Soltanpour, F. (2012). A Comparison of the Effects of Reflective Learning Portfolios and Dialogue Journal Writing on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy in Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 1-16.
- Hinkel, E. (2011). What research on second language writing tells us and what it doesn't. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 523-538). Routledge.
- Mills, G. E., & Gay, L. R. (2019). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. ERIC.
- Mulati, D. F., Nurkamto, J., & Draji, N. A. (2020). THE TEACHERS' BELIEFS IN TEACHER WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON THE STUDENTS' WRITING. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Nur Yulawati, L., Harmanto, B., ATIEK MUSTIKAWATI, D., & Maghfiroh, A. (2021). WRITTEN CORRECTIVE

- FEEDBACK: STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON ONLINE LEARNING. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 4(6).
- Prawiro, I. Y., & Kholisna, W. (2020). The impact of written corrective feedback towards the senior high school students' work: Teacher's and students' perceptions. *Journal of English Language Learning*, 4(1), 44-59.
- Putra, B. A. D. (2015). *Type of Written Corrective Feedback Used by a Teacher in Academic Writing Class*.
- Sa'adah, L. (2021). Written Corrective Feedback Provided By the Teacher on Student'S Descriptive Writing for Fostering Student'S Writing Quality. *RETAIN (Research on English Language Teaching in Indonesia)*, 9(3), 84-92.
- Sugiyono, P. D. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif Dan R &D*, Alfabeta. Denzin, NK, & Lincoln, S. Yvonna.
- Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written Corrective Feedback in English Compositions: Teachers' Practices and Students' Expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(2), 95-107.
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 660564.