

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN WRITING CLASS

Ni Luh Nyoman Seri Malini

Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati

Udayana University

Abstract: The students will study more effectively when they know what they are doing in their writing subject. They expect feedback about the score they have gained they have received, for their achievement, and suggestions for how they can improve their language. Teachers are often suggested giving learners the opportunity to self-correct or invite other students to correct their work. However, a number of problems with learner self-correction will arise such as learners typically prefer the teacher doing/correcting their works or students can only correct their own works is they have the necessary linguistic knowledge. Therefore, we have clear grounds to motivate self-correction. The teachers can offer another alternative that is peer-correction, when that fails. The presentation will start discussing about the concepts of assessment including oral and written corrective feedback. Next, the step and the task will be elaborated. This paper is designed to give description on how learners can improve their linguistic accuracy.

Keyword : *writing, assessment, corrective feedback*

Introduction

Corrective feedback (CF) is considered as feedback received by learners on the linguistic errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language (L2). Both oral and written CF have attracted considerable attention in recent years both because of their significance for the development of theories of L2 acquisition and because they have always helped an important place in L2 pedagogy (Sheen & Ellis, 2010).

Oral CF can involve both on-line attempts to make learners aware that they have produced an utterance that contains an error (i.e., the feedback is provided more or less immediately following the utterance that contain an error) and off-line attempts (i.e., the feedback is withheld until the communicative event the learner is participating in has finished). Oral CF can be input-providing (i.e. the learner is supplied with the correct form) or output-prompting (i.e., it can attempt to elicit a correction from the learner). Oral CF can also be implicit as when the teacher simply requests clarification in response to the learner's erroneous utterance or explicit as when the teacher directly corrects the learner and/or provides some kind of metalinguistic explanation of the error. A common form of CF is a recast. Recasts can be conversational and implicit when they take the form of a confirmation check as a response to a failure to understand the learner's utterance or didactic and more explicit when the learner's erroneous utterance is reformulated even though it has not caused a communication problem (see Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Sheen, 2006).

Written CF almost always involves off-line (i.e., delayed) corrections of the errors that students have committed in a written text. As with oral CF, this can involve both input-providing feedback (usually referred to as "direct correction") and output-prompting feedback (referred to as "indirect correction"). Direct correction involves supplying learners with the correct form or reformulating the entire text; indirect correction involves indicating that an error has been committed either in the margin of the text or within the text where the error occurs. Both direct and indirect written CF may or may not be accompanied with metalinguistic information. implicit and explicit CF do not apply in the case of writing; all written CF is necessarily explicit (i.e. the student knows he/she has been corrected

Method

Written Corrective Feedback has been applied to students portfolios in Expository Writing classes at the English Department of Unud. The objective of Expository Writing is to enable students to explain something, to make it clear to the reader's understanding. Exposition relies on thinking skill of synthesis, drawing together and blending information from several sources, merging it into single explanation. As Thompkins (1998) proposed that the students were given five expository text and their associated signal words namely description, sequence, comparison, cause and effect, and problem and solution.






In this investigation, the portfolio refers to a collection of students's work and assignment in Expository Writing classes over one semester. At the first two meetings, the students were asked to identify the mechanics of the writing examples such as spelling, punctuation, tenses, linking words After that , the students attended the theoretical session how to compose good essays with various topics such as *The Use Of Water, Job Satisfaction And Public Services, Organizing Your Essay, Smoking, Drug Use Drop in US Teens, Comparison and*

Installation Guide. The lectures gave individual students feedback. Peer assessment especially in editing was also included in this sessions to improve the quality of essays.

To obtain the data, the research was conducted at 100 students of 2nd semester of ED of Unud. The data were collected during even semester between January-July 2014. A qualitative analysis was applied in analyzing the data. The grading of students' ability are as follows.

Category/ Scores	1 (Very Poor)	2 (poor)	3 (Fair)	4 (good)	5 (excellent)
Task completion	0 - 10	≥ 12	≥ 14,5	≥ 16	≥ 22
Organization	0 - 12	≥ 14	≥ 16,5	≥ 21	≥ 26
Vocabulary & Spelling	0 - 12	≥ 14	≥ 16,5	≥ 21	≥ 26
Grammar & Punctuation	0 - 12	≥ 14	≥ 16,5	≥ 21	≥ 26
Total Scores	0 - 46	47 - 54	55 - 64	65 - 79	80 - 100

The strategies applied in doing CF covered metalinguistics and non metalinguistics information. Direct ways can be applied by teachers like provision of the correct form with brief grammatical explanation. For non metalinguistics information teachers can see the provision of the correct form only and reformation of the entire sentence. For indirect metalinguistics; we use error code

Spelling , capital , Punctuation  Insert A Word
 remove a word (), new paragraph P, wrong word WW, wrong tense WT, wrong form WF, awkward wording AWK,  indent  For indirect metalinguistics, teachers can apply Errors are indicated but not located and information the correct form is not supplied (e.g., a paragraph. cross is placed in the margin next to the line where an error has occurred). Errors are indicated and located but the correct form is not supplied (e.g., an error is underlined in the place in the text in which it occurs).

In the post-method era, methodologists are more likely to affirm the need for oral CF, recognizing the cognitive contribution it can make while also issuing warnings about the potential affective damage it can cause. Ur stated that “there is certainly a place for correction” but “we should not over-estimate this contribution” (1996, p. 255) because it often fails to eliminate errors and concluded that she would rather invest time in avoiding errors than in correcting them.

Findings and Discussion

The findings shows that students were able to revise 73% of the grammatical errors teachers corrected. The students (1) revised consistently and successfully following feedback involving form, (2) revised less successfully following comments about content or questions seeking further information, and (3) revised or did not revise irrespective of whether the teacher attempted to hedge on critical comments. A number of studies of students' perceptions have been conducted using survey and self-report data (e.g., Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Leki, 1991). These studies have consistently shown that learners value teacher feedback highly and believe that it helps improve their writing. More specifically, students prefer comments that explain specific problems in their texts and make concrete suggestions about how to revise them. Conversely, they report that teachers' short, general comments are not very helpful, especially when these take the form of content-related questions. The interview with the students found that most students desired to be corrected by their teachers as also reported by SW Leki (1991). All students have a positive attitude toward written CF. Students tend to prefer CF directed at grammar, the lexicon and mechanics of their written texts to feedback directed at content and style. They expressed a preference toward feedback on the content and organization of their writing. Since the learning context may determine how learners respond to the CF they receive. They may differ individually in their reaction to feedback depending on such factors as language aptitude, learning style, personality and motivation.

We also found the fact that students are able to edit their papers when revising does not constitute evidence that they will be able to transfer this skill to a new piece of writing. We examined different ways in which direct feedback (where errors are indicated and corrected) and indirect feedback (where errors are just indicated). The studies all had another feature in common—they all examined unfocused written CF (i.e., CF that was directed broadly at many types of linguistic errors). We also investigated the effects of CF not just on a single grammatical feature (articles) but also on a broader range of features. The written CF does not have some of the negative effects on students' fluency in writing.

Similar differences in opinion exist where written CF is concerned as is evident in the debate between Truscott and Ferris (Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007; Ferris 1999, 2004). Truscott, reflecting the views of teachers who adhere to process theories of writing, advanced the strong claim that correcting learners' errors in a written composition may enable them to eliminate the errors in a subsequent draft but has no effect on grammatical accuracy in a new piece of writing (i.e., it does not result in acquisition). Ferris (1999) disputed this claim, arguing that it was not possible to dismiss correction in general as it depended on the quality of the correction—in other words, if the correction was clear and consistent it could work for acquisition. Truscott (1999) replied by

claiming that Ferris (1999) failed to cite any evidence in support of her contention. There is a need for teachers to correct their students' written work. However, they also point out the danger of over-correcting and the importance of providing feedback on other aspects of writing (e.g., content and organization) as well as linguistic problems. How to balance content-correction and corrective feedback is a major issue where writing is concerned. Indeed, as Ferris (2003a) noted a common refrain is that teachers focus too much on correcting linguistic errors at the expense of content and organization.

SW_ As found by Rolin-Ianzati (2006) who identified two different approaches that teachers of L2 French used when providing delayed feedback following a role-play activity—they either initiated repair by the student or simply reviewed the errors students had made. She argued that initiating repair was a more effective strategy as it led to more self-repair by the students. When to correct is less of an issue in written CF as correction is nearly always delayed to some extent—unless, as in Aljaafreh and Lantolf's (1994) study, teachers ask students to read out their written text and correct errors orally. However, the issue of timing arises in the process of writing instruction where students produce multiple drafts. Teachers need to decide whether to stage their feedback, focusing initially on content and organization and only in later drafts on linguistic errors. Mc Garrell and Verbeem (2007) argue that corrective feedback should be delayed as it constitutes a form of assessment that may deter students from revising their ideas and organization of the text. This CF study does lead to gain in linguistic accuracy and also that the more explicit the feedback is, the bigger the benefit for the students. Sheen (2007a), for example, measured students' progress over time (in post-tests and delayed post-tests) and also included a control group (which received no feedback at all) and reported that both direct CF and direct + metalinguistic CF led to significant gains in accuracy, with the latter having a stronger effect than the former. However, these studies, of focused CF have all investigated the same grammatical feature—English articles—so it is not clear whether focused CF will prove generally effective in improving learners' linguistic accuracy. What they do suggest is that written CF, when focused on a single feature, can be effective and thus this constitutes evidence to refute Truscott's (1996, 2004) claims.

Conclusions and Suggestions

Corrective feedback can inform some pedagogic practice such as the students almost invariably express a wish to be corrected and effective in assisting learners to improve their linguistic accuracy over time. The positive effect of CF is evident not just in careful, planned language use where learners are able to make use of their explicit knowledge of L2 features, but also in meaning-centered, unplanned language use, which calls for implicit knowledge. One function of CF is to assist the learner to self-correct (i.e., to uptake the correction by repairing the error). While the role of self-correction in oral language use and of revision in writing remains to be clearly established, there is increasing evidence to suggest that when learners do self-correct, learning is more likely to occur. If learner self-correction is the goal of CF, then this might be best achieved by means of CF that is fine-tuned to individual learners' level of L2 development and their capacity to benefit from CF. One way in which this might be achieved is by teachers systematically probing for the most implicit form of CF that will enable the learner to self-correct. Corrective feedback constitutes an area where the discourses of theory and practice can comfortably rub shoulders. It affords an ideal area for researchers and teachers to engage in collaborative enquiry.

References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465–483.
- .Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1990). Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.),
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575–600.
- 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.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141–163.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203–218.
- Sheen, Y & Ellis, R (2011). Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching: Chapter proof. Routledge