

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Research

Writing is one of the essential skills for language production. However, it is considered a difficult skill, especially in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL) such as in Indonesian. English is only studied in schools for a limited time and not widely used in everyday life. The limited use of English causes the EFL learners difficulty in grammar understanding. Moreover, English's markedness is different from Indonesia. It becomes a challenge experienced by students in writing. This condition causes their writing skill to be weak especially in grammatical accuracy. Therefore, they need hard efforts for writing effectively.

To produce a good piece of writing, EFL learners require teacher's contractive support. The support is expected to foster students' interest in writing. The support that can be done in various ways, one of them through feedback. Feedback can be an effective strategy for improving writing accuracy. The accuracy can be improved through feedback of grammar correction by the teacher. By grammar correction can reduce errors so as to enhance the quality of writing because an error takes place as a result of lack of knowledge (Corder, 1967 as cited in Ellis, 2009b). Therefore, feedback can be a solution to this problem.

One feedback that can be used to improve students' writing skill is written corrective feedback (WCF). Some studies (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006) have

reported the positive effects of WCF. Many researchers and teachers have long assumed that WCF helps students to acquire and demonstrate mastery in the use of targeted linguistic forms and structures (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). Further, Sheen (2007) and Ellis (2008) presented reliable and convincing evidence that as Ferris (2010) states under the right conditions, WCF can facilitate students to improve the accuracy of their writing, at least for the particular features under consideration. Some studies provide evidence that when students revise their papers after receiving feedback; their accuracy improves, either in the short or long term (Lalande, 1982; Ferris, 1997; Chandler, 2000; Ferris & Helt, 2000).

There are two major types of WCF: direct written corrective feedback (DWCF) and indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF). In DWCF, the teacher marks the error and provide students with the correct form (Ellis, 2009a). For example: when a student makes errors, teacher circles or underlines the mistakes then gives the proper way. While, IWCF, the teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correct form.

Therefore, researchers have had a keen interest in investigating what feedback has the most significant effect on improving students' writing proficiency (Nakanishi, 2007) but the most important is what kind of feedback that students prefer in writing. The effectiveness of WCF has also been suggested to hinge upon students' preferences for it. In other words, students' opinions and preferences for certain types and amounts of WCF affect their use of it for learning. For example, if a student prefers or believes that one type of WCF is more useful, then they may

be more likely to pay more attention to the correction and use it for learning than if they do not believe in its effects (McCargar, 1993; Schulz, 2001 as cited in Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010)

The results of previous studies have suggested that students preferred indirect. Likewise, some say the opposite. Therefore, this study is intended to discover the types of feedback that is preferred, feel comfortable and better to improve students' recount writing. Recount text selected because it is easier to be developed by junior high school level students since this text retells past events. Besides, they can feel free to explore the story that is based on their personal experience and eventually convert their ideas into written form.

Considering the problem, this research entitled "Students' Preference of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Recount Writing."

B. Research Questions

As the background above, the research is intended to formulate these problem in the following questions:

1. How are the students' engagement while they revise their writings?
2. How are the students' ability to respond the teacher's corrective feedback?
3. What are students' preferences toward the use of teachers' corrective feedback on students' writing?

C. Research Objectives

From the research questions, this study aims at obtaining three following objectives:

1. To find out the students' engagement while they revise their writings.
2. To find out students' ability to respond the teacher's corrective feedback.
3. To find out the students' preferences toward the use of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing.

D. Research Significances

The result of the study is expected to be significant theoretically and practically:

1. Theoretically, this research is supposed to be able to increase students' ability to write recount correctly.
2. Practically, this research provides an alternative way for the teacher in increasing student's writing skill and facilitates the students to gain more knowledge and acquisition in writing.

E. Rationale

Feedback can be used as an excellent strategy to improve writing skills. A teacher gives a clue in various ways for errors so that students can revise their writing. A number of studies provide evidence that when students revise their papers after receiving feedback, their accuracy improves, either in the short or long-term (Lalande, 1982; Ferris, 1997; Chandler, 2000; Ferris & Helt, 2000 as cited in

Nakanishi, 2007). On the other hand, the teachers' written corrective feedback on the errors in the students' writing will at least reduce the error so that their writing gradually getting better.

According to Russell and Spada (2006) as cited in Evans, Hartshorn, & Tuioti, (2010), corrective feedback in language learning refers to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source that contains evidence of learner error of language form". WFC is divided into six types: direct CF, indirect CF, metalinguistic CF, electronic feedback, and reformulation.

There are two major types of written corrective feedback: direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback (Ellis, 2009a). Furthermore, Ellis explains direct corrective feedback gives correction form in the paper of the students while indirect feedback occurs when the teacher indicates an error exists but does not provide the correction, thus leaving it to the students to find it.

The research is focused on direct and indirect written corrective feedback specified to the recount context. Recount is a text which retells events or experiences in the past. Saragih, Silalahi, & Pardede (2014) states that recount text gives a descriptions of what occurred and when it occurred. Furthermore, they state that the story recount has expressions of attitude and feeling by narrator about the events. The social function of recount text is to to inform or entertain the readers.

Recount text has three generic structure: orientation, event, and reorientation. Boardman (2008:287) as cited in Saragih, Silalahi, & Pardede (2014) states recount text has some language features: 1) Use of nouns and pronouns, 2) use of past action

verbs, 3) use of past tense to located events in relation to speaker`s or researcher`s time, 4) use conjunctions and time connectives, 5) use of adverb and adverbial phrases, 6) use of adjectives.

The error corrections of grammatical accuracy by using teacher`s corrective feedback is believed can improve writing skill, especially in writing recount skill. Student`s engagement when writing can be seen in classroom observation and the result of their writing. If student`s give positively engage in the class it will affect their writing. It is also influenced by student`s believe in types of correctives feedback. If students believe in type of feedback then they are more pay attention to the teacher correction so the result is better.

F. Previous Research

The following discussion is previous studies related to written corrective feedback. It becomes the useful references for this research. Here are some researchers equipped with a brief explanation along with the result.

The first comes from Tangkiengsirisin & Kalra (2016). The research is followed by 63 senior students in two sections of business English classroom at an international university in Thailand are divided into two groups. Each group received one type of feedback. The group that received direct corrective feedback perceived it positively hence they show better improvement when compare to the group that received indirect corrective feedback which is negatively perceive. The result is students prefer to get direct WCF in their writing than indirect WCF.

Eslami (2014). The research was followed by 60 low-intermediate EFL students in Karaj, Iran. The feedback is focused on simple past tense errors. He showed the indirect CF group outperformed the direct CF group. Jamalinesari, Rahimi, Gowhary, & Azizifar (2015) also said that the class with indirect feedback improved better compared to the class with direct feedback. The participants were twenty female students between 13 and 17 years old in a private language institute in Ilam, Iran. The students in both classes were given essays as homework for 10 consecutive class sessions, and their errors were analyzed and recorded separately.

On the contrary, Kisnanto (2016) stated that direct WCF was statistically significant helps the students improve writing accuracy than indirect WCF. The study applied a quantitative research design with 43 Indonesian student participants majoring in IT. The data were collected from the students' narrative written works in a six week period. Sarvestani (2016) also shown that direct WCF affected students' performance more than indirect WCF. She has researched in Iran with a quantitative and experimental survey that measured the accuracy of a definite and indefinite article during eight weeks using pre-test and post-test with sixty students.

The furthermore previous study was done by Tan & Manochphinyo (2014) in a journal revealed that direct and indirect WCF were separately effective in increasing the accuracy of different grammatical aspects. Overall, those who received indirect WCF showed significant long-term improvement. The several research above are different with this research. This research focus on student's preference of direct and indirect WCF in recount writing with qualitative study.