The Investigation of Teacher's Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing

Suci Maharani*
School of Postgraduate Studies
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Bandung, Indonesia
*sucimaharani@upi.edu

Abstract—**Studies on the investigation of indirect written corrective feedback given by English teacher to students' writing as part of their formative assessment seem not have been fully investigated. Thus, this study aimed to find out how the teacher gave indirect feedback to the student's writing and the reasons why the teacher gave any types of indirect written corrective feedback. Students' writings were the main source for the data collection. Twenty of year 8 students' writings were collected, which including 10 of the students' first drafts and 10 of the second drafts. The teacher's commentary was analyzed by using the adapted framework. Moreover, interview was also conducted in order to find out the teacher's aims on the given feedback. Then, the interviews were analyzed descriptively. The results showed that the teacher used error code, ask for information/question, direction/statement, direction/imperative, and meta-linguistic explanation in providing the indirect written corrective feedback. Moreover, it was also revealed that the indirect written corrective feedback given was aimed to train the students to think critically in order to discover the writing errors by themselves. In addition, it can be inferred that indirect written corrective feedback was not really effective to be used for 8 graders.**

Keywords—indirect written corrective feedback; students' writing; teacher's reasoning

I. INTRODUCTION

Studies on the investigation of indirect written corrective feedback given by English teacher to students' writing as part of their formative assessment seem not have been fully investigated. A study found that teachers were having difficulties in helping the students write more effectively when at the same time the students also fail to produce a more linguistically accurate text [1]. What is more, teachers have struggled in correcting the students' writing and was uncertain about the best way to provide the corrective feedback [2]. Therefore, written corrective feedback can be used as one of the essential aspects for solving this problem [3]. It is important for the teacher to give written corrective feedback to the students so that they will use the feedback given to improve their writing skill.

One of the forms of written corrective feedback that teachers can provide to their students' writing is indirect feedback [4]. According to Bitchener and Ferris, indirect written corrective feedback is when the teacher identifies the

error but does not straightforwardly correct them [4]. There are several forms that can be used for indicating the errors, such as through circling, underlining, highlighting, or otherwise marking it at its location in a text.

Some studies on the importance and impacts of giving written corrective feedback by Kamberi [5], Bitchener [6], Chen [3], Karim and Nassaji [7], Sabet et al [2], Amin and Saadatmanesh [8], Ellis [9] and Ferris [1] revealed that written corrective feedback is significant in improving students' writing skill.

Furthermore, the teacher's comments in the students' writing can be analyzed by using the adapted framework for analyzing teacher's commentary suggested by Bitchener & Ferris [4] and also Ferris [1]. There are five terms that can be used to categorize the teacher's comment, which are error code; ask for information/question; direction/statement; direction/imperative; and meta-linguistic explanation.

Moreover, the teachers' reasoning on why they gave certain types of indirect feedback to their students' writings should be analyzed as well in order to find out deeply why certain types of indirect feedback were given.

Thus, this study aimed to find out how a teacher gave indirect feedback to the student's writing and how it affected the students' writing performance. It was intended to answer the following research questions: (1) "what are the types of indirect written feedback commentary given by the teacher?" (2) "why did the teacher give those types of indirect feedback to the students' writing?"

II. METHOD

This study is a qualitative research that used case study as the research design. The participants of this study were a junior high school English teacher and ten of year 8 students from two different classes. The instruments used in this study were documents of the students' writings and interviews. The students' writings were used in order to find out the types of indirect written corrective feedback that the teacher gave, in order to answer the first research question. There were 20 documents which consisted of 10 documents of the students' first draft and 10 documents of the second draft. Then, in order to see why the teacher gave those types of indirect feedback to the students' writing which was the second research question,

interview to the teacher was conducted as well. Then, the interview was transcribed and analyzed descriptively.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings for answering the first research question which is about the types of indirect written feedback given by the teacher showed that the teacher used all of the five types of indirect written corrective feedback. The most used one is the asking for information/question, which was found for 30% of all of the indirect feedback given by the teacher. Then, the second and third type of indirect written corrective feedback that was used were error code and direction/imperative that were found 20% of all of the indirect feedback given for each type of the two. After that, the fourth and the fifth most common types of indirect feedback found were direction/statement and meta-linguistic explanation. They were found for 15% each of all of the indirect feedback given. Based on these findings, it can be inferred that the teacher was actually knowledgeable in varying the kinds of indirect feedback that can be given to the students' writings.

The results of the interview in order to answer the second research question about the reasons why the teacher gave those different types of indirect feedback to the students showed that the teacher had several reasoning for each type. Firstly, in terms of the error code, the teacher used it for the misspelled words only so that the students could get some highlights. Secondly, the reason for asking for information/question was to clarify to the students any unclear sentences that the students wrote. Thirdly, the teacher put direction/imperative as a type of indirect feedback in order to give command to put certain sentences to be placed in different part of the paragraph of the students' writing. Fourthly, the teacher used direction / statement to give a suggestion on what the students should write instead of what they had written in their writings. Finally, the teacher gave the students meta-linguistic type of indirect feedback in order to give more explanation on why certain parts of the writings were incorrect so that the students could discover the correct answer by themselves based on the teacher's explanation on their writings.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In conclusion, the teacher was knowledgeable in using different kinds of indirect written corrective feedback to the students. She used it for several reasons for doing it as explained earlier. However, by analyzing the students' second draft, it turned out that the indirect written corrective feedback given by teacher had only a slight impact on the improvement of the students' writing performance. Therefore, the future research should be conducted in order to find out the students' perspectives on the given feedback and to figure out why the given feedback did not significantly improve the students' writing.

REFERENCES

[1] D.R. Ferris, "Second langage writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: intersections and practical applications," Studies in Second Language Acquisition, vol. 32, pp. 181-201, 2010.

[2] M.K. Sabet, A.M. Zafarghandi and M. Tajvidi, "The impact of direct and indirect error treatment on student writing accuracy," TELL, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 159-185, 2011.

[3] C. Chen, "Focus on form and corrective feedback research at the University of Victoria, Canada," Lang. Teach., vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 278-283, Cambridge University Press, 2018.

[4] J. Bitchener and D.R. Ferris, "Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing. New York: Routledge, 2012.

[5] L. Kamberi, "The significance of teacher feedback in EFL writing for tertiary level foreign language learners," Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, pp. 70, pp. 1696–1690, 2013.

[6] J. Bitchener, "Evidence in support of written corrective feedback," Journal of Second Language Writing, vol. 17, pp. 102-118, 2008.

[7] K. Karim and H. Nassaji, "The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing," Language Teaching Research, pp. 1-21, 2018.

[8] M.Y. Amin and S. Saadatmanesh, "Discovering the effectiveness of direct versus indirect corrective feedback on EFL learners' writings: a case of an Iranian context," Interntional Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, vol. 5, issue 2, pp. 171-181, 2018.

[9] R. Ellis, Y. Sheen, M. Murakami and H. Takashima, "The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context," System, vol. 36, pp. 353-371, Elsevier, 2008.