

EFL Learners Perception of Written Corrective Feedback

Suerni^{1,*}, Seyu Fani², Asnawi³, Wariyati⁴

^{1,2}*English Applied Linguistics, Universitas Negeri Medan, Medan, Sumatera Utara*

^{3,4}*English Department, Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al Washliyah Medan, Medan, Indonesia*

*Corresponding author. Email: suerni.girl@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to find out the perception of written corrective feedback of student in practice writing skill in English class and the lack of using correct feedback in class. The study was using qualitative method and the data that collected using a written questionnaire that elicited participant's perceptions about written corrective feedback and the reasons behind it. The data are collected by means of close ended questionnaire items with multiple choices or Likert scale formats. The subject was ten students that study English Education in one of private university in Medan. The finding showed that students tend to hold a positive view on written corrective feedback. Moreover, their views of written corrective feedback were tempered by what they consider to be an over-emphasis on grammar explicit. Thus, the used of WCF should carefully consider a balance between grammar and how the lecturer correct itself. The results also demonstrate that the students preferred direct correction to indirect correction. Many students also expressed strong desires for more self-correction as well as interactive activities in the revision process. This signals a potential limitation of unidirectional written corrective feedback techniques.

Keywords: *Written Corrective Feedback, EFL, Learners' Perception*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is the process of expressing the ideas, information, knowledge, or experience and understand the writing to acquire the knowledge or some information to share and learn [1]. To improve their ability in writing, corrective feedback holds a very crucial part in it, corrective feedback is any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error. This department means that there will be several outcomes and responses from the students whether a realization of self-correction or not. It is to find out either correcting the inaccurate application or giving information about where the error has occurred and how it may be corrected.

In the classroom, there are many ways to correct the students' errors. One of the well-known research on Corrective Feedback is conducted by Ellis. She classifies the type of Written Corrective feedback into six different types, such as direct CF, indirect CF, metalinguistic feedback, the focus of the feedback, electronic feedback, reformulation feedback. These six types of correction should be known by teachers or lecturers in developing their ability to give a correction to their students.

Error is a linguistic mixture of forms, which in the identical context and below comparable prerequisites of production, now not be produced by means of the speakers' native speaker counterparts'. Despite the poor connotations, they are no longer in themselves something negative, somehow, blunders are now not evidence of a failure to learn. They are evidence of intention to learn, another expert states that errors are evidence of a learners. Moreover, it is clear that the written corrective feedback is important for the student. Thus, from the explanation above the researcher will conduct a research to see the perception of written corrective feedback for the students. The purpose of this research was to find out the perception of WCF from student when practice writing skill in English class and also the lack of using it in class.

Writing can benefit people with a lot of purpose, in the case of learners, writing for them is one of an essential things because they need it to write their thesis in the end of semester, not only that, they also need it to improving their skill, for instance to take TOEFL Test or other language test. However, a good writing may require different forms of knowledge and skill, also there may be some overlap in writing ability across domains and context, for example grammar skill. Writing for

assignment also one of the essential part for learners. The focus here is on the success of writing, and successful achievement of the stated goal of the constructed the task. Our construct further focused on quick writing without revisions. Error is part of writing, and it is natural because the limitation of ability and knowledge by the learners.

Making errors in writing is a natural thing for every learner, because of the limitations of science by these learners. Thing that can be done is to giving feedback on the learners' writing, so they can improve it in the future. Therefore each student has their own preference for what method they prefer to receive the feedback. Errors in writing is the most natural thing and it is evidently attached to the mankind. But, how do we define an error. There are different definitions of the word and as Ellis explains learners make errors in both comprehension and production, the first being rather scantily investigated [2]. In contrast with Oppenheimer that states it is worth noting that for logistical purposes our measurement strategy involved pen and paper rather than computer based composition, which can affect writing output [3]. This research measures the perception of EFL learners towards written corrective feedback. Several types of timed writing proficiency, persuasive opinion writing proficiency and expository writing proficiency, and the context noted applies to both. While aspects of the context were similar, the constructs measured in each of the two tasks are significantly different.

Providing corrective feedbacks is a must practice of writing, the teachers especially writing in a foreign or second language learner [4]. Even if it is a time consuming, hard and painstaking task, teachers keep doing for the students because they believe and want that learners will be able to improve their writing with their feedback. Theoretically, feedbacks also have roles in both second language learning and also language pedagogy. Behaviorist and cognitive theories states that written corrective feedback contribute to language learning, while structural and communicative approaches view it as a means of fostering learners' motivation and to ensure linguistic accuracy.

Feedback is provided not only for the purpose of task by the teacher but also for assisting learners to work out of the text's potential. It helps learners to comprehend the writing context and to provide a sense of audience and their expectation of the texts itself [5]. It means that when the learners able to make sure no error in their writing will make the reader of their text comprehend the meaning of the text well.

A famous written corrective feedback that used by teacher is direct feedback. Direct feedback is a strategy of providing feedback to students to help them correct their errors by providing the correct linguistic form or linguistic structure of the target language [6]. Direct feedback is a strategy that providing feedback to students and help them correcting their errors by providing the correct linguistic form to the target language. Direct feedback is given by teachers, usually noticing a

grammatical mistake, by doing this, it is providing the correct answer or the expected response near the linguistic or grammatical error. The advantage of direct feedback, it provides information about the correct form that adds that direct feedback may be appropriate for beginner students, or in a situation when errors are 'untreatable' that are not susceptible to self-correction such as sentence structure and word choice, and when teachers want to direct student attention to error patterns that require student correction. The example of direct feedback is when the lecturer ask the students to make a narrative or report about the news within certain time. The lecturer will directly give correction of the students. It can be like crossing the word that is wrong and then give the correct word above it. This case of direct CF the teacher giving the student with the correct form. This might take a number of different forms—crossing out the unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near the erroneous form.

2. METHOD

This research used qualitative method. The data were collected using a written questionnaire to show the participant's perceptions about written corrective feedback and also the reasons behind such opinion. The data were collected using means of close-ended questionnaire items with multiple choices and Likert Scale formats. The subject was ten students that study English Education in one of private university in Medan, Sumatera Utara. The qualitative data were collected to explore the rationales behind their preferences. Qualitative research is an umbrella term that refer to several research strategies that share certain characteristics. Qualitative designs were typically a well-considered and reasonable combination of sampling, and data collection, analysis, techniques. Qualitative design especially able to obtain straight and largely

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

There are 4 table that will be discuss in this chapter. The researcher got the complete data from all the research instruments. The researcher had analyzed the data systematically and accurately. The data was analyzed in order to draw conclusion about the objective of the study. Researcher described the findings for the first item as follows:

Table 1. The Participants' Perception of Grammar Instruction

Questionnaire items	Mean Rating
Grammar instruction is essential for mastering the writing of English.	4.2

Study of grammar improves my writing skill of English.	4.0
I believe that my English writing will improve quickly if I study and practice English grammar.	4.0
I like studying English grammar	3.0
I need more grammar instruction in my English writing classes	3.8
I keep the English grammar rules in mind when I am writing in English	3.9
I think that language practice in real contexts is more important than grammar instruction in the classroom.	3.3

*1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

The table 1 above showed the participants' perceptions of WCF. All of the students held a very positive view regarding WCF in writing instruction. The highest average from questions of "Grammar instruction is essential for mastering the writing of English" with mean rating 4.2. Followed by "Study of grammar improves my writing skill of English" and "I believe that my English writing will improve quickly if I study and practice English grammar" with mean rating 4.0. The lowest average from questions of "I like studying English grammar" with mean rating 3.0.

The respondents indicated that the importance of written corrective feedback came from the following factors: (1) it help them to know or spot their error in the future; (2) written corrective feedback help them to improves their writing skill and also for the betterment in the future; and (3) because it is writing class, it is need more attention, focus and accuracy to write it.

The participants also believe that correcting errors in English writings class by the lecturers are very important. 10 out of 10 participants believe it is very important. To further examine the participants' perceptions of different types of written corrective feedback, the researcher asked about their most preferred error types for correction. As Table II showed below.

Table 2. Participants' Preferences of Error Correction Types

The most preferred error type for correction	Frequency	Percentage (%)
--	-----------	----------------

Grammar errors	8	80
Vocabulary errors	1	10
Spelling errors	1	10
Organization errors	0	0
Punctuation errors	0	0

From the table 2 showed that all of the students believe that "grammar error" the most preferred error type for correction, with 8 frequency and 80 percentage. Followed by "vocabulary error" with 1 frequency and 10 percentage, and "spelling error" with 1 frequency and 10 percentage. Moreover the table III below will show the responses in which their opinions on instructors' error correction priority were examined.

Table 3. Participants' Opinion on Teachers' Error Correction Priority

If there are many errors in your writing, what do you prefer your lecturer to do?	Frequency	Percentage (%)
My lecturer should correct all errors.	10	100
My lecturer should correct major errors but not the minor ones.	0	0
My lecturer should only correct errors that interfere with communicating ideas.	0	0
My lecturer should not correct grammatical errors, and should focus on the content only.	0	0

From the table 3, it showed 10 frequency for "My lecturer should correct all errors" With 100%. The participants also give reason like "It is important for my lecturer should correct all errors. Because I don't know how to correct it by myself and also in order for me not to repeat the same thing in the future again", "Lecturer is the source of everything, they know better than me, so it is correct if the lecturer is the only one to correct all error", "Lecturer know better than I am", and "if I know the error I will do it myself but the fact that I don't know that's why the lecturer should correct all the error". Thus, the table IV below will show the responses in which participants' preferences of error correction technique.

Table 4. Participants’ Preferences of Error Correction Technique

Questionnaire items	Mean Rating
Underlining the error without correcting it.	3.0
Underlining the error and then directing you to a source for information.	3.7
Indicating the type of error without locating or correcting it.	3.0
Locating the error (e.g., by underlining it) and also indicating the type of error.	3.0
Underlining the error and then correcting it	4.3
Correcting the error and then providing an explanation for the correction	5.0
Simply indicating that you have an error in the sentence by putting a cross next to it without locating or correcting the error.	1.4
Asking my classmate (s) to correct the error.	2.0

***1=Very useless; 2=Useless; 3=Neither useful nor useless; 4=Useful; 5=Very useful**

Table 4 investigated the participants’ preferences of error correction techniques. The most preferred technique among the students was “*Correcting the error and then providing an explanation for the correction*”, with a total average rating of 5.0. Some reason given by students were (1) Because we need to know the correct one and it will make us understand what to do in the same context; and (2) Explanation will make us know what to learn. Followed by “*Underlining the error and then correcting it*” with a total average rating of 4.3. Some reason given by students were (1). The lowest preferred technique among the students was “*Simply indicating that you have an error in the sentence by putting a cross next to it without locating or correcting the error*”, with a total average rating of 1.4.

4. CONCLUSION

The finding showed that students tend to hold a positive view on written corrective feedback. Moreover, their views of written corrective feedback were tempered by what they consider to be an over-emphasis on grammar explicit. Thus, the used of WCF should carefully consider a balance between grammar and how

the lecturer correct itself. The results also demonstrate that the students preferred direct correction to indirect correction. Many students also expressed strong desires for more self-correction as well as interactive activities in the revision process. This signals a potential limitation of unidirectional written corrective feedback techniques. This research was benefited to found out the preferences of written corrective feedback of the students.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ellis 2012: Ellis, R. “Understanding Second Language Acquisition.” Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012
- [2] Ellis, R., Erlam, R. & Loewen, S. “Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar.” *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2009
- [3] Oppenheimer, D., Zaromb, F., Pomerantz, J., William, J., & Park, Y. “Writing Improvement of Writing Skills During College : A Multi-year Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Study of Undergraduate Writing Performance.” Elsevier, 2016
- [4] Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. “EFL Learners’ Perceptions and Preferences of Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study of University Students From Mainland China.” Springer, 2016
- [5] Hyland, F. (2010). “Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda.” *IJES, International Journal of English Studies*, 2010
- [6] Ferris, D. R. “The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime).” *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2004