The Learners Perceive of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Multicultural Class

Tazkiyatunnafs Elhawwa[1], Dwi Rukmini[2], Januarius Mujiyanto[3], Djoko Sutopo[4]

[1,2,3,4]Graduate School of English Education Department, Universitas Negeri Semarang
[1]Corresponding email: tazkiyatunnafs.elhawwa@gmail.com

Abstract

The study attempts to explain the learners perceive of WCF in writing multicultural class at English Department of IAIN Palangka Raya. This study belongs to descriptive research. The participants of the study are the students of three ethnic groups consisting of twenty five students. The data are collected through questionnaire and observation. The finding reveals that all ethnic group students have positive response on WCF in L2 writing class. In terms of the types of feedback, the majority of participants about ninety per cent of dayaknese and eighty six per cent of Banjarese prefer to treat using direct CF. Meanwhile, Javanese about eighty three per cent prefer to treat using indirect CF, in terms of the sources of feedback, the majority of participants about ninety two per cent of Javanese and eighty per cent of Banjarese prefer to be treated by teacher CF. Meanwhile, Dayaknese about eighty one per cent prefer to be treated by peer CF. It is recommended that the teachers consider the students cultural background in giving WCF to learners.

Keywords: Perceive, written corrective feedback, EFL multicultural class.

1. Introduction

Written Corrective feedback is vital in L2 learning process (Goo & Mackey, 2011; Li, 2010; Russell & Spada, 2006; Saito & Lyster, 2012). Specifically, Written Corrective Feedback enables language instructors to give more information on the accuracy of students' writing product by increasing awareness of the grammatical errors of L2 writing. Historically, giving corrective feedback is seen from various perspectives. In the perspective of behaviorist approach of the 1950s and 1960s, for example, errors were seen as evidence of non-learning and were to be corrected at all cost. In line with this, (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012) state that errors were perceived much more negatively than today's education. Behaviorists believed that errors should be corrected strictly and systematically. Then, in the early 1970's, communicative approach dominated in L2 learning. Until the end of the 1980s, (Truscott, 1996) suggested that error correction should not occur at all. Furthermore, (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012) proposed questions on the reasons for correcting errors. What types of grammatical errors ought to be revised? When, how and who should revise them have been questioned by L2 researchers.

During EFL writing class, I have seen different teachers giving various types of feedback to L2 learners. Some prefer to direct feedback, some prefer to indirect feedback in written; while there are other teachers that simply give their students' scores directly without giving WCF. This simple observation makes me curious about the learners perceive on WCF in L2 writing class. In spite of the fact, that there is still the continuously debate of whether or not corrective feedback (CF) should be used in L2 writing class, I am interested in examining the learners' perceive on WCF in L2 writing multicultural class. The focus of the study is about the learners' perceived on Written Corrective Feedback in L2 writing. Moreover, (Ducken, 2014) stated that WCF plays an important role in developing L2 writing. In my view, WCF is a type of written response to linguistic errors made by the learners in writing text. In the study, I explored the learners' perception on the implementation of various model of WCF in L2 multicultural writing class at English Department students of State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya 2017/2018 academic years. The various model of WCF being explored are direct, indirect and metalinguistic CF using teacher's CF, peer's CF and self CF. The participants of the study consist of Javanese, Banjarese, and Dayaknese students.

1.1 Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

There are some experts give definitions about WCF. According to (Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009; Wang & Loewen, 2015), corrective feedback is a kind of linguistic information given to students considering their linguistic errors. Moreover, (Ducken, 2014) stated that Written Corrective

Feedback is as a type of feedback made by the teacher on a learner's paper to improve grammar. In my opinion, Written Corrective Feedback is a written response to linguistic errors made by the learners in writing text.

1.1.1 The Various Models of WCF

a. Direct Corrective Feedback. In this case, the language instructors give feedback the students' paper with the correct form (Ellis, 2009). Here, in my point of view, Direct CF is a model of feedback where the language instructors give feedback the students' paper directly with the correct form in terms of their grammatical errors.

b. Indirect Corrective Feedback. In this case, the language instructors give feedback the students' paper by indicating that there is an error, however he/she does not give feedback directly. This category has two classes as follows: (a) signing and placing the linguistic error, and (b) signing only. In my point of view, indirect corrective feedback is a model of written corrective feedback in which the language instructors give feedback by signing that there is linguistic error, however he/she does not give feedback directly. The language instructors may either underline the actual errors or place a note in the margin indicating that an error.

c. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback. In this case, the language instructors give feedback the students' paper some kinds of metalinguistic sign. There are two models of metalinguistic CF: (a) the teachers give some grammatical error codes in the right side of text or margin, (b) the language instructors give feedback the students' paper some kinds of brief explanations of the errors. Here, the teacher gives numbering the grammatical errors in the students' essay and then, he/ she writes a description for each error at the end of the essay. In my view, metalinguistic CF is types of feedback in which the teacher gives feedback the students' paper some kinds of metalinguistic sign by giving some grammatical error codes in the right side of text.

1.2. Related Works

Dealing with learners' perceived on WCF, there have been a number of studies. Here, the researcher categorized from teacher' perception, students' perception and other aspect to influence perception. For the first categorize is from students' perception, (Amara, 2015) about students' perceive of teacher written feedback commentary in an ESL writing classroom. The study revealed that participants was strongly motivated with teacher comments. Second, a study conducted by (Westmacott, 2017) about direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback on the student perceive. The study revealed that many language learners stated that indirect feedback was more helpful. Other aspects to influence perception is from (Kartchava, 2016) on learners' beliefs about corrective feedback on perspectives from two international contexts. The study revealed that the respondents felt that feedback should be done and is preferable in L2 class. For the second categorize is from teacher' perception, (Vyatkina, 2011), and (Anglesa & Multiling, 2016) teachers' perception does not coincide with what learners expect from their teachers, and also, teachers must assess learners' expectations regarding WCF as knowing preferences can be beneficial for both parties.

Those studies above give a broader knowledge on students' perception on the implementation of various model of WCF in L2 writing. Different with studies above, I explore the students' perception on the implementation of various model of WCF in L2 multicultural class. The types of WCF being explored are direct, indirect and metalinguistic CF using teacher's CF, peer's CF and self CF. The subjects of the study consisted of Javanese, Banjarese, and Dayaknese learners.

2. Methods

The design in the study was descriptive research, since the study focuses on investigating the learners' perceived on WCF

in L2 writing multicultural class. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative paradigms. The instruments used in the study were closed- ended questionnaire, feedback analysis of students' papers, classroom observations, and questionnaire.

2.1. Participants.

This research was conducted at English Department of IAIN Palangka Raya. The subjects of the study were the fourth semester students. Meanwhile, the object of the study was WCF in L2 writing. The participants consisted of 25 EFL learners (12 males and 13 females) with an average age between 20–21 years, participating in Essay Writing class. This class consists of three big ethnic groups (Javanese, 8 students; Banjaresse, 5 students; and Dayaknese, 12 students).

2.2. Procedures.

The data were obtained in 14 class meetings. The data of this study were in the form percentage, words, sentences, or phrases to describe the students' perceived on WCF in L2 writing multicultural class. The data were in both qualitative and quantitative ones. The data of quantitative dealt with percentage of the learners perceived on WCF in L2 writing class. Meanwhile, the qualitative data dealt with the further explanation of the learners' perceived.

3. Results and Discussion

This section presented participants' perceive from questionnaire items related to six research questions. There were three major topics: (a) findings on students' perception towards teacher WCF; (b) findings on students' perception towards peer WCF; (c) findings on students' perception on self-feedback; and (d) findings on the source of feedback they prefer to receive.

3.1. Students' perception towards teacher WCF.

The first aim of the study was to explain the learners perceive towards teacher WCF. From questionnaire results, participants were asked about how their perceived on teacher WCF. Twenty participants responded. It was found that the majority of participants (36% of Dayaknese students, 24% Javanese of students, and 16% Banjarese students)

felt that they received teacher feedback on language form, content, and organization such as the introduction, the body; or the conclusion. Most students (76%) believed that is was necessary to obtain teacher WCF, considering that it was the teacher's responsibility to give feedback for the leaners' errors. RH stated that: "I think it is the teacher's responsibility to give feedback on the learners' errors in writing. By doing so, there will be a writing improvement." (RH, Dayaknese students' interview). Another student confirmed: "Teacher's feedback help me to write argumentative essay." (NA, Javanese students' interview). Moreover, in the written interviews they claimed that it was important for the teacher to revise their grammatical errors rather than their organization.

3.2. Students' perception towards peer WCF. The second purpose of the study was to investigate the students' perception towards peer WCF. From questionnaire results, participants were asked about how their perceived on peer WCF. Twenty participants responded. The first, participants' opinions demonstrated on receiving peer WCF on language form. The second, participants' opinions demonstrated on receiving teacher WCF on content, such as the unity of the ideas, coherence of the ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas. The third, participants' opinions demonstrated on receiving teacher WCF on organization such as the introduction, the body; or the conclusion. It could be stated that the majority of participants (28% of Dayaknese students and 16% of Banjarese students, and 24% Javanese students) felt that they received peer feedback on language form, and on content, such as the unity of the ideas, coherence of the ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas, and on organization such as the introduction, the body; or the conclusion. Most students (68%) believed that it was vital to get peer WCF, reasoning that it was also the peer responsibility to give feedback for the leaners' errors. NF stated that: "I think peer feedback will

give great contribution to my language improvement in writing." NF, Banjarese students' interview). Another student confirmed: "Peer feedback also help me in writing argumentative essay." (AS, Dayaknese students' interview). Moreover, in the written interviews they claimed that it was important for the peer to correct their certain grammatical errors such as verb agreement, punctuation, and misspelling rather than their content.

3.3. Students' perception towards self WCF. The third aim of the study was to explain the students' perception towards self-WCF. From questionnaire results, participants were asked about how their perceived on self-WCF. Twenty participants responded.

The participants' opinions demonstrated on receiving self-WCF on language form. It showed that all ethic students did not agree to the statement that they received self-WCF on language form,on content, such as the unity of the ideas, coherence of the ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas; and on organization such as the introduction, the body; or the conclusion. The majority of participants (35% of Dayaknese students and 23% of Banjarese students, and 12% Javanese students) felt that they did not receive self-feedback on language form, and on content, such as the unity of the ideas, coherence of the ideas, development of ideas, and clarity of ideas, and on organization such as the introduction, the body; or the conclusion. Most students (70%) believed that self- feedback was not too important to improve their language development, arguing that they did not get benefits from self-WCF because they were not sure to the errors they revised. FH stated that: "I think self-feedback is not important for me, because I have no benefits from it when I write an argumentative essay." (FB, students' interview). Another student confirmed: "I am not sure about the errors I revised." (AG, students' interview). Moreover, in the written interviews they claimed that it self-feedback did not give benefits to their language improvement, because they were not sure about the errors to be revised.

3.4. The source of feedback they prefer to receive.
The fourth aim of the study was to investigate the students' preference on the source of WCF they liked best. From questionnaire results, participants were asked about how their preference on the source WCF. Twenty participants responded. As the findings, students demonstrated that they liked the teacher to revise their writing, rather than peer and self-WCF. The Dayaknese students prefer the teacher WCF (40%) followed by Javanese students (32%) and Banjarese students (12%). Meanwhile, the Banjarese students prefer the peer to correct their writing (20%) followed Javanese students (16%) and Dayaknese students (16%). This result was in accordance with related studies (Montgomery & Baker, 2007) which confirmed that learners perceived language instructor's correction as better than the peer correction since the learners did not believe the linguistic competence of their peer. This result was also congruent with (Amara, 2015). The results of this study revealed that participants had strong motivation to the teacher comments. This finding was also in line with (Mahfoodh & Pandian, 2011) suggest that students perceive their teachers' correction is helpful, very useful for the increasing of their writing skills, and eager their teachers to give feedback on all aspects of texts. However, the finding of the study stating that students preferred teachers'feedback over peer feedback and self-feedback, seemed to be in contrast with other studies. For example, (Orts Soler, 2015) on the EFL learners' attitudes and preferences towards written corrective feedback. The study was conducted to analyse students' attitudes and preferences towards written corrective feedback. This finding reconfirmed that the teacher WCF played an important role in improving their language development in writing.

4. Conclusion

The findings about the learners' perceive towards WCF were closely related to four main issues, namely, the learners perceive towards their teachers' WCF, peer WCF and self-WCF. First, the findings demonstrated most students (76%) believed that it was important to get teacher WCF, considering that it was the teacher's responsibility to give feedback for the leaners' errors. This finding

was in line with related studies investigating on the EFL learners' attitudes towards their teachers' WCF (Grami, 2005; Hamouda, 2011; Lee, 2004; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Second, most students (68%) believed that it was also important to receive peer WCF, arguing that it was also the peer responsibility to give feedback for the leaners' errors. Third, most students (70%) believed that self-feedback was not too important to improve their language development, arguing that they did not get benefits from self-WCF because they were not sure to the errors they revised. Fourth, the findings demonstrated that the Dayaknese students prefer the teacher WCF (40%) followed by Javanese students (32%) and Banjarese students (12%). Meanwhile, the Banjarese students prefer the peer to correct their writing (20%) followed Javanese students (16%) and Dayaknese students (16%). It is recommended that the teachers consider the students cultural background in giving WCF to learners. They should use appropriate comments to indicate location and model of feedback.

5. References

Amara, T. M. (2015). Learners' Perceptions of Teacher Written Feedback Commentary in an Esl Writing Classroom Talal M. Amara The University of Zawia, Libya, 3(2), 38–53.

Anglesa, L., & Multiling, C. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback in Secondary Education : Learners' and Teachers' Preferences and Perceptions (Master's Thesis), (June).

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Research on Written CF in Language Classes. In Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing (pp. 49–74).

Ducken, D. (2014). L2 WRITING CLASSROOM.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Goo, J., & Mackey, A. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual variation in cognitive capacities, and L2 development: Recasts vs. metalinguistic feedback. Department of Linguistics. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com

/docview/1018382253?

Grami, G. M. A. (2005). The effect of teachers' written feedback on ESL students' perception: A study in a Saudi ESL university-level context. Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, 2(1), 10–13.

Hamouda, A. (2011). A Study of Students and Teachers' Preferences and Attitudes towards Correction of Classroom Written Errors in Saudi EFL Context. English Language Teaching, 4(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p128

Kartchava, E. (2016). Learners' Beliefs about Corrective Feedback in the Language Classroom : Perspectives from Two International Contexts, 33(2), 19–45.

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4), 285–312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001

Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. Language Learning. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Mahfoodh, O., & Pandian, A. (2011). A Qualitative Case Study of EFL Students' Affective Reactions to and Perceptions of Their Teachers' Written Feedback. English Language Teaching, 4(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p14

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. Journal of Second Language Writing, 16(2), 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Orts Soler, S. (2015). EFL students' attitudes and preferences towards written corrective feedback. Retrieved from http://repositori.uji.es/xmlui/handle/10234/134705

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching, 133–164. https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.13

Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2012). Effects of Form-Focused Instruction and Corrective Feedback on L2 Pronunciation Development of /r{turned}/ by Japanese Learners of English. Language Learning,

62(2), 595–633. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00639.x

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. System, 37(4), 556–569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002

Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. Language Learning, 46(2), 327–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Vyatkina, N. (2011). Writing instruction and policies for written corrective feedback in the basic language sequence. L2 Journal, 3(1), 63–92.

Wang, W., & Loewen, S. (2015). Nonverbal behavior and corrective feedback in nine ESL university-level classrooms. Language Teaching Research, March 24, 1362168815577239-. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815577239

Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. Indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. Ikala, 22(1), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02