

# THE EFFECT OF DIRECT CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WRITING OF RECOUNT TEXT

M. Arifin<sup>1</sup>, M. Zaim<sup>2</sup>, and Kurnia Ningsih<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UNP, Padang Indonesia, [m.arifin570@yahoo.com](mailto:m.arifin570@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup>UNP, Padang Indonesia, [mzaim\\_unp@yahoo.com](mailto:mzaim_unp@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup>UNP, Padang Indonesia, [krn\\_ningsih@yahoo.com](mailto:krn_ningsih@yahoo.com)

## Abstract

The purpose of this research is to determine the effect of direct corrective feedback toward students' writing, especially in writing recount text. This is a quasi-experimental research. The students of grade ten at MAN 3 Payakumbuh were the population of this study. The sample was chosen by using cluster random sampling technique in which there were 38 students as the subjects of this research. Direct corrective feedback was applied in experimental class and indirect corrective feedback was applied in control class. Data analysis technique was processed by using t-test. The results showed that the average of students' writing score in experimental class was 69.10 and 60.18 in control class. Thus, it can be concluded that direct corrective feedback gives better effect than indirect corrective feedback toward student's writing skill.

**Keywords:** Direct corrective feedback, writing, recount text

---

## Introduction

Writing is a kind of activity to express or present thoughts systematically. Students can state a message what they have in mind by writing down all the expressions of their feelings or ideas by considering important aspects in writing. However, they should prepare and arrange some ideas appropriately before starting to have a good writing. Thus, writing becomes an essential skill that should be taught in language learning process.

Writing is a skill taught in secondary schools in Indonesia. Particularly the schools that implement Curriculum 2013, English subject syllabus of the eleventh grade students of senior high school requires students to be able to write some genres in writing, recount text is one of them.

Recount text was chosen in this research since it is a text that should be learnt by the students in grade ten stated in curriculum. Besides, the reason underlying such option is based on the observation. The evidence revealed that when the teacher asked the students to write a recount text, they are expected to have an ability to develop their ideas. However, many students do not know how to express their ideas properly. Even when some students do have some ideas, they fail to develop the ideas into such a good text because of their poor vocabulary mastery and grammar.

To solve the above problems, teachers should make variation in teaching to make the class more enjoyable so that the judgment about the writing is difficult can be replaced. Direct corrective feedback is one of the strategies that can be applied by the teacher in teaching writing. In writing activity, direct corrective feedback means having teachers to read and give feedback on what students have written directly. Students as writers will get the input to organize ideas from teachers. In this technique, teachers will read and give comments, corrections, and also suggestions on what students have written. Ferris and Robberts (2001) suggest that direct corrective feedback is more helpful to writers because it (1) reduces the type of confusion that they may experience if they fail to understand or remember the feedback they have been given (for example, the meaning of error codes used); (2) provides them with information to help them resolve more complex errors (for example, syntactic structure and idiomatic usage); (3) offers more explicit feedback on hypotheses that may have been made; and (4) is more immediate. By realizing how important the direct corrective feedback is, it is hoped to help the students improve their writing skill. Thus, the teacher should apply direct corrective feedback to the students in their writing class so that the goal of the learning process can be achieved. This research was conducted to find the effect of direct corrective feedback on students' writing of recount text.

## **Theoretical Review**

### *Writing*

Writing is a complex process reflecting the writers' communicative skills. It demands a great deal of work and concentration. Roison et al (2004) state that writing is an amazingly complex activity due to in writing one is simultaneously involved with thinking of what to write, coherence and cohesion of the text, formation and legibility of individual letters, spelling, grammar including punctuation, layout, tone and register, organization and selection of appropriate content for intended audience. Moreover, the skills involved in writing are highly complex. Nunan (2003) states that writing is a process of delivering ideas and thinking into sentences and paragraphs that will be clear to the readers. It means that in writing learning process, the teacher should be able to develop students' competence in writing sentences and paragraphs and train the students to compose a short text grammatically. The teacher is expected to guide the students to organize their ideas during the process of writing. The teachers' comments and correction are needed in order to see the students' development in writing. Thus, the teacher is expected to be able to motivate the students to deliver the ideas and express through written form easily during writing learning process.

The process of writing is not instant. Watkins (2005) states that the process of writing is not a single act but a collection of acts. The writer selects the topic to write, organize the ideas, write a draft, read and revise it. Thus, the process of writing needs long time. The teacher should let the students spend the time longer in writing task in order to have a better writing product. In addition, Palmer (2003) states that teaching the students to write involves a wide range of skills such as spelling, handwriting, phonic encoding, sentence construction, choice of words, and text organization. While at the same time, teacher should help the students control the skills during the process of writing. Besides, the correction should be provided.

The correction given by the teacher to the students in writing learning process is to motivate them, not to make them down. Harmer (2004) says that most students find it very dispiriting if they get a piece of written work back and it is covered in red ink, underlining, and crossing out. This stage is aimed at motivating the students through the development of his/ her writing. Similarly, Richards and Renandya (2002) say that the teacher's correction may lead to the students' improvement on writing work and may make writing interesting, challenging, and enjoyable. Responding and giving feedback to the students' writing can be done in both oral and written form. Therefore, students should not be down when their teacher gives any correction on their writing since it is to develop their writing.

### *Recount text*

Recount text is one of the genres. It is a text which lists and describes past experiences by retelling events in order which happen chronologically. According to Hartono (2005), recount is a kind of genre used to retell events for the purpose of informing or entertaining. Recount text can be found in the form of personal recount, such as biography, factual recount, or imaginative recount. In recount text, there is no conflict. It applies series of events as the basic structure.

Recount text has several types. Derewianka (1992) identified three types of recount text, namely personal recount, factual recount, and imaginative recount. Personal recount exposes an even in which the writer or the author gets involved or acted in the event, for examples, daily funny incidents, entries of a diary and so on. Factual recount text is a note of an event, such as scientific experiment report, police report, news paper report, history explanation and so on. And imaginative recount is an unreal event or storylike reading text for language lesson, a story about a life of a slave.

It is necessary to find out what aspect that should be considered in writing recount text. Roison (2004) in his book about the indicators of recount text, makes it clear that there are three kinds of indicators of recount text. They are purpose, text organization and content, and language features. The purpose is to retell personal experience, record particulars of an event. Text organization and content of recount text include:

- 1) Orientation, it caters for readers by providing contextual details and provides details of the environment that impact on the way events unfold.
- 2) Events, attempts to interpret events imaginatively, elaborating important events, elaborates aspects of characters that affect events, gives characters credibility by using dialogue or significant actions.
- 3) Re-orientation, it writes more complex concluding statements with evaluative comment or summary.

Language features use a variety of appropriate adjective and adverbial phrases, maintain consistent past tense, use a variety of action and process verb, vary conjunction and linking words to indicate time, and vary complete sentences that are increasingly complex and groups of sentences containing related information into paragraphs.

*Direct corrective feedback*

Ferris (2003) says that in direct corrective feedback, the correct linguistic form or structure is written above the linguistic error. Furthermore, Lee (2004) says that in direct correction, the instructor provides the correct forms in students' faulty sentences. Therefore, both detection and correction are entirely the responsibility of the teachers and other students. Besides, Guenette (2007) defines direct feedback that it refers to the teacher's correction of errors. Moreover, Ellis (2009) states that direct feedback refers to overt correction of student's errors, that is, locating and correcting errors for students; the correct form is directly provided. According to Abadikhah and Ashoori (2012), direct corrective feedback occurs when the learners are overtly informed of the existence of an error and provided with the target-like reformulation. Based on the definitions of the direct corrective feedback defined by the experts, it can be said that direct corrective feedback is the feedback in which the correct forms are directly provided.

There are several advantages of implementing direct corrective feedback in the classroom. Ellis (2009) says that it can teach students to pay attention to errors. Secondly, it can train students to recognize different types of errors, then it encourages students to be less dependent on teachers. Finally, it helps learners to recognize that they can learn from each other. By knowing the advantages of direct corrective feedback above, it is realized that direct corrective feedback is really helpful for students since they can learn from the mistakes they made directly.

**Method**

This research belongs to a quasi experimental research. the population of this research were the tenth grade students of MAN 3 Payakumbuh registered in academic year 2017/2018. There were three classes in grade X which had 53 students. They were X/ MIA, X/IIAG, and X/IIS. In this research, X/IIS was the experimental class treated by applying direct corrective feedback and, X/IIAG was the control class treated by applying indirect corrective feedback.

The instrument used to get the data was writing test. It was given after several times of treatment were done in both experimental and control class. The students were given several topics and asked to choose one of them to be developed into a recount text. Then, their writing was scored and used as the data of this research.

*Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments*

*Validity*

a. Content validity

According to Wiersma and Jurs (2009), content validity is the process of how the test establishes the representativeness of the items in a certain domain of the skills, tasks, knowledge, and other aspects that are being measured. It means that the test was developed in reference to the Standard of Competence and Basic Competency for Senior High School students of Grade X in second semester.

b. Construct validity

Wiersma and Jurs (2009) state that construct validity refers to theoretical construct or trait being measured, but not to the technical construction of the test. To fulfill the construct validity, the researcher constructed the instrument consisting on some specific indicators. To score students' writing test, the researcher used O'Malley and Pierce (1996) scoring rubric, as presented below.

**Table 1. Scoring rubric of writing**

No		Rubrics	Score
1	Composing	Focuses on central ideas with an organized and elaborate text	4
		Central idea, but not as evenly elaborated and some digressions	3
		Not a focused idea or more than one idea, sketchy elaboration, and many digressions	2
		Not clear idea, little or no elaboration, many digressions	1
2	Style	Purposefully chosen vocabulary, sentence variety, information, and voice to affect readers	4
		Vocabulary less precise and information chosen less purposeful	3
		Vocabulary basic and not purposefully selected; tone flat or inconsistent	2
		Not controlled, tone flat, sentences halted Or choppy	1
3	Sentence formation	Standard word order, no enjambment (run-on sentences) completeness (no sentence fragments), standard modifiers and	4

		coordinators and effective transitions	
		Mostly standard word order, some enjambments or sentence fragments	3
		Some non-standard word order, enjambment, and word omissions (e.g., verbs)	2
		Frequent non-standard word order, enjambment, and word omissions	1
4	Usage	Standard inflection (e.g., plural, possessives,-ed, -ing with verbs, and -ly with adverbs), subject-verb agreement (we were vs we was), standard word meaning	4
		Mostly standard inflections, agreement, and word meaning	3
		Some errors with inflections, agreement, and word meaning	2
		Shifts from one tense to another, errors in conventions (them/those, good/well, double negatives and so on)	1
5	Mechanics	Effective use of capitalization, punctuation, spelling, and formatting (paragraphs noted by indenting)	4
		Mostly effective use of mechanics; errors do not detract from meaning	3
		Some errors with spelling and punctuation that detract from meaning	2
		Misspells even simple words; little formatting evident	1

### *Reliability*

Reliability of the test is also important as well as the validity of the test. In this research, inter-rater reliability was used. Inter-rater reliability is used if the test is checked by two or more scorers. According to Brown and Abeywickrama (2010), inter-rater reliability occurs when two or more scorers yield consistent score of the same test. Therefore, in this research, students' writing test was checked by two scorers.

### **Data Analysis Technique**

#### 1. Descriptive analysis

Descriptive analysis employed the result of the mean and the standard deviation score.

#### 2. Inferential Analysis

The inferential statistics was focused to answer the question on problems formulation, whether there was a significant difference in students' achievement after treatment. The statistics used in this computation were the test of normality, the test of homogeneity, and the hypothesis test.

##### a. Test of normality

This test was aimed at finding whether the distribution of the responses in the population met the normal distribution requirement or not. It was gained from the scores of post-test in both classes. To determine the level of significance, the researcher used One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov in the significance level of 0.05 from SPSS version 17.0 of Windows computer program.

##### b. Test of homogeneity

This test was used to analyze whether the sample variance is homogeneous or not. In this study, the test of homogeneity was done by using SPSS version 17.0 of Windows computer program. The test was considered homogeneous if the level of significance is more than 0.05.

##### c. Test of hypothesis

t-test was employed to answer the hypothesis whether alternative hypothesis is accepted or rejected.

### **Results and Discussion**

The results indicate that there is a significant difference on the students' writing skills after treatment. The absolute gained scores of the mean and the standard deviation of the sample group emphasized the significant difference of the students' writing ability. Based on the computation of the post-tests result, the mean value of the post-test in experimental class was 69, the mean value of the post-test in control class was 60.

**Table 2. The Summary of Normality test of Writing Testin Experimental and Control Class**

Class	N	Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed)	Significance level	Conclusion
Experimental	21	0.339	0.05	Normal
Control	17	0.188	0.05	Normal

The table above shows the normality of students' writing skill score in experimental and control class. It can be seen that the value of asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) in experimental class was 0.339 which is higher than the value of significance level 0.05. Then, the value of asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) in control class was 0.188 which is also higher than the value of significance level 0.05. Thus, it is pointed that students' writing skill score in both classes are normally distributed.

**Table 3. The Summary of Homogeneity Test of Writing Test in Experimental and Control Class**

Data	Based on sig.	Significance Level	Conclusion
Writing test	0.967	0.05	Homogeneous

The table above indicates that students' writing skill score was homogeneous since the value of sig of writing test was 0.967 which is higher than the level of significance 0.05.

**Table 4. Summary of t-test Analysis of Students Writing Skill in Experimental and Control class**

Classification	Class	
	Experimental	Control
N	21	17
Mean	69	60
Dev Stand	10.54	10.06
$t_{\text{observed}}$	2.659	
$t_{\text{table}}$	2.026	

The table above shows that the value of  $t_{\text{observed}}$  is higher than  $t_{\text{table}}$  ( $t_{\text{observed}} > t_{\text{table}}$ ).  $H_0$  indicates that the students who are taught by using direct corrective feedback do not get better result in writing skill than the students who are taught by using indirect corrective feedback. However,  $H_a$  indicates that the students who are taught by using direct corrective feedback get better result in writing skill than the students who are taught by using indirect corrective feedback.  $H_a$  is accepted. The mean score of writing skill in the table above, it was found that direct corrective feedback got higher mean score which was 69 than indirect corrective feedback that was 60. It means that alternative hypothesis is accepted because  $t_{\text{observed}}$  (2.659) was higher than  $t_{\text{table}}$  (2.026). Based on the data analysis, it was found that the students who were taught by using direct corrective feedback got higher score in writing skill than the students who are taught by using indirect corrective feedback in writing skill.

The result of hypothesis found that direct corrective feedback affects students' writing skill on recount text to get higher result than indirect corrective feedback in grade ten students of MAN 3 Payakumbuh. Direct corrective feedback gave better result to students' writing skill on recount text than indirect corrective feedback. There were many students who got good score in writing test. It happened since in direct corrective feedback, the students could notice the mistakes they made easily, so that they became aware and they were not confused anymore since their mistakes were directly corrected. In a line with, Chandler (2003) states that direct feedback is more effective for learning because it does not confuse the students, gives them more information and provides them with the opportunity to receive immediate feedback, consequently preventing them from making wrong hypotheses.

In addition, students enjoyed the learning process since they were provided with enough information to correct more complicated errors. Bitchener (2012) states that direct corrective feedback is recommendable in that it reduces learners' confusion and the number of hypotheses they need to test and further provides them with the information they require to solve the more complex errors.

Moreover, students did not take too long to correct their own mistakes in the classroom before they rewrite the text since they could see the mistakes they made clearly and the correction was immediately given. Scrivener (2005) argues that indeed, explicit feedback is considered the quickest, most appropriate and most useful way of helping. In addition, Chandler (2003) on her research found that direct correction is the best for producing accurate revisions, and the students prefer it because it is the fastest and easiest way for them as well as the fastest way for teachers over several drafts.

Regarding the explanation above, it can be concluded that direct corrective feedback obtains significant effect toward students' writing skill. In general, direct corrective feedback is good to be applied in teaching writing since the students understand and learn from the correction given easily.

On the other hand, the students who are taught by using indirect corrective feedback did not get better result in writing. In this case, they were confused to correct the mistakes they made since they had lack of knowledge. Moreover, it took much time for them to correct their own mistakes. Consequently, when the teacher asked them to re-write the recount text, they still made many mistakes.

## Conclusion

The students taught by using direct corrective feedback have better recount text than those who are taught by using indirect corrective feedback in grade ten students of MAN 3 Payakumbuh. The result of this research has some implications in teaching English, especially teaching writing. Direct corrective feedback is really helpful for students since it helps them reduce their confusion and the correction is directly provided so that they can inspect the errors they made easily. However, in the teaching and learning process, the English teachers did not give direct corrective feedback to the students, so that they were confused what to do.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to dedicate my sincere gratitude and appreciation to those who have given their contribution. My deepest gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. M. Zaim, M.Hum and Dr. Kurnia Ningsih, M.A as my advisors, who have helped me, given a great deal of time, guidance and valuable pieces of advice. Besides, Prof. Dra. Yenni Rozimela, M.Ed, Ph.D., Dr. Refnaldi, M.Litt, Dr. Ridwan, M. Sc., Ed., and Desvalini Anwar, S.S., M. Hum, Ph.D as the examiners and contributors who have given contributions and suggestions for the improvement of this work.

## References

- Abadikhah, S., & Ashoori, A. (2012). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Performance after Collaborative Output. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 118-125*
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. London: Routledge
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Longman
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 100 – 111*.
- Derewianka, B. (1992). *Exploring How the Text Work*. Primary English Teaching Association. Newton
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1(1)*. Retrieved November 17, 2012 from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3>.
- Ferris, D.R. (2003). *Respond to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Ferris, D.R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10, 161-184*
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach English*. Cambridge: Addison Wesley Longman Limited
- Hartono, R. (2005). *Genres of Text*. Semarang: UNNES
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: *The case of Hong Kong. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13, 285-312*
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Education (Asia)
- O'Malley, J.M., & Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approaches for Teachers*. Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Company
- Palmer, S. (2003). *How to Teach Writing Across the Curriculum at Key Stage 1*. New York: David Fulton Publishers
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Roison, G. et al. (2004). *Writing Resource Book*. Victoria: Rigby Heinemann
- Scrivener, J., (2005). *Learning Teaching: A Guidebook for English Language Teachers*. Macmillan Education, Oxford.
- Watkins, P. (2005). *Learning to Teach English*. London: Delta Publishing
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. (2009). *Research Methods in Education*. United States: Pearson Education, Inc.