ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSE TO TEACHER WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN WRITING A DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Mahmud Layan Hutasuhut S.Pd., M.Hum., Ph.D.[1]
Emalia Kurnia Ananda[2]

[1]Universitas Negeri Medan

Abstract

This research describes students' responses to teacher written corrective feedback in their descriptive texts. It also discovers types of written corrective feedback used by the teacher. The research employed descriptive qualitative. The subjects of the study consisted of 16 seventh year students of *SMP Negeri 1 Tanjung Beringin* and an English teacher. Open-ended interview and documentation review were used as the research instruments to collect the data. Results of the study revealed that (1) the majority of the students showed positive responses to teacher's written corrective feedback, as the following: (a) They said that teacher written corrective feedback was useful, (b) they felt pleased when their descriptive texts were provided with written corrective feedback, (c) teacher written corrective feedback made them feel motivated in writing, (d) they hoped the teacher always provided written corrective feedback to improve their writing errors, and (e) direct written corrective feedback served as the most preferred teacher feedback, and that (2) of the three types of written corrective feedback (metalinguistic, direct and indirect), the teacher only used direct and indirect written corrective feedback in the students' descriptive texts.*)*

Keywords: Student response; teacher written corrective feedback; assessment; descriptive text

1. Introduction

Writing is classified as linguistic communication because it is used to communicate with others (Quirk et al., 1985; Rukayah, 2014). This means that writing has meaning in every word to be understood by readers. Creativity becomes the primary source of writing activity (Haerazi et al., 2009), as writing requires people to be creative in order to offer a variety of ideas in a composition of diverse genres. They must be creative in terms of what they feel appropriate and engaging to share to readers. Brown

(2000: 49) asserted that writing is a mental process that should be prepared and given a limitless number of changes before publication. The linguistic aspects such as vocabulary, grammar, language use, and choice of sentences are also important in writing to make the message in the writing conveyed to the readers.

While learning to write, students will also have to learn some text genres, such as descriptive, recount, procedure, report, and narrative texts. A descriptive text, for instance, is one of the text genres that students have to learn. It is a type of text that is used to describe or illustrate something, such as a location, person, animal, object, or idea from the writer's point of view. The aim or social function of a descriptive text according to Dirgeyasa (2017) is to describe a person, place, or thing in such a way that an image is generated in the reader's mind. According to Badger and White (2000: 153), there is a lack of crucial parts of writing such as planning, drafting, and revising. Revising can assist students in producing meaningful and well-organized texts. There are various sources of revision, including peer revision, self-revision, and teacher revision or teacher corrective feedback. Teacher corrective feedback might prompt students to examine their papers in terms of content,

organization, communicative intent, and genre.

According to Srichanyachon (2012), feedback is a vital component of English language writing classes. Teachers can choose the topic of the comments based on the elements of the students' writing that are good or need more modification. The involvement of the teacher is important. The teacher has to give some corrections to the learners about the error that they have made so the students will not make the same errors. In addition to this, Erris and Roberts (2001) stated that understanding about students' attitudes, emotions, and preferences for feedback written by teachers is crucial. Cazden (2001) found one of the important aspects in the learning environment is the teacher-student interaction. It means the students need conducting the response to the written corrective feedback given by their English teacher in order to find out if the written corrective feedback given by teachers is good enough or needs a modification to be a better one.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Writing

Writing is a mental activity in developing ideas, determining how to communicate them, and structuring them into statements and paragraphs that are

understandable to a reader (Nunan, 2003: 88). According to Rao & Durga (2018), writing is a written sign system that describes the sounds and words of a language in various forms, including capitalization, spelling, punctuation, word shape, and function. There are steps before the final product of writing are proposed by Badger and White (2000: 153). These steps involve planning, drafting and also revising. Moreover, there are components of writing which promoted by Nurgiantoro (2001:306-308) namely content, organization, grammar, vocabulary and mechanics of writing.

2.2 Descriptive Writing

Various types of texts are introduced to learners from the first year to the third year of junior high school, based on the 2013 curriculum issued by Permendikbud No. 59 (2014). One of the written texts is a descriptive text, which the second-year junior high school students are learning. The descriptive text for seventh grade students is detailed in basic competency 3.7 and 4.7 of the 2017 revision syllabus.

Pardiyono (2007: 33 - 34) defined a descriptive text as a type of written text that has a specific goal of providing information about an object (human or non-human). Oshima and Hogue (1997: 50), on the other hand, argued that a descriptive writing appeals to the senses by describing how something looks, feels, smells, tastes, and sounds. The purpose of a descriptive text is to let the readers imagine a person, subject, or place. It is permissible to have a picture so that the readers may visualize it (Fink et al., 1983: 41). Gerot and Wignell (1994: 208) explained that a descriptive text has two generic structures, namely description and identification. Masruri (2010: 1) explained that identification is a section of the paragraph that reveals or identifies the subject, while a description is a section of a paragraph that depicts the characters.

2.3 Response

Response is related to any verbal or nonverbal reaction geared to fulfill the expectations inherent in the inquiries, directives, or requests of others (Agustina, 2007: 19). Chaffe (in Solihin, 2020) stated that there are 3 types of response: cognitive, affective, and conative responses. Cognitive response is strongly related to a person's knowledge of information about something. Affective (attitudinal response) is a response based on emotions, attitudes, and a person's assessment of something. Conative response is response to actual behaviors, including action or habits. There are

two responses resulted from an interaction between object and individual including positive and negative responses (Altman et al. 1985). Positive response refers to positive interpretations that involve people evaluating things around them. Negative response is defined as perception that describes information negatively or as negative interpretations for the object being perceived.

2.4 Feedback

Hyland and Hyland (2006: 83) stated that feedback is the process of responding to students' work, and it has long been regarded as core for the development of second and foreign language skills, both for its potential for learning and for students' motivation. It means that as students already accomplish their learning, they need correction or criticism from other sources to assess their learning result and they may improve their writing performance. Ur (1996 in Shivanji, n.d.) defined feedback as information that is given to the learners about their performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance. Thus, feedback is provided to ask for further information, to give directions, suggestion, or request for revision. To give students new information that will help them make their writing product to

be better. Radeki and Swales (1988) believed feedback is important for teachers to provide since studies on students' attitudes towards feedback discovered that many students do want the errors in their writing to be corrected. It can be concluded that many researchers agree that feedback is essential and has a positive effect on students' writing. Thus, feedback on writing can be selected as a means of helping students to make revision and improve their writing skills. In general, feedback is divided into two types: spoken corrective feedback and written corrective feedback (Küçükali, 2017). Meanwhile, there are three sources of feedback: teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self-evaluation, which is equal to self-directed feedback (Lewis, 2002: 15-23). After that there are three basic forms of written corrective feedback are identified: direct, indirect, and metalinguistic (Ellis, 2009).

3. Research Methodology

A descriptive qualitative method was used in this study to collect the data. Bogdan and Biklen (1982) stated that qualitative research is a study that explores the quality of relationships, activities, circumstances, or materials. Subject of this research were 16 seventh year students and an English teacher of SMP Negeri 1 Tanjung Beringin. In analyzing the data, the researcher used two data instruments: they were

interview and documentation review. The open-ended interview was conducted to make the participants able to answer the questions in their own unique way and in their own words. The researcher used this interview to get extensive information of the students' responses in term of attitudinal response to teacher written corrective feedback and then recorded via audiotape. The question variables were divided into 4. They were students' difficulties in learning to write a descriptive text (consisting of 1 question), students' opinion about written corrective feedback utilized by their teacher (consisting of 3 questions), types of teacher's written corrective feedback (consisting of 1 questions), and learners' hope to teacher's written corrective feedback (consisting of 1 question). The second instrument was documentation review. The researcher reviewed documentation from students' descriptive texts, and the texts have received written corrective feedback from the teacher. It aimed to discover the types of written corrective feedback used by the English teacher. The researcher had been aided by the teacher in collecting the students' descriptive texts. To examine the data, the researcher used a qualitative descriptive approach that consisted of the following steps: data reduction, data display, and data conclusion promoted by Miles and Huberman (1994).

4. Research Findings and Discussion

4.1 Research Findings

The following table describes findings from the data analysis.

No.	Questions	Students' Answers
1.	What are your difficulties in writing descriptive text?	• 1 student said it is difficult to make paragraph. • 2 students had answered afraid to make mistakes. • 4 students had said cannot develop ideas. • 6 students answered cannot using English. • 1 student had answered cannot explain something. • 1 student told do not like writing. • 1 student answered do not understand about text descriptive.
2.	What is your opinion about teacher's written corrective feedback on your writing errors ?	• 16 students said it is good if the teacher provide written corrective feedback.

				were no errors in the written texts • 1 student expected that the teacher did not have to give them written corrective feedback. The teacher should have just explained the learning material first • 1 student reasoned that the teacher should have just given the final score without the written corrective feedback itself.

3.	How do you feel when the teacher gave her written corrective feedback to the errors in the descriptive text that you have made ?	• 8 students answered felt happy. • 1 student answered upset for the errors. • 1 student said felt confident. • 5 students said felt afraid. • 1 student answered felt worried.
4.	Does teacher's written corrective feedback motivates you write a text ?	• 14 students had answered that they felt motivated. • 2 students had said that they did not feel motivated.
5.	From the three types of teacher's written corrective feedback (direct, indirect, metalinguitic), which one do you prefer ?	• 16 students had answered that they preferred direct written corrective feedback.
6.	What is your expectation for teacher in doing written corrective feedback ?	• 9 students responded that they wished the teacher always had given her written corrective feedback in the students' writing errors. • 4 students hoped that the teacher's writing mechanism had to be improved. • 1 student wished there

From the six questions, the findings showed diverse students' answers because the researcher used open-ended question which aimed to get unique answers from every interview. The findings of the interview could be described as follows: there were several difficulties faced by each one of the students. Most of the students stated that they could not use English well and it made them difficult to write. From sixteen students, five (31%) students stated it was difficult for them to develop ideas. Six (37,5%) students admitted that they could not use English. Moreover, two (12,5%) students said that they were

afraid to make mistakes, while three (19%) students realized that they did not understand descriptive text well. Therefore, it can be said that the lack of English being the reason why the students felt difficult to write a descriptive text.

The next question was *'Apa pendapat mu jika guru mengkoreksi kesalahan pada tulisan mu?'* All of the 16 students (100%) responded that they thought it benefited them if the teacher gave written corrective feedback in their writing errors. They added that it could make them realize what errors they had made, and some of the students believed that success comes from failure. This belief can be seen in this statement *'Baik, karena saya percaya keberhasilan datang dari kegagalan'.* It showed that all students agreed with the benefits of teacher's written corrective feedback.

About the students' feelings after receiving teacher's written corrective feedback, it was discovered that most of the students (44,5%) felt pleased because their writing errors were corrected by the teacher. In contrast, some of the students (37,5%) felt afraid of being scolded by the teacher because of their writing errors. On the other hand, the other student (6%) felt upset for their writing errors, whereas the other (6%) felt confidence for the writing whether it was

good or not and the rest one student (6%) felt worried about the errors. It can be concluded that many students felt happy about receiving corrective feedback. They reasoned that it made them realize their mistakes, they knew their grades and they just liked if their writing was corrected by the teacher.

The next question was whether the teacher's written corrective feedback made the students feel motivated to write descriptive text. The findings showed that most of the students (87,5%) agreed if teacher's written corrective feedback made them feel motivated to write again and make them more thorough in their next writings. On the other hand, there were two student (12,5%) who did not like writing although the teacher gave written corrective feedback in the writing errors. From the explanation above, it can be said that the implementation of teacher's written corrective feedback was needed to make the students feel motivated in writing as shown in most students' responses.

Type of written corrective feedback preferred by all of 16 students (100%) was direct written corrective feedback. It was demonstrated in question number five. The students reasoned that teacher's written corrective feedback helped them improve their next writings since the teacher provided their writing errors with

the right answers directly. It means that indirect written corrective feedback made them feel confused because the teacher only marked the writing errors without leaving the right answers. No one chose neither indirect nor metalinguistic teacher's written corrective feedback.

The last question was about students' expectations for teacher's written corrective feedback in their writing errors. The researcher discovered most of the students (56,25%) wished the teacher always had given the written corrective feedback in their writing. It could help them improve their next writing with guidance from the teacher. On the other hand, some students (25%) hoped the teacher's writing mechanism had to be improved, making her writing clearer and more thorough. But one (6,25%) of them said the teacher should explain the whole material first and confirmed whether the students had understood or not, to make them avoid doing the writing errors. In contrast, one student (6,25%) told that the teacher did not have to give the written corrective feedback but should have just given the final score for the writing. And the rest one student (6,25%) hoped that there were no errors it the writings. To conclude, most of the students wished if their teacher guided their writing by

providing the written corrective feedback in their descriptive text writing.

The result of types of teacher's written corrective feedback analysis showed the teacher provided both direct and indirect written corrective feedbacks in the descriptive texts and the teacher combined direct and indirect written corrective feedback in each of students' writings. The writing errors made by students which always found by the teacher were grammatical errors, mechanics of writing including word spelling, punctuation, and capitalization. Based on the form of both types of written corrective feedback conducted, the using of direct feedback was indicated with underlining, circling, or arrowing the writing errors and inserting the right answers above or beside the wrong one with a red ink. It made easier for students to find. In terms of indirect feedback, the teacher just circled, crossed out, underlined the writing errors made by students without providing the right answers. There were 11 descriptive texts written by students. The researcher had calculated the number of both types of the teacher's written corrective feedback itself and had found a total of 54 written corrective feedbacks with 28 direct and 26 indirect written corrective feedback.

4.2 Discussion

There were the difficulties of writing a descriptive text faced by 16 students of 7th year class of SMP Negeri 1 Tanjung beringin, but most of the students said that they could not use English well. One purpose of a descriptive text is to explain something to readers, but without a proper language, the purpose could not be delivered to the readers. It did not mean the writers must stop writing. Harmer (2007:33) argued that writing focuses on practice of language and act of speaking. It means that writing is still needed for those who could not using English language well because by writing someone could practice and improve her/his language ability. Teacher's written corrective feedback was needed as a teacher's role to guide students' writing and improve their English language skills.

From the research results, the students showed positive responses to teacher's written corrective feedback. All of 16 students thought it was good for the teacher to provide written corrective feedback in their descriptive text. The students described that the teacher's written corrective feedback helped them to know what their mistakes were and how their ability was. It is in line with the statement "the importance of providing feedback is to make the students know where their weakness and where their strength" (Leki, 2006). Moreover, most of the students felt pleased if their descriptive writing errors were corrected by their teacher. They stated that it made them know their scores and made them realize their writing errors so they could fix their next writing tasks. It is supported by Hyland and Hyland (2006) who stated that written corrective feedback is important in writing class to make the students' effort. It means that the effort in understanding their writing errors and the corrections provided would result in better writing. Some of the students were afraid after receiving teacher's written corrective feedback in their writing errors. They said that they were afraid of being scolded by the teacher for their writing errors. One student felt upset for the writing errors, but one other felt worried for the writing errors and the last one said felt confidence for his work whether it was wrong or right. Those students had negative feelings after being given written corrective feedback, but even so, they still liked to have their writing corrected. They just did not like the mistakes they made. This was supported by the statement from one of the students *"saya sedih tetapi saya berharap bisa memperbaiki kesalahan saya"*.

According to Willingham (1990) the essence of providing corrective feedback to students' works is to make them be motivated in writing better. In line with Willingham's statement, the students responded that they were motivated in writing if the teacher gave written corrective feedback. They added that it was because the teacher's written corrective feedback them felt they did not want to give up, they wanted to improve the errors marked by teacher and would avoid the same errors. The rest two students answered that even the teacher gave written corrective feedback to their writings, they still did not feel motivated to write. They did not like to write and thought their writing was always wrong. It happened because the students did not understand the corrections given by the teacher.

Moreover, all of the 16 students preferred to choose the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. Direct written corrective feedback made them easier to find the right answers and made them understand what they should write in the correct form. Direct written corrective feedback is the easiest type of corrective feedback for students, as they can quickly understand it and complete the revision (Ellis, 2008).

After that, there were various students' expectations to teacher's written corrective feedback. Most students wished the teacher always had provided written corrective feedback in their descriptive texts. Redecki and Swales (1988) stated that studies on student attitude showed that many students do like their writing errors to be corrected and may be lethargic if it does not happen. But some of the students wished the teacher's writing mechanism had to be improved including the ink clarity and the precision. The other one student expected that the teacher did not have to give teacher's written corrective feedback, the teacher should have only explained the whole learning material first, in order to make students avoiding the writing errors. And the rest one student said that the teacher should have just given the final score without giving teacher's written corrective feedback in the writing.

According to Ellis (2009) there are three types of corrective feedback: direct, indirect and metalinguistics. Based on the results from the identified students' descriptive texts consisted of teacher's written corrective feedbacks, the researcher discovered that the teacher only provided direct and indirect teacher's written corrective feedbacks and combined both of them in every student descriptive texts. The teacher's using of direct written corrective

feedback was indicated with underlining, circling, and crossing out the writing errors and inserting the correct forms. The provision of the correct language form or structure above or near a linguistic error is referred to as direct corrective feedback (Ferris,2003). Then, in terms of indirect written corrective feedback, the teacher underlined and circled without providing the correct answers in it. Indirect written corrective feedback happened in any of these methods; underline or circle the linguistic errors, write the number of mistakes in the margin, or use code to indicate where the error happened and what type of error it was (Robb, Ross & Shorteed, 1986).

5. Conclusion and Suggestion
5.1 Conclusion

This research focuses on students' affective responses (attitudinal response). It is a response based on emotions, attitudes, and a person's assessment of something. The indication of students' attitudinal responses is the students' inclination to respond positively or negatively to corrective feedback from teachers in foreign language writing. The responses were discovered by using open ended interview with 16 students. There were six questions and four variables asked to the students, such as students' difficulties in writing descriptive text (consisting of 1 question), students'

opinion about the teacher's written corrective feedback (consisting of 3 questions), types of teacher's written corrective feedback (consisting of 1 question), and students' expectation to teacher's written corrective feedback (consisting of 1 question). Then, it was discovered that the students responded positively to teacher's written corrective feedback. They agreed the written corrective feedback being used by the teacher and They do want their writing errors being corrected by the teacher. It is in line with Radeki and Swales (1988) statement who believed feedback is important for teachers to provide since studies on students' attitudes towards feedback found that many students do want the errors in their writing to be corrected.

According to Ellis (2009), there are three types of written corrective feedback, such as direct, indirect, and metalinguistics written corrective feedback. The English teacher of SMP Negeri 1 Tanjung Beringin only used direct and indirect written corrective feedback. In direct written corrective feedback, the teacher underlined, circled, crossed out and arrowed the writing errors made by students and inserted the right one above or near the errors. The teacher just circled and underlined the writing errors without provided the right

linguistic form in indirect written corrective feedback. There were several writing errors which the teacher usually found in students' descriptive text writings including grammatical errors and mechanics of writing (word spelling, punctuation, and capitalization).

5.2 Suggestions

Suggestions are made for those who will interact or have interacted with students' responses to teacher's written corrective feedback. First, the students should be able to take lessons from what happened so that they can avoid the same mistakes in the future. Learning from mistakes is a good thing to do by continuing practice writing. Next, teacher could provide type of written corrective feedback preferred by students. The mechanic of teacher's writing had to be improved as students' wish including the clarity of ink and the accuracy. After that, it is expected to next researchers to conduct research on teacher's corrective feedback at different grade levels and learning topics.

REFERENCES

Badger, R. & White, G. 2000 .*Product, Process and Genre: Approaches to Writing in EAP*. ELT Journal, 2000: 153.

Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. USA: San Francisco State University.

Badger, R. & White, G. 2000 .*Product, Process and Genre: Approaches to Writing in EAP*. ELT Journal, 2000: 153.

Bogdan, Robert C. and Biklen Kopp Sari. 1982. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*.

Bull, Victoria. 2008. *Oxford Learner's Pocket Dictionary*; Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dirgeyasa. I. W. 2016. C*ollage Academic Writing: A Genre Based Perspective.* Jakarta: Kencana.

Ellis, Rod. 2009. *A Typologi of Written Corrective Feedback Types*. Curtin University.

Ellis, Rod. 2008. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York.

Ferris, D. 2003. *Response to Student Writing : Implication for Second Language Students.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fink, Lila et.al. 1983. *A Text for Writing and Reading*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Gerot, L. And Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodeon Educational Enterprises (AEE).

Harmer, J. 2007. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Fourth edition. USA

Hyland, K; Hyland, F. 2006. F*eedback on second language students' writing. Language Teaching*. Copyright © Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. 2006. Negotiating Socioacademic Relations: English Learners' Reception by and Reaction to College Faculty. Tennessee.

Lewis, M. 2002. *Giving feedback in Langauge Classes*. Singapore. SEAMEO Regional Language Center.

Masruri. 2010. *The generic structure of Descriptive text*.

Miles, Mathew B., and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis.* London: Sage.

Nunan, D. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York : Mc Graw Hill.

Nurgiyantoro, Burhan. 2001. P*enilaian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra.* Yogyakarta: BPFE Yogyakarta.

Pardiyono. 2007. *Pasti Bisa*. *Teaching Genre-Based Writing.* Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.

Oshima, A. dan Hogue, A. 1998. *Academic Writing*. Longman.

Radecki, P.M. and Swales, J.M. (1988). *ESL Student Reaction to Written Comments on Their Written Work,* System.

Rao, V. C. S., & Durga, M. V. S. 2018. D*eveloping Students ' Writing Skills in English-A Process Approach.* Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching.

Robb. T., Ross. S., & Shortreed. I., 1986. Salience of Feedback On Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality. TESOL Quarterly.

Gerot, L. And Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodeon Educational Enterprises (AEE).

Srichanyachon, N. 2012. T*eacher Written Feedback for L2 Learners' Writing Development.* Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts.

Willingham, Daniel. B. 1990. *Effective Feedback on Written Assigment*. Harvard University.