THE EFFECT OF TEACHER'S WRITTEN FEEDBACKS ON INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS' RECOUNT WRITING COMPETENCE

Marwito Wihadi
Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia
Email: m_wihadi@yahoo.com

Ine Martiana
Department of English Education, University of Kuningan, Indonesia
Email: inemartiana@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: This paper investigated the effect of teacher's written feedbacks in recount writing competence and the students' attitudes towards written feedbacks. Giving written feedbacks helps students to decrease their errors and gives guidance in writing as a beginner writer. This study employed a quantitaive and qualitative research design. The experimental group given written feedbacks. For measuring the effect of written feedbacks, a pretest and posttest was administered to both group. Meanwhile, for getting their attitudes toward teacher's written feedbacks was administered questionnaire and open-ended interview. Based on the data, teacher's written feedbacks gave positive effects on their improvement in recount writing competence. The result of questionnaire and interview showed that students got real guidance and special attention individually in their writing process as a beginner writer.
Keywords: *written feedbacks, recount writing competence, attitudes.*

INTRODUCTION

English Foreign Language learners learn English as integrated process that needs appropriate guidance in order to balance the all of skills. Everyone has agreed that four skills including reading, listening, speaking and writing should be well-balanced for learners' actual language development. In this present study, writing skill will become a major focus. Harmer (2001) assumed that written text has a number of conventions which separate it out from speaking. Apart from differences in grammar and vocabulary, there are issues of letter, words, and text formation, layout and pronunciation. It means that in writing competence there are a lot of aspects that should be achieved.

Brown (2000) revealed "Foreign language contexts are those in which student do not have ready-made context for communication beyond their class room". It means that foreign language learners are not easy to put and generate their ideas directly in writing form. Their effort must be made to create some opportunities. Such as special media, special treatment from the teacher and so on.

Hyland (2003) cited in Hyland & Hyland (2006) affirmed that teacher written feedbacks are substantial comments on papers to provide a reader reaction to students' efforts, to help them improve as writers and to justify the grade they have been given. Gulcat and Ozagac (2006) also revealed "the most important aspect while giving feedback is adopting a positive attitude to the students writing". So, when the teacher only highlights the all of mechanical errors, the students will be hard to correct the errors because they become discourage to revise their writing task.

Duppenthaler (2002) lists that there are three types of written feedbacks: (1) meaning-focused feedback, in which he engaged in an ongoing and cumulative, interactive dialog, providing commentary on the content, suggesting future topics, and asking for additional information and

clarification; (2) Positive comments, in which he responded with phrases such as "well done," "keep up the good work" and "keep writing," and with occasional short positive comments on the content, but did not engage in an ongoing interactive dialog, or ask for additional information and clarification; and (3). Error-focused feedback, in which he corrected all errors, in red ink, in the participants' journal entries with no revision required on the part of the participants.

In teaching and learning writing, feedback becomes a tool for measure our quality and the accuracy. In EFL learners, they still lack in understanding and cannot comment their or the others work. It because EFL learners still need a real guidance that is teachers' responses on their writing task. Although, responding to and commenting on student writing consumes the largest proportion of teachers' time. Specifically, however, we comment on student writing because we believe that it is necessary for us to offer assistance to student writers.

Williams (2003: 101) affirmed that there are three major innovations in the process approach in improving students writing: (a) Asking students to write often, (b) Providing frequent feedback on work in progress, (c) Requiring numerous revisions based on that feedback. Those three factors involved in student-centered Instruction. So, that why the researcher interested in providing written feedback on their writing progress and let them revise the feedback individually.

While, Wilson (2009: 96) argued that "giving feedback is a key to successful development of potential, increasing motivation and assessment. Feedback is part of learning process, because it tells the learners how they are doing". It means that feedback has crucial effect in learning process. That is not only in their writing achievement but also in their attitude.

This study seeks the effect of written feedbacks on students' writing recount competence and students' attitude towards teacher's written feedbacks. In getting the data in score form the researcher conducts two times of treatments to the experimental group. Besides that, to know the students' attitude towards the teacher written feedbacks the researcher gives a questionnaire and interview.

METHOD

This study employed a mixed-method research. Quantitative and qualitative researches are employed to get the data needed. The experimental research design with pretest-treatment and posttest used to get the data. Four meetings held for pretest-two times of treatments-posttest which done during two weeks. The treatments are teacher's written feedbacks on their writing recount competence.

The participants of this study were 40 students of class X IIS 1 and X IIS 3 in one of Senior High School in Darma. The aims of the test are to evaluate the students' background knowledge and the treatments' effects toward students' improvement in their writing recount competence. Meanwhile, in getting students' attitudes the researcher given questionnaire and open-ended interview after tests were done. The questionnaire given in Indonesian, it consists of ten questions adopted from Chen & Hamp-Lyons (1999: 216) and Lee (2008: 163). The five open-ended questions also given to some of sample. The question delivered in Indonesian. There is no different learning process between experimental and control class. The difference is the treatment only. Experimental class received teacher's written feedbacks on their writing tasks. The researcher corrected their errors on each text. The results of each test were calculated to see their improvements.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

All scores were computed to analyze the data. A technique such independent t-test is used to compare the output of the two tests (pretest and posttest). In order to answer the first research question, independent sample t-test regarding the experimental and the control class was calculated first. As Table 1 displays, both experimental and control class had almost the same significance on the

pretest and there was no significant difference between the two groups.

As the findings in Table 2 show, there was a highly significant difference between the experimental and control class in the posttest-pretest total gain scores (t_{table} = 4.838, sig > 0.005). The result shows an increase from the pretest to the posttest and improvement in learning occurred more significantly in the experimental class and control class. Thus, the experimental class performed significantly better the control class by showing significantly higher gain score from the pretest and posttest.

Table 1. *Independent sample t-test related to both groups' performances on the pretest*

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference		Lower	Upper

Table 2. *Independent sample t-test related to both groups' performances on posttest*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post1	Equal variances assumed	4.525	.040	4.838	37	.000	16.068	3.321	9.339	22.798
Post2	Equal variances not assumed			4.891	32.607	.000	16.068	3.285	9.382	22.755

One outstanding factor which made both classes different was teacher's written feedbacks. The control class less, even never received written feedbacks on their writing process in this study, compared with the written feedbacks or experimental class. This is a welcome development by many as it shows the direction in which written feedback becomes guidance for their writing process as a beginner.

The main purposes of this research is to know the effect of giving feedback in students' recount writing competence. The data of students' recount writing successfully collected through test. After the writer analyzed the data, the writer found that this research or t_{test} > t_{table} the result is 4.838 > -2.336. It means that there is different significance between pretest and posttest score in experimental class. So, written feedbacks have positive effect in improving students' recount writing competence.

The students' attitudes toward the teacher's written feedbacks were collected from two major ways. Those are questionnaire and interview. The two ways conducted to get the real and valid information toward the teacher's written feedbacks on their writing task.

With regard to the second question, it can be stated that experimental class expressed satisfaction about the positive effect of the teacher's written feedbacks. They stated that the treatment is very useful for their writing process and their understanding about how to compose a good

recount text. They also revealed that teacher's written feedbacks becomes a special contact with the teacher were all really beneficial and motivating to them to correct their mistakes.

Written feedbacks prevent the students from being discouraged and the students become more enthusiastic in learning recount writing. The responses of students have a good response towards teacher's written feedback for students' recount writing competence. It is shown from the result questionnaire's answer from students. Although, it is only half of them understand what the entire comment. But more than half of them can correct the errors. It can be seen in their result of post test that experimental class got higher means score than control class. The result of interview indicates that teacher written feedbacks had good effect in their writing recount competence. All of them agree they could enhance their errors writing after received written feedbacks. They do not need much time to correct their mistakes. They assert it is very useful for them as a beginner writer. All of them agree if their English teachers also apply this method in the future.

Based on the interviewing, the researcher gets viewpoints towards the students' attitudes on the written feedbacks. Generally, students understand towards teacher's written feedback but still confused to understand red marks, or circle marks. Although the students do not understand the whole written comment, they asserted that the written feedbacks are very useful for their comprehending in their process of writing. They are more easy to understand the meaning-focused feedbacks such suggestion than error-focused feedbacks such red ink. Because writing learning needs much time and more attention so three students of five get easy to feel bored. But all of them realize that teacher's written feedbacks are very useful for their improvement in writing learning process. Eventually, they agree if their English teacher especially can apply this method in the future with creatively teaching learning.

Eventually, there are many positive effects of written feedbacks for their writing competence in EFL learners. Analysis of the data has indicated that there is a positive relationship between the usage of written feedbacks and improvement of writing competence achievement.

CONCLUSION

Based on the objectives of research, the researcher undertook the present study to determine the effect of teacher's written feedbacks for EFL learners in improving recount writing competence. This was done by comparing the improvement gained by the experimental class. Both classes were given writing tasks at the low level of intermediate level.

The analysis revealed that the improvement obtained by two groups were, to a certain degree, different. The number of students' errors in certain aspects was decreased as students worked with written feedbacks. Most students declared that written feedbacks have many beneficial effects in their writing process. Although, the positive effects of written feedbacks on their writing tasks are concerned, it is necessary to conduct further research involving other subjects within the context of EFL learning. It is nevertheless to be expected that these findings will be beneficial to EFL learners.

Finding of the study showed that the use of giving feedbacks enhancing students' achievement in writing. There are many reason why giving written feedbacks is advantageous for students and teacher in education. First, by giving written feedbacks students realize their mistakes and their misunderstanding and finally they can decrease their mistakes. Secondly, through written feedbacks, teacher easily to interact with each student individually with each needed. So, teacher's written feedbacks can take place between a teacher and student (group of students) over writing tasks is not limited to the confines of a classroom.

Finally, giving written feedbacks also give individual attention to the students. Teacher gives revision and suggestion in certain assignment due to the particular

procedure, teacher also free in revise their mistakes in each students without disturbing the other students' focus.

References

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principle. An interactive approach to language pedagogy: Second Edition*. San Francisco: Longman

Duppenthaler, P. M. (2002). Feedback and Japanese high school English language. *JALT Journal*, *24*(2).

Eagly, A.H & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes: Fort worth.* Texas: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1–10.

Fraenkel, J. R & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, inc.

Giorgi, A. (1975). An application of phenomenological method in psychology. In A. Giorgi, C.T Fischer, & F. Murray (Eds.), *Duquesne studies in phenomenological psychology*, II (pp. 82-103). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Gulcat, Z & Ozagac, O. (2006). Correcting and giving feedback to writing. Bogazici: University SFL

Hamp-Lyons, L & Chen, J. (1999). *An investigation into the effectiveness of teacher feedback on student writing. English language teaching and learning.* The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Cambridge: Longman

Hattie, J. & Helen, T. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81-112.DOI: 31021003465430298487

Hornby, A. S. (1995). Oxford advance learner's dictionary of current English: Fifth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyland, K & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, *39*(2), 83-101.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Jayathilake, C. (2013). Correcting errors: The relative efficacy of different forms of error feedback in second language writing. *English Review*: *Journal of English Education, (1)*2, 136-152.

Koentjaraningrat. (1990). *Metode-metode penelitian masyarakat*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* California: SAGE Publication.

Lee, I. (2007). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 144-164. DOI:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.12.001

Marczyk, G. R., DeMatteo, D. & Festinger, D. (2005). *Essential of research design and methodology*. Canada: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Munawaroh, M. (2014). *Analisis literasi kuantitatif siswa SMA dalam konsep pertumbuhan dan perkembangan tumbuhan.* Bandung: UPI. Retrieved from http//repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

Oskamp, S & Schultz, P.W. (2005). *Attitudes and opinions: Third edition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Priyatno, D. (2009). *5 jam belajar olah data dengan SPSS 17*. Yogyakarta: C.V Andi.

Rassaei, E & Moinzadeh. (2011). Investigating the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English Wh-question forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching 4*(2).

Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development. Silpakorn *University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, 12*(1), 7-17.

Sugiyono. (2012). *Metode penelitian pendidikan: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*(2), 327- 369.

Wahidi, R. (2008). *Genre of texts*. Retrieved from http://rachmatwahidi.wordpress.com.

Williams, J.D. (2003). *Preparing to teach writing: Research, theory, and practice*. United State of America: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Wilson, L. (2009). *Practical teaching: A guide to PTLLS & DTLLS*. Canada: Cengage Learning EMEA.