

EMPLOYING CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING: FORMS AND BENEFITS

Syaiful Anwar; Susiati

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk 1) mengetahui dan menjelaskan bentuk-bentuk umpan balik korektif yang digunakan guru dalam mengajar menulis di SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo, dan 2) mengetahui dan menjelaskan manfaat penggunaan umpan balik korektif yang digunakan guru dalam mengajar menulis di SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo. Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian deskriptif kualitatif, yaitu mencoba menggambarkan secara detail dan mendalam kondisi yang ditemui pada saat penelitian dilakukan, dan merupakan penelitian kualitatif karena menggambarkan kondisi, situasi dan fenomena sosial yang terjadi pada objek penelitian. belajar. Penelitian ini menggunakan deskriptif kualitatif untuk mendeskripsikan pelaksanaan pembelajaran menulis ilmiah di SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo melalui pemberian umpan balik korektif dari guru. Hasil penelitian menjelaskan bahwa, 1) guru paling sering memberikan umpan balik korektif eksplisit, termasuk metalinguistik, elisitasi, dan umpan balik korektif tidak langsung untuk memfasilitasi pembelajaran menulis karya ilmiah, 2) alasan pemberian umpan balik korektif langsung adalah tingkat kesalahan ejaan, penggunaan kata yang tidak baku, dan penggunaan kata sambung yang kurang tepat, pemberian informasi pembenaran langsung dari guru, serta penyempurnaan koreksi pelajaran menulis, dan 3) dampak pemberian umpan balik korektif langsung antara lain siswa segera mengetahui letak kesalahannya serta pembenaran, pembenaran membuat koreksi lebih terarah, dan menghindari kesalahan lebih lanjut.

Kata Kunci: korektif, umpan balik, pembelajaran, menulis.

Abstract

This study aims to 1) knowing and explaining the forms of corrective feedback are used by teachers in teaching writing at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo, and 2) knowing and explaining benefits of using corrective feedback are taken by teachers in teaching writing at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo. This research is a qualitative descriptive research, which tries to describe in detail and in depth the conditions encountered at the time the research is carried out, and is a qualitative research because it describes the conditions, situations and social phenomena that occur in the object of study. This study uses descriptive qualitative to describe the implementation of scientific writing learning at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo through the provision of corrective feedback from teachers. The results of

the study explained that, 1) teachers most often provide explicit corrective feedback, include metalinguistics, elicitation, and indirect corrective feedback to facilitate learning to write scientific papers, 2) the reasons behind giving direct corrective feedback are the level of spelling errors, the use of non-standard words, and the use of inappropriate conjunctions, providing justification information directly from the teacher, as well as perfecting corrections for writing lessons, and 3) the impact of providing direct corrective feedback, among others, is that students immediately know where their mistakes are as well as justifications, justifications make corrections more focused, and avoid further mistakes.

Keywords: corrective, feedback, learning, writing.

1. INTRODUCTION

English learning as part of the education unit and the government-defined curriculum framework is not separated from the use of strategies and methods in the process of developing potential learners through language sciences. In language learning is required a proper strategy for specific objectives or competencies to be achieved. Writing skills are the most high skill levels for learners as opposed to the other three skills. Writing is a person's language skills that can be gained after mastering all three other language skills. In the process of writing there are constraints experienced by the authors categorized into two, namely internal and external. In general Tompkins and Hoskisson (1995) Both constraints include: (1) The Pramenulis stage, (2) writing drafts, (3) revising, (4) editing, and (5) publishing. Later on, learning to write in class IX Junior High School of them has written material of scientific works. The writing aspect of the scientific work that has the above points is not a matter that can be mastered easily by the learners (Robinson and Holyoak, 2013). The research conducted by Romadlon (2016) shows the number of students who are completed according to the prescribed KKM are 16 learners of 25 learners or 64% of learners who are expressed to reach or exceed the KKM. Thus, it can be inferred that the skills of writing learners are still relatively poor.

This research is oriented on the ability to write scientific works of learners before and after receiving corrective feedback from teachers in the supervision of writing scientific works. The implementation of corrective feedback is backed by the

difficulties experienced by learners in writing scientific works. Therefore, the result of this research is expected an input in learning to write scientific works based on corrective feedback that applied especially in the students IX class of Junior High School 4 Mojosoongo. Based on this it is the author doing a writing by taking the title Employing Corrective Feedback Technique to Improve Students' Writing: Forms and Benefits.

2. METHOD

This research was located at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo, conducted during March that started in the March 2022 to April 2022. This research used qualitative descriptive research methods. This research used qualitative method by describing the implementation of learning to write the scientific work of class IX in SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo through giving corrective feedback from teachers. The research approach used was case studies. This approach aimed to focus on a single point of issue in order to achieve research targets. The main focus on this issue was the ability to write scientific work at students of Class IX SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo. The steps in case study research included (1) drafting research designs by inflating theories and linking with past research, (2) Collecting data with observations, interview and document analysis, (3) data analysis, and (4) Compile the report (Yin, 2015:61). This research used data sources in the form of informanings (informants), events, locations, and documents in the form of learning records writing scientific work in SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo. This research used the technique of taking research subject to purposive sampling, namely sampling for certain considerations. Class IX was conducted in consideration with the students of SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo and the selection of tutoring teachers in class IX English language that applied the giving corrective feedback in the study writing scientific work. The data collection techniques used in this research are interview informant, observation, and analysis of documents or archives. To got valid, reliable, and objective data, research was conducted using valid and reliable instruments, conducted on samples approaching population numbers and data collection and analysis done in the right way (Sugiyono, 2016:117-119). In this

study used triangulation data, triangulation methods, and triangulation theory. This research procedure covers four phases, namely the preparation phase, data collection phase, data analysis phase, and Report preparation phase.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Corrective Feedback Used by Teachers in Teaching Writing at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo

The provision of corrective feedback in learning to write scientific papers which was carried out at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosongo provided benefits for the development of students' skills in the realm of writing scientific papers. Giving corrective feedback is done by the teacher by giving corrections in the form of certain signs in the students' scientific work. In the process of giving corrective feedback to students' scientific work, the teacher does not only provide scribbles and forms of justification, but also asks students to pay attention to the scientific work that has been corrected by the teacher by conducting discussions in class so that it is expected to provide corrective feedback directly from the teacher. does not hinder the activity of students.

If students are not given further action after the teacher corrects their scientific work, then students do not have the opportunity to understand the feedback. Therefore, the teacher conducts discussions in class to discuss the errors that still exist in their scientific work. This is related to Lee & Schallert (in Sumarwati, et al., 2017) suggesting that if students are only given direct feedback without further action or discussion, it will inhibit students from learning actively and creatively because they do not have the opportunity to use feedback. the teacher. This study uses corrective feedback forms from Lyster, et al (2017) which classifies giving feedback in seven forms, including;

- a. Explicit Corrective Feedback or explicit correction refers to an explicit provision of the correct form. The teacher gives the correct form to clearly show the students' mistakes,
- b. Recast or rearrange involves teacher reformulation of all or part of student writing, minus errors,

- c. Clarification Feedback or requests for clarification indicate to students that their writing was misunderstood by the teacher or that the writing was not structured in a certain way and a reformulation was needed. This is a form of feedback that can be referred to in either understanding, accuracy, or both,
- d. Metalinguistic Feedback or metalinguistic input contains comments, information, or questions related to the formation of students' writing, without explicitly providing the correct form.
- e. Elicitation Feedback or elicitation refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly generate the correct form of learners.
- f. Repeatability Feedback or repetition, feedback that refers to the teacher's repetition in isolation from students who make mistakes in speech or writing.
- g. Translation Feedback or translation input that involves a detailed correction process.

Based on the research data, corrections were obtained from the teacher containing the forms of corrective feedback used, namely direct and indirect corrective feedback. Direct corrective feedback or direct corrective feedback is the provision of corrections in which the teacher includes a form of justification for errors made by students. Meanwhile, indirect corrective or indirect corrective feedback is giving teacher corrections without showing the form of justification.

Based on the findings of the case study research at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoong, the researchers found forms of giving corrective feedback, among others. Direct corrective feedback which consists of explicit feedback, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation of feedback and indirect corrective feedback. The following is a description of the form of corrective feedback found.

3.1.1 Explicit corrective feedback

Explicit corrective feedback tells students that there are errors in their writing. The teacher provides feedback directly (explicitly) or other direct information as a form of giving justification, such as giving certain marks, inserting letters as giving justification, and writing the form of justification in its entirety. This is in accordance with Lyster (2017) in his research saying that "Feedback is in the form telling the student that the response was incorrect and providing the correct response or other

direct information, expecting the uptake to occur, based on this information. A feedback technique that involves a teacher simply providing a student with the correct answer, gives information about the incorrect utterance (such as provision of a rule).”

3.1.2 Metalinguistic feedback or metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback occurs when the teacher shows students that there is an error in their writing, but does not give the correct form so that the teacher makes comments or raises questions that show students that there is an error in the language output. In his findings Lyster (2017) reveals “Feedback that involves the teacher indicating to the student that there is an error, but not providing him or her with the correct response. Involves a teacher making comments or indicating to the student that there is an error in the language output”.

Giving corrective feedback in the form of metalinguistic input from the data found, such as giving questions that arise due to errors in the writing of the word "negative". The teacher does not give the correct form frankly but adds words and question marks at showing students that there is an error in writing the word "negative". In addition to questions from the teacher as an indication that there was an error in writing the word "negative", the teacher also commented on the location of an inappropriate conjunction. Falhasiri (2017) shows that explicit metalinguistic feedback works better with some categories and interlanguage errors better than others.

3.1.3 Elicitation feedback or elicitation feedback

Elicitation feedback is carried out by the teacher by strategically pausing the form of justification. It is intended that students continue the teacher's paused statement or ask students to fill in statements that have not been completed by the teacher. The correction is a technique used by teachers to directly produce the correct form of students.

In line with research conducted by Lyster (2017) that “Feedback that involves the teacher strategically pausing when getting to the student's error and providing him or her with clues for self correction. A feedback type when teachers ask for completion of their own sentence by pausing and allowing students to correct themselves; they may

also questions to elicit correct form and help students to reformulate an ill-formed utterance. Gives part of correct response or stabilized in a different medium". Writing corrections with pauses is more effective for teachers, as in the findings above the teacher asks students not to abbreviate "etc" so that they are justified by writing down the abbreviation of "etc" but not completed by the teacher "and others.. ". The provision of elicitation feedback such as the following makes the teacher more effective because there is no need to write down justifications to completion. In the KI-1 data several times, students wrote non-standard word forms, namely the word "system" so that the teacher provided elicitation corrections to justify but not completely, the justification was written by writing the description "sist..." next to the word "system". ". next to the word "system". ". next to the word "system".

3.1.4 Giving indirect corrective feedback

Giving indirect corrections actually also aims to show students that there are errors in the composition of their writing. Based on research conducted by Hyland (in Baleghizadeh, 2017) indirect correction refers to encouragement to students regarding the location of the error. Providing indirect feedback on research data is in line with Lee's (2014) research which suggests that indirect feedback is provided when the teacher points out the location of an error by underlining, highlighting, or circling the wrong word on the student's worksheet without giving the correct forms. In giving indirect corrective feedback, the teacher needs to leave a scribble or mark on the error section. Then, students need to identify errors and correct themselves.

3.2 Benefits Of Using Corrective Feedback Are Taken By Teachers In Teaching Writing At Smp Negeri 4 Mojosongo

The provision of corrective feedback was directly motivated by the level of spelling errors, the use of non-standard words, and the use of inappropriate conjunctions, providing justification information directly from the teacher, as well as perfecting corrections for writing lessons. The reasons that influence the provision of indirect corrective feedback are more efficient teacher time, repeated word errors, teachers trust students to understand the meaning of marking, and measure students' understanding. Research conducted by Sumarwati (in Ariningsih, 2016) c found that in the general the

writing organization in students' essays still showed illogical reasoning, and there were many language errors which included the use of spelling, diction, sentences, and there were some similar writings, or similar.

Haryanto's research (in Sumarwati, 2016) concluded that one of the factors causing students to use non-standard words was because the teacher never gave feedback as a correction. Giving corrective feedback is also motivated to measure the success of students in understanding the material for writing scientific papers. In addition to the teacher providing written corrections to scientific papers, providing corrective feedback makes students active in discussions of learning to write scientific papers. The impact of giving direct corrective feedback, among others, is that students immediately know the form of justification for their writing errors, justification makes corrections more focused, and avoids mistakes in subsequent writing. a,

Giving feedback requires students to find improvements in their writing based on feedback that has been given by the teacher so that they get used to being independent in learning. In line with research conducted by Hidayati (2016) that the learning process by providing this feedback can also give participants the opportunity to develop and make them independent learners. Providing corrective feedback makes the learning atmosphere more focused. There was a communicative discussion between the teacher and students regarding the writing errors in the students' first scientific work. Through the provision of corrective feedback, it encourages students to continue to actively pay attention to learning in the form of error correction of students' scientific work.

In line with Warsono's opinion (2016) that active learning is simply defined as a teaching method that involves students actively in the learning process. The activeness of students in learning makes a meaningful learning experience with critical thinking about the learning material. On the other hand, the teacher needs a lot of time to make direct corrections so that indirect feedback is chosen to make the teacher's time more efficient and know the students' understanding in writing. Corrective feedback is very important and has a positive effect on students' writing. Giving corrective

feedback is a means that can be chosen to assist students in improving their previous scientific work.

Another benefit that can be obtained by students through the provision of corrective feedback is that students are able to remember every mistake and its justification so that it directly improves their writing skills. This is in line with the opinion of Ferris (2017) that the corrective feedback given by the teacher leads to the development of students' writing skills.

The activity of observing scientific work learning by providing corrective feedback also obtained information that the teacher had carried out targeted learning. By giving corrections, students feel that they get more attention. In the core learning activities, the teacher has invited students to be active in learning and implement activities of observing, asking, trying, reasoning, associating, and communicating. Thus, the ongoing learning becomes more effective with better results. Hidayat (2018) says that an effective learning pattern is a learning pattern in which there is a two-way interaction between teachers and students. Teachers are not always the dominant party in learning even though all are aware that the teacher's job is as a facilitator in schools.

4. CLOSING

Based on the results of research findings and discussions regarding the provision of corrective feedback in the guidance of writing scientific papers at SMP Negeri 4 Mojosoongo, it can be concluded as follows. Explicit corrective feedback tells students that the answer is wrong and is given the correct form or other direct information. Metalinguistic corrective feedback occurs when the teacher shows students that there is an error, but does not give the correct response to him so that the teacher makes a question or comment indicating to the student that there is an error in the language output. Corrective feedback elicitation is done by the teacher by strategically pausing his statement. It is intended that students continue the teacher's paused statement or ask students to fill in statements that have not been completed by the teacher. Then, indirect corrective feedback is given by the teacher through a special sign without being accompanied by a justification so that students are asked to identify the error.

The reasons behind giving direct corrective feedback are the level of spelling errors, the use of non-standard words, and the use of inappropriate conjunctions, providing justification information directly from the teacher, as well as perfecting corrections for writing lessons. The factors that influence the provision of indirect corrective feedback are more efficient teacher time, repeated mistakes in writing words, and teachers trusting students to understand the meaning of marking, and measuring students' understanding in learning to write scientific papers.

The impact of providing direct corrective feedback, among others, is that students immediately know where their mistakes are as well as justifications, justifications make corrections more focused, and avoid further mistakes. Meanwhile, the impact of providing indirect corrective feedback is that the correction time is more efficient and knows the students' understanding in writing. However, in terms of the content of students' scientific works, it is still necessary to increase book references to perfect scientific works.

REFERENCES

- Aslinda dan Leni Syafyahya. 2007. *Pengantar Sociolinguistik*. Bandung: Refika Aditama
- Azwar, Saifudin. 2012. *Reliabilitas dan Validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar
- Brown, D. H. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Brown, Douglas. 2008. *Prinsip Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran Bahasa*. Jakarta: Person Education
- Chaer dan Agustina. 2004. *Sociolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ellis, Rod. 2009. Corrective Feedback And Teacher Development. *L2 Journal Vol. 1* (2009). *University of California*.
- Ellis, Rod., Loewen, Shawn., & Erlam, Rosemary. 2006. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition* 28 339-368. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Iskandarwassid 2013. *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Bandung: PT Remaja.
- Kartchava, Eva., & Ammar Ahlem. 2014. The noticeability and effectiveness of corrective feedback in relation to target type. *Language Teaching Research* 2014, Vol 18 (4) 428-452. *ltr.sagepub.com*.
- Keraf, Gorys. 2010. *Diksi dan Gaya Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Ikrar Mandiri Abadi
- Kim, Ji Hyun. 2004. Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol 4, No.2. Columbia University*.

- Kosasih, Hermawan. 2012. *Ketatabahasaan dan Kesusastraan*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti. 2008. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama
- Mahsun. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Moleong, Lexy J. 2000. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakayara.
- Muslich, M. 2009. *KTSP Pembelajaran Berbasis Kompetensi dan Kontekstual*. Bumi aksara. Jakarta.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1987. *Ilmu Pragmatik: Teori dan Penerapannya*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Ngalimun. 2014. *Strategi dan Model Pembelajaran*. Aswaja Pressindo. Yogyakarta.
- Prayitno. 2009. *Dasar Teori dan Praksis Pendidikan*. Grasindo. Jakarta.
- Purwanto. 2008. *Evaluasi Hasil Belajar*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Putrayasa, Ida Bagus. 2010. *Kalimat Efektif (Diksi, Struktur, dan Logika)*. Bandung: Refika Aditama
- Riyanto, Y. 2001. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. SIC. Surabaya.
- Rohmadi, Muhammad, dan N, Yakub. 2010. *Paragraf Pengembangan & Implementasi*. Yogyakarta: Media perkasa
- Solihatini, Etin dan Raharjo. 2007. *Cooperatif Learning Analisis Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sufanti, Main. 2010. *Pedagogi Khusus Bidang Studi Bahasa & Sastra*. Surakarta: Badan Penerbit FKIP-UMS.
- Sugiyono, 2012. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tarigan, H. G. 2015. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.