

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the researcher presents some theories related to Written Corrective Feedback and writing. It consists of writing and its process, the roles of teacher in writing, essay writing, Written Corrective Feedback and previous study.

A. Writing

Writing is one and the last of the four skills besides listening, speaking and reading. Writing is one of activity in certain skills in learning as Nation (2009:113) states that writing is an activity that can usefully be prepared for by work in other skills of listening, speaking and reading. As Hamp-Lyons and Kroll (1997:8) state that writing is an act that takes place within a context, that accomplishes a particular purpose, and that is appropriately shaped for its intended audience. Meanwhile based on Brown (2001:331) writing is a thinking process, writing can be planned and given many revision before the work release. So, writing is usefully be prepared for by work and writing allows students to learn in gathering idea and know what appropriate one for intended audience. Because writing is a thinking process that can be planned and given revisions before the work release to get good writing.

1. The Process of Writing

The writing process is a collection of activities in creating a written work of ideas. However, it steps often similar according to several author and sometimes little bit different inside. The process of writing is

recursive, which means “going back and forth.” In this respect, writing is like reading. If we do not understand what we have read, we back up and read it again.

The writing process consists of several stages based on expert, sometimes they give different name on certain stages but actually the point already same. Here researcher collected some theories based on several experts. The first writing process according Langan (2009:17) and Anker (2010:105) state if writing a paper is a process which can be divided into prewriting, drafting, revising and editing. It process already same with Kendall and Khuon (2006:4) but from them there is additional process called publishing. Then, Brandon & Brandon (2011:31-32) state that writing process consists of a set of strategies that will help writer proceeds from idea or purpose to the final statement of a paragraph or an essay, their stages are completely same with Langan stage` before. The other writing process comes from Kristine Brown and Susan Hood (1993:6) state only three main stages of the writing process which without editing stages. From all theories above the writing process that can be divided into:

a. Prewriting

This think of an interesting topic or a point to make about our topic or we may have trouble coming up with specific details to support our point. The five techniques that will help us think about and develop a

topic and get words on paper: (1) free-writing, (2) questioning, (3) making a list, (4) clustering, and (5) preparing a scratch outline.

b. Writing the first draft (drafting)

Instead, make goal to state our main idea clearly and develop the content of our paragraph with plenty of specific details. Teachers do not want to take time correcting words or sentences that students may decide to remove later.

c. Revising

Revising means that we rewrite a paragraph or paper, building upon what has already been done in order to make it stronger. Write additional thoughts and changes above the lines or in the margins of our paper. Our written comments can serve as a guide when we work on the next draft. Revising is taking another look at our ideas to make them clearer, stronger, and more convincing. When revising, we are evaluating how well we have made our point. There are two stages to the revision process: 1. Revising content and 2. Revising sentences

d. Editing and proofreading

The next-to-last major stage in the writing process is editing—checking a paper for mistakes in grammar, punctuation, usage, and spelling. Students often find it hard to edit a paper carefully. Furthermore, as we get into the habit of checking our papers, we will also get into the habit of using sentence skills consistently. Editing is finding and correcting problems with grammar style, word choice and

usage, and punctuation. When editing, we are evaluating the words and phrases we have used.

e. Publishing

Publishing offers writers opportunities to take their writing out into the world. There is a wide variety of ways to motivate writers to publish.

In line with this there is Nation (2009:114-115) states that one way of focusing attention on different aspects of writing is to look at writing as a process. One possible division of the writing process contains the following seven sub-processes:

a. Considering the goals of the writer

Written work is usually done for a purpose and for a particular audience. Once again, an important way of encouraging writers to keep their goals and audience in mind is to provide them with feedback about the effectiveness of their writing.

b. Having a model of the reader

Teachers should also check their writing programme to make sure that learners are given practice in writing for a range of purposes to a range of readers.

c. Gathering ideas

Leibman-Kleine (1987) suggests that techniques for gathering ideas about a topic can be classified into three groups. First group consists of open-ended, free-ranging activities where all ideas are

considered or the learners follow whatever path their mind takes: brainstorming and quick-writing. The second group consists of systematic searching procedures such as questioning (who, why, where, when). The third group consists of techniques which help learners gather and organize ideas at the same time. These include using tree diagrams and concept diagrams or maps.

d. Organising ideas

The way learners organise ideas gives them a chance to put their own point of view and their own thought into their writing, particularly in writing assignments and answering examination questions.

e. Turning ideas into written text

Some learners are able to say what they want to write but have difficulty in putting it into written form. That is, they have problems in translating their ideas into text.

f. Reviewing what has been written

This is done to check what ideas have already been included in the writing, to keep the coherence and flow of the writing, to stimulate further ideas, and to look for errors.

g. Editing

Editing involves going back over the writing and making changes to its organisation, style, grammatical and lexical correctness, and appropriateness. Learners can be encouraged to edit through the

feedback that they get from their classmates, teacher and other readers. Such feedback is useful if it occurs several times during the writing process and is expressed in ways that the writer finds acceptable and easy to act on.

Still in the same subtopic, there is Hyland (2004:11) states the basic model of writing that has been elaborated to further describe what goes on at each stage of the process and to integrate cognitive with social factors more centrally: Selection of topic: by teacher and/or students. Prewriting: brainstorming, collecting data, note taking, outlining, etc. Composing: getting ideas down on paper. Response to draft: teacher/peers respond to ideas, organization, and style. Revising: reorganizing, style, adjusting to readers, refining ideas. Response to revisions: teacher/peers respond to ideas, organization, and style. Proofreading and editing: checking and correcting form, layout, evidence, etc. Evaluation: teacher evaluates progress over the process. Publishing: by class circulation or presentation, noticeboards, Website, etc. Follow-up tasks: to address weaknesses.

From the several explanations above, it can be concluded that the most common process of writing consists of prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. Since the current approach in teaching writing is process approach, it is important not to see writing as a product anymore but more pay attention to the process of the writing. By considering the process of the writing, the student writers have advantages to re-plan, re-draft, and re-edit their writing because the process of writing is recursive. From all stages,

one that most take concern in giving written corrective feedback is on the revision stages then the draft editing as the correction itself, so the draft will be a good writing product.

2. The Roles of the Teacher in Teaching Writing

Teachers have the important role in teaching writing that all in one purpose is to help students in writing process. The teachers have roles that classify in several categories. One of it according to Brown (2001:340) states that the role of teacher must be one of facilitator and coach, not an authoritative director and arbiter. This facilitative role of the writing teacher has inspired research on the role of the teacher as a responder to students` writing. The teachers also offers guidance in helping students to engage in the thinking process but in a spirit of respect for students opinion, must not impose his or her own thoughts on students writing. The other roles states by Harmer (2007:330) that teacher has usual roles that are important are as follows:

a. Motivator

Teacher should motivate students, creating the right conditions for the generation of ideas, persuading them of the usefulness of the activity and encouraging them to make as much effort as possible for maximum benefit.

b. Resource

During more extend writing task, teacher should be ready to supply necessary information and language. Teacher should tell the student that they are available and be prepared to look students' work as it progresses. The teacher should offer advice and suggestions need in constructive and wise way

c. Feedback provider

Teacher should respond positively and encouragingly to the content of what the students have written. In giving feedback on writing tasks, its demands special care by the teacher. When offering correction, teacher should choose what and how much to focus on, based on what the student need at this particular stage of their studies on the tasks they have undertaken.

d. Monitoring

The teacher`s role while activities is to monitor. This include making sure that all the learner know what to do and are actively participating, and also making a note on how succesfully the learners are communicating (Hadfield and Hadfield 2011:150).

So it can concluded that the roles of teacher the roles of the teacher in teaching writing is being a facilitator to guide the students in process of writing. However, it must be involved by some motivations to the students so that the learning become meaningful and fun. In addition, the teacher must be understood with students progress that is why it needs the feedback and

respond positively on students tasks and also monitoring them continuously. Those are what teacher should do in teaching writing.

3. The Essay Writing

There are so many various kind of writing. One of the kind of writing that common learn in university is essay writing. The essay writing itself based on Langan (2009:127) states that an essay is simply a paper composed of several paragraphs, rather than one paragraph. In an essay, subjects can and should be treated more fully than they would be in a single-paragraph paper. The main idea or point developed in an essay is called the *thesis statement* or *thesis sentence* (rather than, as in a paragraph, the *topic sentence*). The thesis statement appears in the introductory paragraph, and it is then developed in the supporting paragraphs that follow. A short concluding paragraph closes the essay.

The other definition of essay writing come from Brandon & Brandon (2011:83) states the essay defined in relation to the developmental paragraph. The essay is as difficult to define as the paragraph, but the paragraph definition gives us a framework. The definition of developmental paragraph “is a group of sentences, each with the function of supporting a controlling idea called the topic sentence.” The main parts of the developmental paragraph are the topic sentence (subject and focus), support (evidence and reasoning), and, often, a concluding sentence.

Now let's use that framework to define the essay: The essay is a group of paragraphs or simply a paper composed of several paragraphs each with the function of supporting a controlling idea called the thesis. Besides the definition essay writing has some parts inside of it. These are the main parts of the essay: Introduction, Development and Conclusion. The other parts also mentioned by Anker (2009:145) but with different names, not parts but called forms. The forms of essay writing are: Introductory Paragraph, First Supporting Paragraph, Second Supporting Paragraph, Third Supporting Paragraph and Concluding Paragraph.

So they are several parts or forms based on the explanation above. The simple part of essay writing is introduction and conclusion. For the complete form begin from introductory paragraph, first until third supporting paragraph and concluding paragraph. After the definition and the parts of essay writing, there are different kinds of essays that states by Anker (2009:147) are: 1) Narration essay, 2) Illustration, 3) Description, 4) Process analysis, 5) Classification, 6) Definition essay, 7) Comparison and Contrast writing, 8) Cause and Effect, and the last 9) Argument essay.

From all the explanation above the conclusion from essay writing are first the definition of essay is a group of paragraphs or simply a paper composed of several paragraphs each with the function of supporting a controlling idea called the thesis. Besides the definition it has some parts inside of it. These are the main parts of the essay: The simple part of essay writing is introduction and conclusion. The last is the various kinds

of essay from narration, illustration, description, process analysis, classification, definition, comparison contrast, cause effect, and argument.

B. Feedback

1. The Nature of Feedback

Feedback can also take the form of correction, which can be done in several ways. It is sometimes best to correct students immediately (as soon as they make the mistake) and sometimes best to wait until after they have finished speaking and writing. According to Amara (2015) Feedback occurs when two parties engage in an instructional procedure in which one side is viewed as a knowledge giver and the other as a knowledge receiver of the subject matter. Han (2001) defined feedback as a two-way interdependent process, in which both parties are information providers; and negotiate a new identity. Hattie and Timperley (2007) define feedback as information provided by an agent regarding one's performance or understanding of instructions.

In other words, feedback is employed to reduce discrepancies between current understandings and performance, and an expected goal. Feedback allows for a comparison between one's actual outcome and a desired outcome based on standards of performance (Mory, 2004). Feedback occurs more often when there is a single correct form, action, or performance desired by the feedback provider. Written corrective feedback

is intended to improve writing accuracy and is one of the essential and challenging tasks of classroom instruction. Lalande (1982) defines written feedback as “any procedure used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong”.

One of the definitions of CF found in the literature provided by Chaudron (1977) that cited by Buffa (2016) in his work, the author developed a model for the description of error correction and corrective interactions. Chaudron (1977: 31) understood CF as ‘any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance’. Lightbown and Spada (2006) explained CF as the teacher’s input which signals that the student’s use of the target language contains a grammatical inaccuracy or fails in the act of communication. Then definition of CF is to understand written corrective feedback as feedback from the part of the teacher to improve learners’ grammatical appropriateness when communicating through the written medium.

Based on definition above, it can be concluded that corrective feedback is ‘any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance’, from teacher’s input which signals that the student’s use of the target language contains a grammatical inaccuracy or fails in the act of communication. Feedback occurs more often when there is a single correct form, action, or performance desired by the feedback provider. Written

corrective feedback is intended to improve writing accuracy and is one of the essential and challenging tasks of classroom instruction.

2. The Sources of Feedback

There are various ways of organizing feedback on writing, including feedback from the teacher, feedback from other learners, and self-reflection and feedback by the writer (Nation, 2009:122). Amara (2015) also states in general, the feedback provider not only is an instructor or peer, but can also be a parent, oneself, a book, and/or experience. Parent feedback on school work might also provide both information and encouragement (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In a teaching and learning context, WCF refers to the classroom practice in which students receive corrections on their writing products. This procedure involves a teacher, students, and peers. Meanwhile according to Bitchener and Ferris (2010:144) classroom teachers are typically the key provider of written CF. It is generally assumed that teachers have the required knowledge to (1) identify where errors have occurred, (2) provide effective feedback on linguistic errors, and (3) deliver it in a clear and meaningful manner. It is also assumed that teachers have had sufficient training and experience to know what works best for individual learners, as well as for groups or classes of learners. However, this may not always be the case. Some teachers are well trained while others are less well trained or, in fact, not trained at all. The linguistic knowledge base of teachers can sometimes

be less than adequate, meaning that some teachers may not be able to provide accurate feedback on a range of error types.

The learners themselves certainly expect their teachers to have the level and depth of knowledge required to give them appropriate feedback. Some learners may have higher expectations of their teachers than others and expect them to provide written CF on all of their written errors. Nevertheless, most learners understand that there are times when written CF is appropriate and times when it is not because attention needs to be given to other aspects of their writing.

The WCF sources also states by to Ellis and Shintani (2014) which cited by Buffa (2016) that addresses the issue of authorship in correction. There are three choices are possible: (1) the teacher, (2) the learner or (3) other learner. Traditionally, the teacher is in charge of providing the feedback on written assignments. Nonetheless, many authors (Hedge 2000; Hendrickson; 1980) pointed that the learner him- or herself can also self-correct the work. By the teacher fostering this practice, learners gain more autonomy and awareness regarding their written process. Peer-editing is another possibility but this may result in a case of someone who is not prepared and capable helping other of the same condition (Sheen, 2011). Therefore, training learners to do peer-edit is advisable. However, CF can also take place in the written mode. Teachers spend a great deal of time correcting writing assignments in order to provide learners with feedback regarding their written productions.

3. Teacher Assessing and Giving Feedback on Written work

Teacher will help students to correct such as their error or attempts by gives assess on their work. Assessing students` performance usually in the form of praise or blame based on their work. Harmer (2007:139) mentions a number of ways in which teacher can assess the students` work are:

- a) **Comments:** teacher should acknowledge the students` efforts first (the medal) before showing that something is wrong and then suggesting future action (the mission). When responding to students` written work, the same praise recommendation procedure is also appropriate, though here a lot will depend on what stage the students` writing is at. In other words, teacher responses to finished pieces of written work will be different from those teacher gives to help students as they work with written drafts.
- b) **Marks and Grades:** awarding a mark of 9/10 for a piece of writing or giving a B+ assessment for a speaking activity are clear indicators that students have done well. But it is more difficult with more creative activities where we ask students to produce spoken or written language to perform a task.
- c) **Reports:** at the end of a term or year some teachers write reports on students` performance. It should give a clear indication of how well the students have done in the recent past and a reasonable assessment of their future prospects.

Besides comments, marks/grades and reports students also need feedback to improve their work especially for writing performance. There are 2 kinds of feedback are during oral work and written work. Harmer (2007:147) written both of them but here we discuss only feedback on written work. The way teacher gives feedback on writing will depend on the kind of writing task the students have undertaken and the effect we wish to create.

- a) **Responding:** this type of feedback takes time of course but it can be more useful to the student than a draft covered in correction marks, it is designed for students that go back and review the draft before producing a new version. When teacher respond to a final written product (an essay or a finished project), teachers can say what they liked, how they felt about the text and what they students might do next time if students might to write something similar. Another constructive way of responding to students` written work is to show alternative ways of writing through reformulation. Keeping the original intention as far as possible but avoiding any of the language or construction problems which the student`s original contained.

Such as reformulation is extremely useful for students since by comparing their version with yours they discover a lot about the language. However, it has to be done sympathetically, since we might end up `steamrolling` our own view of things, forcing the students to adopt a different voice from the one they wanted to use

b) Correcting: Many teachers use correction codes to indicate that students have made mistakes in their written work. These codes can be written into the body of the text itself or in the margin. In order for students to benefit from the use of symbols such as these, they need to be trained in their use.

In correction techniques the learners look for mistakes either in ideas or form and describe them or correct them. They include techniques like finding grammar mistakes in sentences, finding unnecessary and unusual words which have been put in a reading passage, finding wrong facts in a reading passage, finding the word that does not go with the others in a group of words, describing inappropriate items in pictures, and so on. Learners show that they have found mistakes by underlining or circling them writing the corrected item (Nation, 2009:104).

The focus of error also needs to take concern. According to Bitchener and Ferris (2010:145) there is a common distinction made in the literature on error correction is between *global* and *local* errors. Examples of global or serious errors include many lexical issues and various problems with sentence structure, such as confusing word order or missing words. The instructor might also prefer to devote time and energy primarily to errors that are *treatable* “rule-governed structures” or *untreatable* (idiosyncratic).

To provide the correction there is way that state by Hyland (2004). The following ways in providing CF are: (1) Write personalized comments – maintaining a dialogue between reader and writer (2) Provide guidance where necessary – avoiding advice that is too directive or prescriptive (3) Make text-specific comments – relating comments to the text rather than general rules (4) Balance positive and negative comments – avoiding discouraging students with criticism.

- c) **Training students:** If students are to benefit from teacher` feedback on their writing, they need to know what we mean and what to do about it. This involves training them to understand the process. We can now introduce students to correction symbols. We can go through them one by one, showing examples of each category. Once we think students have grasped their meaning, we might get them to try using the correction symbols themselves.

The conclusion from the explanation above teacher should know the best way in assessing and giving feedback on students draft. Teacher can give comment, marks and grades or report, or they can consider give feedback such as responding or correcting form and they can training students to understand the feedback it.

4. Strategies in Providing Feedback

It is important for teacher in responding students writing to help them improve the accuracy and grow the motivation in learning. Harmer (2004) states that the way to respond writing (e.g. the first way is feedback to work in progress, the second, feedback can be presented by an English teacher through comment. Third response is feedback in post-task statements, fourthly feedback can be in the taped comment, fifthly, feedback uses electronic comments, the sixth way is peer review (feedback).

It is probably more useful for the learners if the teacher does not correct their mistakes but shows them where the mistake is and what type of mistake it is. To do this a marking system is needed. Here is a useful one for the most common mistakes. The signs at the side of the page show the type of mistake, and the signs in the sentences show where it is. The learners should correct their mistakes themselves after the teacher has marked them. In most compositions, at least half of the mistakes are usually things that the learners already know about. They are there mainly because of carelessness.

Self-correction helps to stop this. The learners should be encouraged to develop the habit of checking their work carefully before giving it to the teacher to be marked. A marking system helps them to do this by showing them their main weaknesses. Giving attention to the writing process is a way of bringing about improvement in learners'

writing by providing help at the various stages of the process, instead of focusing only on the finished product. A process approach is most suited to writing because it is a largely solitary, productive skill where there is plenty of time to observe and consider the parts of the process. However, a process approach can be applied to at least some parts of listening, speaking and reading skills (Nation, 2009:123).

Written corrective feedback is the primary form of feedback in the writing process to improving learning progress. The important to know is the strategies in providing feedback itself to respond students writing. According to Hyland and Hyland feedback is divided into two types: oral and written feedback. Then it divided into written feedback into direct and indirect feedback.

Meanwhile, written corrective feedback strategies based on Elis (2009) are five basic/forms strategies for providing written CF can be identified, with a number of options associated with some of them.

1. Direct CF

In the case of direct CF the teacher provides the student with the correct form. As Ferris notes, this can take a number of different forms crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form. Example 1 illustrates direct correction.

a	a	the
A dog stole λ bone from λ butcher. He escaped with having λ bone.		
over	a	a
When the dog was going through λ bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		

The explanation of example 1: Direct CF has the advantage that it provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. This is clearly desirable if learners do not know what the correct form is (i.e. are not capable of self-correcting the error). Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest direct CF is probably better than indirect CF with student writers of low levels of proficiency. However, a disadvantage is that it requires minimal processing on the part of the learner and thus, although it might help them to produce the correct form when they revise their writing, it may not contribute to long-term learning. However, a recent study by Sheen (2007) suggests that direct CF can be effective in promoting acquisition of specific grammatical features.

2. Indirect CF

Indirect CF involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the student's text (as in the example below) or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error. The example 2 of indirect CF:

A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with XhavingX X bone.
 When the dog was going XthroughX X bridge over XtheX river he found X
 dog in the river.

X = Missing word

X__X = wrong word

‘guided learning and problem solving’ (Lalande 1982) and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. For these reasons, it is considered more likely to lead to long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts 2001). The results of studies that have investigated this claim, however, are very mixed. Some studies (for example, Lalande 1982) suggest that indirect feedback is indeed more effective in enabling students to correct their errors but others (for example, Ferris and Roberts’ own study) found no difference between direct and indirect CF. No study to date has compared the effects of these two indirect types of CF on whether they have any effect on accuracy in new pieces of writing.

In accordance with the general line of argument by Ferris and Roberts (2001), it might be claimed that indirect feedback where the exact location of errors is not shown might be more effective than indirect feedback where the location of the errors is shown (as illustrated in Example 2) as students would have to engage in deeper processing. Robb (1986). Investigated four types of feedback including direct feedback and indirect feedback where the number of errors was given in each line of text. They reported no significant difference. Lee (1997), however, specifically compared the two types of indirect correction and found that learners were better able to correct errors that were indicated and located than errors that were just

indicated by a check in the margin. However, Lee did not consider long-term gains.

3. Metalinguistic CF

Metalinguistic CF involves providing learners with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors they have made. The explicit comment can take two forms. By far the most common is the use of error codes. These consist of abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors. The labels can be placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin.

In the latter case, the exact location of the error may or may not be shown. In the former, the student has to work out the correction needed from the clue provided while in the latter the student needs to first locate the error and then work out the correction. Examples of both are provided below. A major issue in error codes is how delicate the categories should be. For example, should there be a single category for ‘articles’ (as in the examples below) or should there be separate categories for ‘definite’ and ‘indefinite articles’? Most of the error codes used in research and language pedagogy employ relatively broad categories.

EXAMPLE 3

art.	art.	WW art.
A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog		
prep.	art.	art.
was going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		

A number of studies have compared using error codes with other types of written CF. Lalande (1982) reported that a group of learners of L2 German that received correction using error codes improved in accuracy in subsequent writing whereas a group receiving direct correction made more errors. However, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. Robb et al. (1986) included an error codes treatment in their study but found it no more effective than any of the other three types of CF they investigated (i.e. direct feedback and two kinds of indirect feedback).

Ferris (2006) reported that error codes helped students to improve their accuracy over time in only two of the four categories of error she investigated. Longitudinal comparisons between the number of errors in students' first and fourth compositions showed improvement in total errors and verb errors but not in noun errors, article errors, lexical errors, or sentence errors. Ferris and Roberts (2001) found that error codes did assist the students to self-edit their writing but no more so than indirect feedback. Overall, then, there is very limited evidence to show that error codes help writers to achieve greater accuracy over time and it would also seem that they are no more effective than other types of CF in assisting self-editing.

EXAMPLE 4

Art. x 3;WW	A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone.
Prep.;art.	When the dog was going through bridge over the river he
Art.	found dog in the river.

The second type of metalinguistic CF consists of providing students with metalinguistic explanations of their errors. An example is provided below. This is far less common, perhaps because it is much more time consuming than using error codes and also because it calls for the teacher to possess sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to be able to write clear and accurate explanations for a variety of errors. Sheen (2006) compared direct and metalinguistic CF, finding that both were effective in increasing accuracy in the students' use of articles in subsequent writing completed immediately after the CF treatment. Interestingly, the metalinguistic CF also proved more effective than the direct CF in the long term (i.e. in a new piece of writing completed two weeks after the treatment).

EXAMPLE 5

(1)	(2)	(3)
A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog		
(4)	(5)	(6)
was going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		
<i>(1), (2),(5), and (6)- you need `a` before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.</i>		
<i>(3) – you need `the` before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously</i>		
<i>(4) – you need `over` when you go across the surface of something; you use `through` when you go inside something (eg. `go through the forest`)</i>		

Here the other example code that proposed by Harmer (2004:111), he proposed about **the symbols of coded as this table below:**

Table 2.1. The Symbol/Code Proposed by Harmer

Symbol	Meaning	Example error
S	A spelling errors	The <u>asnwer</u> is <u>obvius</u>
WO	A mistake in words order	I <u>like very much</u> it
G	A grammar mistake	I am going to buy some <u>furnitures.</u>
T	Wrong verb tense	I <u>have seen</u> him yesterday
C	Concord mistakes (e.g. subject and verb agreement)	People <u>is</u> angry
∧	Something has been left out	He told ∧ that he was sorry
WW	Wrong word	I am interested <u>on</u> jazz music
{ }	Something is not necessary	He was not {too} strong enough
?M	The meaning is unclear	That is a <u>very excited photograph</u>
P	A punctuation mistake	Do you like London
F/I	Too formal or too informal	Hi, Mr. Franklin, thank you for your letter.....

Source: Harmer, 2004, p.111

Meanwhile Anker (2010) also proposed about useful editing and proofreading marks. This chart lists typical marks and abbreviations that instructors use to correct and comment on students papers.

Table 2.2. The Symbol/Code Proposed by Anker

No	Symbol or Code	How to Revise/Edit
1.	adj	Use correct adjective form
2.	adv	Use correct adverb form
3.	agr	Correct subject-verb agreement or pronoun agreement
4.	awk	Awkward expression: edit for clarity
5.	cap or triple underline	Use capital letter correctly
6.	Cliché	Replace overused phrase with fresh words
7.	case	Use correct pronoun case
8.	coh	Revise paragraph or essay coherence
9.	coord	Use coordination correctly
10.	cs	Comma splice: join the sentences correctly
11.	dev	Develop you paragraph or essay more completely
12.	dm	Revise to avoid a dangling modifier
13.	Frag	Attach the fragment to a sentence or make it a sentence

Continued

Continuation

No	Symbol or Code	How to Revise/Edit
14.	fs	Fused sentence: join the two sentences correctly
15.	ital.	Use italics
16.	ic or diagonal slash	Use lowercase
17.	mm	Revise to avoid a misplaced modifier
18.	pl	Use the correct plural form of the verb
19.	ref	Make pronoun reference clear
20.	Ro	Run-on sentence; join the two sentences correctly
21.	sp	Correct the spelling error
22.	sub	Use subordination correctly
23.	sup	Support your point with details, examples, or facts
24.	Tense	Correct the problem with verb tense
25.	Trans	Add a transition
26.	W	Delete unnecessary words
27.	wc	Reconsider your word choice
28.	?	Make your meaning clearer
29.	^,	Use comma correctly
30.	; : () - ---	Use semicolon/colon/parentheses/hyphen/dash correctly
31.	“ ”	Use quotation marks correctly
32.	^	Insert something
33.	∅	Delete something
34.	Λ	Change the order of letters or words
35.	¶	Start a new paragraph
36.	#	Add a space
37.	○	Close up a space

The code or symbol among Ellis, Harmer or Anker is very useful in correct students' writing draft. The teacher also can adapt among of three examples above to the symbol that suit as students' necessary. Here the code that adapted by teacher ID in essay writing class.

Table 2.3. The Symbol/Code Proposed by Teacher (ID)

No.	Symbol	How to revise
1.	A	Use the correct article (a,an,the).
2.	cap	Use capital letter correctly.
3.	conj	Add or correct the conjunction.
4.	CS	Comma splice: Join the sentences correctly.
5.	delete	Delete unnecessary words.

Continued

Continuation

No	Symbol	How to Revise
6.	p	Use the correct punctuation.
7.	pl	Use the correct singular/plural.
8.	prep	Use the correct preposition.
9.	pron	Use the correct pronoun.
10.	RO	Run on sentence. Cut or join the sentences correctly.
11.	S	Add a subject.
12.	SF	Sentence fragment: Attach the fragment to a sentence or make it a sentence.
13.	sv	Correct subject-verb agreement.
14.	sp	Correct the spelling error.
15.	T	Use the correct tense.
16.	vf	Use the correct verb form.
17.	wf	Use the correct word form.
18.	ww	Replace the wrong word with the appropriate word.
19.	wo	Correct the word order.
20.	√	Add word/s.
21.	??	Make your meaning clearer.
22.	Th	Add or strengthen the thesis statement.
23.	TS	Add or strengthen the topic sentence or thesis statement.
24.	→	Indent the sentence.
25.	+	Add details or supports.

4. Focused versus unfocused CF

Teachers can elect to correct all of the students' errors, in which case the CF is unfocused. Alternatively they can select specific error types for correction. For example, in the above examples the teacher could have chosen to correct just article errors. The distinction between unfocused and focused CF applies to all of the previously discussed options. Processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the learner is required to attend to a variety of errors and thus is unlikely to be able to reflect much on each error. In this respect, focused CF may prove more

effective as the learner is able to examine multiple corrections of a single error and thus obtain the rich evidence they need to both understand why what they wrote was erroneous and to acquire the correct form.

If learning is dependent on attention to form, then it is reasonable to assume that the more intensive the attention, the more likely the correction is to lead to learning. Focused metalinguistic CF may be especially helpful in this respect as it promotes not just attention but also understanding of the nature of the error. However, unfocused CF has the advantage of addressing a range of errors, so while it might not be as effective in assisting learners to acquire specific features as focused CF in the short term, it may prove superior in the long run.

The bulk of the CF studies completed to date have investigated unfocused CF. In Sheen's study (2006), the CF was of the focused kind (i.e. it addressed errors in the use of articles for first and second mention) and, as already noted, that proved effective in promoting more accurate language use of this feature. However, to date, there have been no studies comparing the relative effects of focused and unfocused CF. This is clearly a distinction in need of further study.

5. Electronic feedback

Extensive corpora of written English (either carefully constructed or simply available via search engines such as Google) can be exploited to provide students with assistance in their writing. This assistance can be

accessed by means of software programs while students write or it can be utilized as a form of feedback. I am concerned only with the latter here. Electronic resources provide learners with the means where they can appropriate the usage of more experienced writers.

Milton (2006) describes an approach based on a software program called Mark My Words. This provides teachers with an electronic store of approximately 100 recurrent lexico-grammatical and style errors that he found occurred frequently in the writing of Chinese students. The store also provides a brief comment on each error and with links to resources showing the correct form. The program enables the teacher to use the electronic store to insert brief metalinguistic comments into a student's text. The text is then returned to the student who then consults the electronic resources to compare his/her usage with that illustrated in the samples of language made available. This assists the student to self-correct. The same program also generates an error log for each piece of writing, thus drawing students' attention to recurrent linguistic problems. Milton does not report a study of the effectiveness of this method of correcting student errors but provides anecdotal evidence that it can work. He describes receiving a ten-page document from a student, identifying 100 errors using Mark My Words, and then asking the student to consult the electronic resources and revise the text himself. Milton reported that the student's revisions were successful.

There are some obvious advantages to this option. One is that it removes the need for the teacher to be the arbiter of what constitutes a correct form. Teachers' intuitions about grammatical correctness are often fallible; arguably, a usage-based approach is more reliable. It can also be argued that the key to effective error correction is identifying the learner's textual intention. While the approach advocated by Milton still lays the onus on the teacher to identify errors, it allows the learners to locate the corrections that are most appropriate for their own textual intentions and so encourages student independence.

6. Reformulation

The final option we will consider is similar to the use of concordances in that it aims to provide learners with a resource that they can use to correct their errors but places the responsibility for the final decision about whether and how to correct on the students themselves. A standard procedure in error analysis is reconstruction. That is, in order to identify an error, the analyst (and the teacher) needs to construct a native speaker version of that part of the text containing an error. The idea for reformulation as a technique for providing feedback to learners grew out of this procedure. It involves a native-speaker rewriting the student's text in such a way as 'to preserve as many of the writer's ideas as possible, while expressing them in his/her own words so as to make the piece sound native like'

(Cohen, 1989: 4). The writer then revises by deciding which of the native-speaker's reconstructions to accept. In essence, then, reformulation involves two options 'direct correction' + 'revision' but it differs from how these options are typically executed in that the whole of the student's text is reformulated thus laying the burden on the learner to identify the specific changes that have been made. Sachs and Polio (2007) report an interesting study that compared reformulation with direct error correction. The main difference between these two options was 'a matter of presentation and task demands and was not related to the kinds of errors that were corrected'. The difference in presentation is illustrated in the example below.

Original version:	As he was jogging, his tammy was shaken.
Reformulation:	As he was jogging, his tummy was shaking. tummy shaking
Error correction:	As he was jogging his tammy was shaken .

EXAMPLE 6 (from Sachs and Polio 2007: 78)

The students were shown their reformulated/corrected stories and asked to study them for 20 minutes and take notes if they wanted. Then, one day later, they were given a clean sheet of paper and asked to revise their stories but without access to either the reformulated/corrected texts or the notes they had taken. Both the groups that received reformulation and corrections outperformed the control group. However, the corrections group produced more accurate revisions than the reformulation group. As Sachs and Polio point out, reformulation is a technique that is not

restricted to assisting students with their surface level linguistic errors; it is also designed to draw attention to higher order stylistic and organizational errors. Thus, their study should not be used to dismiss the use of reformulation as a technique for teaching written composition.

Nevertheless, it would seem from this study that it does not constitute the most effective way of assisting students to eliminate linguistic errors when they revise.

5. The Goals and Advantages providing feedback

The main purpose of WCF is to bring students' attention to their writing errors, and to teach the L2 language skills to the point where learners are aware of what is expected from them as writers. Amara (2015) states WCF is also used to coach learners from the margin to produce written work with minimal errors and maximum clarity.

Written corrective feedback is used not only as a response to writing errors, but also to praise what is good in the writing (Mory, 2004; Cardelle & Corno, 1981). That is, teachers can use WCF to thank and praise their learners for good work. WCF is used to help language learners avoid errors (e.g. grammatical, syntactic, or semantic errors) and revise their own writing, and also to make teachers aware of learners' writing weaknesses.

As stated above about the definition of feedback, feedback is important to improve writing accuracy and need teacher control inside it as

the input. To prevent the unexpected result as Nation (2009:124) states that poor control of some of the parts may lead to a poor performance on other parts of the process. Once again, an important way of encouraging writers to keep their goals and audience in mind is to provide them with feedback about the effectiveness of their writing (Nation, 2009:115-116). This feedback can be direct comment on the writing as a piece of writing or it can be a response to the message and correction to improve the accuracy.

For example, Rinvoluceri (1983) suggests that the teacher and learners should write letters to each other with the teacher responding to the ideas rather than the form of the letter. Teachers should also check their writing programme to make sure that learners are given practice in writing for a range of purposes to a range of readers. The following list, adapted from Purves, Sofer, Takala and Vahapassi (1984), indicates how wide this range can be. In writing with immediate feedback the writer sits next to a reader and as each sentence or paragraph is written, the writer gets feedback from the reader and they discuss what has been written and what might come next. The writer then writes the next paragraph and the discussion continues. This technique is especially useful when writing instructions or technical descriptions. Amara (2015) states that teachers might receive insightful pieces of information of one topic from the students. Then WCF becomes more essential when it comes to learning a

second or foreign language. Providing WCF in an L2 context is essential to improving writing accuracy.

The other researcher state about the important feedback is Dignen (2014). He proposed that there are five reasons related to the important of the feedback:

- a) Feedback is available in the process of learning all the time.
- b) Feedback is the other words of effective listening.
- c) Feedback is a way to motivate learning and developing.
- d) Feedback is important to develop performances.
- e) Feedback is a way to keep learning.

The important of feedback one of it is to prevent the unexpected result that poor control of some of the parts may lead to a poor performance on other parts of the process. Then it important way of encouraging writers to keep their goals and audience in mind is to provide them with feedback about the effectiveness of their writing. Also the motivation should create while teacher give feedback to make students comfort in learning and developing.

Teachers can use their feedback comments as a communication learning channel in which the teacher can inform the learner of their performance, and praise them for their good work. More importantly, teacher comments potentially include statements that confirm a learner identity as a good writer. If learners are left without confirmation of their identity, they may feel that they are positioned as poor writers.

SLA research has shown that indirect written correction stimulates learners' independency when it comes to written production. On the other hand as Buffa (2016) states that direct correction helps in the internalization of the correct form (Chandler, 2003) and can be beneficial for beginners (Ferris, 2002). In this sense, feedback can either be positive, highlighting the good performance and praising the learner in order to increase motivation (Nunan, 1991) or negative, which promotes negotiation and L2 acquisition (García-Mayo & Alcón, 2013). For the sake of this paper, the focus will be on negative feedback (or CF) initiated by an error produced by the learner.

The other several advantages in the practices written correction feedback states by London (2003) such as feedbacks could influence the achieving of the learning objective in the future by enhancing the students in learning and also increasing their ability to detect their own mistakes in the process. Feedbacks also increase the students' motivation by showing the behaviors that contribute to successful learning outcomes. It also increases the important of the information and also the feedback process. In the group setting, feedbacks focus on the group members' attention on the same performances elements and provide them with common perspectives. It could be helpful for the group members to complete the tasks in completing the group assignments. Feedbacks have values because it direct and motivates the students' behaviors. It also contributes on the increasing of self-awareness.

C. Previous Study

Previous study is the result of research from the researcher before. There are several researches which are similar to this study. The first is the study of Advisers' Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedbacks on The EFL Students' Final Academic Writing (A qualitative Descriptive Case Study, a thesis (2018) by Aisyah Mulyani, English Education, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta. The objective of this research was to analyse and describe the application of direct and indirect corrective feedback on the EFL students' academic writing in their paper. The result is a description of the direct and indirect corrective feedback and its application in academic writing, and it was found that the need to use both types of feedback is important in fostering students' academic writing ability and in increasing their reflection skills after receiving feedback from supervisors.

The second related previous study is Improving Students' Writing Skill through Teacher's Direct Feedback in SMAN 1 Jogonalan, a thesis (2012) by Uli Tri Utami, English Education, Yogyakarta State University. The purpose of this research is to improve the writing skill of students at grade XI of the social program in SMAN 1 Jogonalan Klaten in the academic year 2010/2011 through teacher's direct feedback. The result is that teacher's direct feedback can improve students' writing skill.

The third related previous study is Academic Writing Students' Perceptions toward Written Teacher Feedback on Their First Draft, a

thesis (2013) by Christina Natalia Sutresno, English Department, Satya Wacana Christian University Salatiga. The purpose of this research is to explore academic writing students' perceptions toward written teacher feedback on their first draft in the English Department of Satya Wacana Christian University. The result of this study is Academic writing students had positive perceptions toward their teacher written feedback, they found it useful especially in the content and organization aspect.

The fourth related previous study is Written Corrective Feedback in Secondary Education: Learners' and Teachers' Preferences and Perceptions, a master thesis (2016) by Ignacio Martinez Buffa, English Department, Jaume University. The purpose of this research is to know the aspects of the language do learners and teachers believe the focus of written correction should be placed on, The preferences WCF techniques from learners and teachers and know way of learners handle the feedback. The result of this study is learners' desire to be directly corrected and especially on grammatical and lexical aspects, students preference for direct correction and the teacher prefer indirect correction.

In short, there are lots of studies that have been done related to the writing and feedback especially written corrective feedback which shows that feedback has significant contribution based on its practices. These studies might be the foundation of the present study as the guidelines on how to start and end the present study.

In this study, the researcher` purposes are to know the practices and the contribution of lecturer` written corrective feedback to students` essay writing at English department of IAIN Tulungagung. The correction type that used is metalinguistic and the research design use descriptive qualitative.