

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

This study is intended to investigate students' cognitive attitudes on the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 Writing. This chapter depicts the background of the study, the scope of the study, the research questions, and the purpose of the study. Moreover, it includes the significance of the study and the definition of the key terms used in this study.

#### 1.1. Background of the Study

Like many popular and influential trends of teaching, direct written corrective feedback is a standard method used by most teachers to guide in revising student's writing. In the vein of many other important and influential approaches in writing, in fact, for most writing teachers, it is the most preferred and common form of feedback (Ferris et al., 2012). The investigation of the annals of research in written corrective feedback has shown that direct written corrective feedback is one of the most frequently used techniques in English writing classes. Overall, based on the currently available evidence over the issue of written corrective feedback (WCF) (Ferris et al., 2012)

For L2 learners, writing in the target language is a painstaking job, and L2 teachers are required to help them improve their writing proficiency. Generally, overcoming the occurrence of errors depends on the way they are corrected and written feedback is an essential aspect of any English Language Writing course. (Simpson, 2006) has asserted that one of the major concerns of L2 writers is error-free work since their work may be evaluated in an academic setting where accuracy is an important matter, so learners require and value

feedback to their works. Also (Jodaie, Farokhi & Zoghi, 2011) believe that if students fail in a good performance in writing, further feedback is necessary to help them take corrective actions about their writing to improve it and reach an acceptable level of performance. Since (Shintani and Aubrey, 2016) claimed that providing corrective feedback on L2 writing should be abandoned, a debate about whether and how to give L2 learners feedback on their written grammatical errors has been of considerable interest to researchers and classroom practitioners. Some researchers ((Shang, 2019)) claim that grammar corrections do not have a positive effect on the development of L2 writing accuracy. According to the most extreme views, such as Truscott (2007), corrective feedback (CF), which indicates to learners that there is an error in their linguistic output, is seen as not only ineffective but also potentially harmful.

For instance, Ferris and Roberts (2001) investigated 72 university ESL students' abilities to self-edit their texts across three feedback conditions: (1) errors marked with codes; (2) errors underlined but not otherwise marked or labeled; (3) no feedback at all. They found that both groups who received feedback significantly outperformed the no-feedback group on the self-editing task but that there were no significant differences between the "codes" and "no-codes" groups. However, as mentioned before, more recent studies have examined the value of written CF by measuring progress in new pieces of writing. (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009) for example, investigated the extent to which different types of CF (direct CF with and without oral conferencing) influence the accuracy in new pieces of writing.

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

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

Singh (2002) states that it is still common to find people who can speak English, but they are not able to express themselves in writing. Most of the students can get a good score in speaking activity, but they are not able to get a good score in learning writing. The problems of the student's writing were starting to compose, organizing ideas, expressing their ideas, and using correct grammar. In senior high school, many students confused to use the correct grammar in a sentence. So, they need a teacher's corrective feedback to correct their grammar and content. The teacher must provide corrective feedback to the students' errors in writing.

In response, the issues above direct written corrective feedback are chosen because In the case of direct CF the teacher gives the correct form to the students, and it is desirable for low-level-of-proficiency students who are unable to self-correct and do not know what the correct form might be. However, it requires minimal processing on the part of the learners, and thus, it may not contribute to longterm learning (Wilbert et al., 2016). And also a recent study by (Nemati et al., 2019)) suggests that direct CF can be effective in promoting the acquisition of only specific grammatical features. the chance of learning taking place as evidenced in new

writing. In the case of ME, rewriting requires learners to apply the information provided to identify and correct their errors.

The conflict and uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of various types and amounts of WCF, as well as the incongruity between students' and teachers' perceptions regarding WCF are pedagogically problematic. For example, teachers may be providing a particular kind of WCF but students may not agree with it. As noted above, if students do not agree that a certain type of WCF is needed, then they will be less likely to use it. Therefore, it is important for both teachers and students to be clear on what works for them and how. Thus, several researchers have suggested that in order for feedback to be effective, there needs to be an agreement between teachers and students, and perhaps students' expectations need to change to better fit what is most effective in developing their writing skills (e.g., Diab, 2005; Hyland, 1998; Jeon & Kang, 2005; Leki, 1991; Plonsky & Mills, 2006; Raimes, 1991; Saito, 1994; Schulz, 1996, 2001). But is it possible for teachers and students to agree on WCF? In an experimental study, Plonsky and Mills, (2006) trained students by allowing their teacher to explain his approach to providing WCF, and demonstrated a significant change in the students' perceptions and opinions of WCF after the treatment. Thus, although research has shown that students do not always receive the WCF that they prefer, it is possible to open dialogues between teachers and students to improve the effectiveness of WCF by improving students' perceptions of it. One way of doing so is by conducting studies that not only compare students' and teachers' opinions about WCF, but also investigate teachers' and students' reasons for preferring particular types of WCF. The purpose of the present study was to examine and compare the opinions and preferences of ESL students and teachers with regard to WCF. It examined what types, as well as what amounts of WCF ESL teachers and

students consider useful and whether there are differences between teachers' and students' opinions and preferences. The study also examined ESL students' and teachers' reasons for their preferences.

Ferris and Robberts (2001) suggest that direct corrective feedback is more helpful to writers because it (1) reduces the type of confusion that they may experience if they fail to understand or remember the feedback they have been given (for example, the meaning of error codes used); (2) provides them with information to help them resolve more complex errors (for example, syntactic structure and idiomatic usage); (3) offers more explicit feedback on hypotheses that may have been made; and (4) is more immediate. By realizing how important direct corrective feedback is, it is hoped to help the students improve their writing skills. Thus, the teacher should apply direct corrective feedback to the students in their writing class so that the goal of the learning process can be achieved.

When investigating the amount of correct revisions after WCF, Ferris (2002) found that, direct WCF led to a greater degree of correct revisions (88%) than indirect WCF (77%). However, indirect WCF reduced the amount of errors compared with direct WCF over the semester, which suggests that the effects of indirect WCF might be more enduring because of the cognitive effort involved in figuring out how to respond to WCF. In terms of learner engagement through processing WCF, indirect WCF provided through editing symbols elicited a greater level of engagement than direct WCF (i.e., reformulations; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012). In order to examine the role of different types of WCF in the subsequent language learning, more controlled research design is necessary. Only a small number of studies have compared the impact of direct and indirect feedback on the learning of grammar structures, and this has been examined using a pretest/posttest research design. For example,

Bitchener and Knoch (2010b) investigated the role of WCF (two direct groups [a. metalinguistic explanation and b. metalinguistic feedback with oral form-focused instruction] and an indirect WCF group) for students learning English articles. All three treatment groups performed better than the no- feedback group on the posttest. However, the instructional benefit of indirect WCF was not maintained over time. In Lu (2010)'s study, both direct and indirect WCF promoted subsequent learning of the present simple tense, although indirect WCF was more effective than direct WCF. Overall, the majority of WCF studies which focused on subsequent learning outcomes incorporated metalinguistic explanation and direct feedback, but little research has been KIM ET AL. | 5 conducted to compare the effects of direct and indirect feedback on the learning of grammar, particularly for languages other than English. Previous WCF research has been conducted using individual writing tasks; however, due to increasing attention toward collaborative writing, WCF research might benefit from implementing collaborative writing tasks. One of the few existing studies conducted with collaborative writing is Storch and Wigglesworth (2010), who examined how the collaborative processing of feedback is mediated by different types of WCF and whether or not there is any feedback type effects. Twenty-four graduate students composed a text based on a graph in pairs (Session 1). Two types of feedback which are reformulations (direct WCF) and editing symbols (indirect feedback) were provided. During Session 2, learners processed the feedback in pairs, during which time their interaction was recorded, and rewrote their original text. Each learner then responded to the same prompt as in Session 1 and wrote the text individually during Session 3. Storch and Wigglesworth compared the influence of reformulations (direct WCF) and editing symbols (indirect feedback) on the number of language-related episodes (LREs; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). The analysis of LREs

which were the incidents of learners' attention to language forms was used to identify learners' processing of WCF (e.g., instances in which learners read the reformulated text aloud or discussed how to revise a portion of the text in response to an editing symbol). The findings suggest that the indirect feedback elicited a greater number of LREs and was associated with greater uptake in the revised texts than the direct WCF. Overall, in previous research, WCF was provided as AWCF and was provided to learners on their individual writing. Therefore, findings cannot be generalized to collaborative writing contexts where the instructor provides WCF while students are working on the collaborative writing tasks.

## **1.2. Scope of the Study**

This study focused on the students' cognitive attitude of the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 Writing at X Agama MAN 1 Konsel. Students' personal recount text was chosen as one of the data collection in this research.

## **1.3. Research Questions**

How students' cognitive attitudes towards the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 Writing?

## **1.4. Purpose of the Study**

Based on the research question, this present study aims to describe students' cognitive attitude towards the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 Writing

## **1.5. Significance of the Study**

This research has some important insight whether theoretical and practical for teachers and learners. This research can be used as a reference for those who want to get research about the students' cognitive attitude toward the use of direct written corrective feedback in L2 writing.

Practically this method can be used as a reference by a teacher to provide direct written corrective feedback to the students.

### **1.6. Definition of Key Terms**

To clarify the key terms used in this study, some definitions are put forward.

*Students' cognitive attitude.* attitude is a positive or negative predisposition toward object, situation, institution, or person which can be seen through the combination of personality, opinions, values, behaviors, and motivation.. Students cognitive attitude is belief or thought of students that based on their experience in learning-teaching process.

*Direct Written Corrective Feedback* is one type of error correction that is crossing out where is the error occurs and shows the right form might be. Direct corrective feedback is one of the strategies that can be applied by the teacher in teaching writing. In writing activity, direct corrective feedback means having teachers to read and give feedback on what students have written directly. Students as writers will get the input to organize ideas from teachers. In this technique, teachers will read and give comments, corrections, and also suggestions on what students