

THE STUDENTS' RESPONSES TO TEACHER'S CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE WRITING: A CASE FOR NURSING THE STUDENTS AT STIKES BAPTIST HOSPITAL KEDIRI

Asef Wildan Munfadlila, Niken Ayu Pupitasari, Yoyok Febrijanto

STIKES Bina Sehat PPNI Mojokerto¹, STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri ^{2,3}

acheif90@gmail.com ¹, nikenayupuspitasari04@gmail.com ², fyoyok@yahoo.co.id ³

Abstract

This study aimed to describe the students' responses to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing: a case for nursing the students at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri. This research used descriptive qualitative approach as its design. The subject was 24 the students of the second semester of Diploma III. Documentation and interviews were used for collecting data about the teacher's corrective feedback, questionnaire was used for collecting data about the students' responses in terms of attitude to teacher corrective feedback, the questionnaire and documentation were used for collecting data about the students' responses in terms of action. The data analysis was based on three concurrent flows of activities namely data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The result of this study showed that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback in the students' foreign language writing by circling the students' errors and providing the correct answer. The teacher gave direct corrective feedback on the students' error in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and content. The students had positive responses to the teacher's corrective feedback by remembering their grammar mistakes. It is supported by the data from questionnaire for the students' attitude that showed most of the students agreed that the teacher should point out grammar errors. Most of the students believed that correction in their writing task is useful. Most of the students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing. They also showed positive responses when most of the students answered that they would revise their writing if their errors were corrected by the teacher and chose for direct corrective feedback.

Keywords: *Teacher's corrective feedback, the students' responses, and writing*

INTRODUCTION

Difficulty in communicating with English in Indonesia happens not only in speaking but also in writing. Since the learners find a lot of difficulties in writing, it

means that there is a possibility to make errors, even a single one of errors. Therefore, a term of giving correction is appeared as a part of producing a writing work. In fact, in learning, everyone needs a process and making errors is a part of language learning process. Watcharapunyawong and Siriluck (2013:68) stated that the results revealed that the errors most frequently made by the students were classified into 13 categories, namely noun, adverb, verb, adjective, verb form, preposition, article, spelling, concord, idiom, pronoun, passive voice, and word order. The causes of errors found were mainly from the interference of L1 in relation to the direct translation, the differences of syntactic properties between L1 and L2, and the transfer of L1 systems in L2 writing. Jenwitheesuk (2009: p.982) investigated the causes of L2 writing errors in the third year college the students' written works. The study revealed that their errors were mainly caused by a lack of syntactic knowledge. Rachmajanti and Sulisty (2008) state that writing itself is a process. This process consists of planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and finally writing a final version. Therefore, giving writing feedback on the student's draft is considered as one of sub-processes in writing.

English is the important subject for nursing the students, the skills of reading, listening, speaking and writing support them to communicate with others when they are working as nurses. They should be able to communicate well not only in oral but also in written because it is important for creating effective communication with patients and doctors. This communication in nursing activity is very important so that the process of patients' healing will be achieved. The teacher's corrective feedback is hoped to give good effect for nursing the students' writing. Taran (2011) states that writing plays a key role in nursing today. How effectively a nurse is able to communicate through writing can have a major impact on the impression they make on both patients and peers. Whether it is writing memos about patients, drafting emails to other healthcare providers, or creating papers and presentations for academic study and research, all nurses must have the ability to express themselves clearly, effectively, and professionally through their writing.

METHOD

Research Design

The approach of this study is a descriptive qualitative and case study design was used because this study basically aimed at describing the students' responses to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing: a case for nursing the students at STIKES Baptist hospital.

Subject of the Study

The source of the data was the nursing the students of Diploma III in the semester 2 at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri in academic 2016-2017. This research took place at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri and was done for 2 months during March-April 2017. The reason why it is the students of Diploma III in the semester 2 because those students experienced difficulty in writing that was known after the researcher had conducted pre-interview with the lecturers.

Instrument of the Study

In this study, we equipped ourselves with some research instruments such as open-ended interview, this instrument was used to collect data about teacher's corrective feedback, the data were in the form of recordings. These recordings then changed into indirect quotation. The questionnaires were given to the students aimed to collect data about the students' responses in the terms of attitude and action to teacher's corrective feedback. The students' answer to the questionnaire was in the percentage form. Documentation was used to collect the data about teacher's corrective feedback, and the students' responses in terms of action. These data were the students' writing revision after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. Documentation also used to get the data of the students' writing task with teacher's corrective feedback, the students' writing revision result, the teacher's curriculum, syllabus, lesson plan, teacher's material in teaching writing, the students' score of writing, the rubric for assessing writing, teacher's curriculum vitae, teacher's experience in teaching English, the documentation when teaching writing, and the school profile.

Interview was used to collect data about teacher's corrective feedback in the students' foreign language writing. The researcher had done pre-interview with the teacher in 1 March, and continued in 6, and 8 March 2017. Then the next interview was done on 19 April 2017, so that the interview took 4 times during March and April. The data collection of interview consisted of 8 interview points, such as teacher's educational background, teacher's experience in teaching writing, teacher's preparation before teaching, the students' weakness on writing, the teacher's teaching and learning writing, teacher's corrective feedback, teacher's perception to corrective feedback, and the last was the teacher's assessment.

This study only focused on the students' responses to behavioral and affective aspects. The behavioral aspect is the students' action on the feedback. In this case the action is the students' revision after receiving corrective feedback from the teacher. Affective aspect, it means that the students' attitudinal responses to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing, the indicator of the students' attitudinal responses is to know the students' tendency to respond favorably unfavorably towards teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing. The questionnaire for the students' responses in terms of action to teacher's corrective feedback consists of 7 descriptions of actions, and then the sheet has been completed by 5 answers such as "never", "rarely", "sometimes", "usually", and "always" that can be chosen one by giving the mark (√) in the column. The questionnaire for the students' responses in terms of attitude to teacher's corrective feedback consists of 23 questions in multiple-choice that the students can choose one by giving mark (X) to the answer.

The Trustworthiness of the Study

This study used theory of trustworthiness based on Lincoln and Guba (1985) in Danim (2002), the level of trustworthiness from the research result can be achieved if the researcher holds 4 principles, namely: credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability.

In this study credibility testing had been done by improving researcher's credibility through practices that have done with qualitative experts, advisors. The

practices are reviewing documents, interview practice, and questionnaires. Perseverance improvement in study has been made by improving the ability to do interview and reviewing papers continuously, doing discussions with colleague namely consultation with the advisor.

Dependability can also be stated as reliability or data stability. In this study, the researcher collected the information not only from some books but also from some journals related to the students' responses to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing. The researcher analyzed the finding of research for each journal and then draw conclusion; this conclusion helped the researcher to do data reliability in research so that research results from other sources can support this research. The data were reliable although the data were obtained from different sources.

Transferability or external validity were done by collecting the information not only from teacher but also from the students at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri. The researcher also looked for information from the literature about the students' responses to the teacher's corrective feedback so that data could be valid and applied to population.

Confirmability objectivity and data neutrality were conducted by showing the result to the informant and advisor to get suggestions and comments. In this study, I had done confirmability with the teacher and the nursing the students at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri related to the data objectivity.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analyses were conducted by following Miles and Huberman's theory (1984) that says data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing were conducted interactively. Before making data reduction the researchers did coding for each data collection. Ary (2010: 483) states that after learning the data and organizing the data for easy retrieval, we can start coding and reducing process. This is a crucial part of qualitative analysis and includes the identification of categories and themes and their refinement. Bohm (2004: 271) states that there are three steps in doing coding; they are open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. The researchers conducted open coding, axial coding,

and selective coding for the instruments of interview with teacher, questionnaire to the students' responses in terms of attitude and action, and documentation in the form of the students' essay after receiving teacher's direct corrective feedback. The researchers gave same highlight or color for the same concept and category in coding and gave different colour among concepts and types. Coding makes the interpretation and data processing easier.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings showed that the teacher's applied corrective feedback in the students' writing by circling the students' errors and provided the correct answer. It means that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback because he wrote the right answer directly to the students' writing. The students' errors in writing were in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and content. The researcher conducted coding for teacher's direct corrective feedback in the form of providing correct answers by giving the sign of purple triangle and for the code for teacher's way to circle the error is by using green checklist. When the teacher wanted to eliminate extra words in the students' writing, he crossed out the extra words, coding for this case was in brown squares.

The teacher also gave comments and suggestions about the content, he gave criticism and ideas both in the middle and the end of the students' essay. The comments and ideas such as "Spelling please!", "Capital letter please!", "Check your spelling!", "Do not use correction pen too much!", "Pay attention to your grammar, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation!", "It is better if you add...", "It is better if you use your own words or, It is better if you make paraphrasing", "Please make it clearer", "Fragment!", "Run-on sentence!", "Word order!", "What does it mean?". The researchers conducted coding for teacher's direct corrective feedback in the form of comments and suggestions giving the sign of yellow rectangles. The teacher gave appreciation to the students' writing by giving positive comments such as "Good picture!", "Nice design!", "Good job!", "Very good!", "Keep learning!", "Keep writing more and more!", "I do appreciate your writing...", "You do correction well!", "You have done good improvement!", "You do it well!". The researcher conducted coding for teacher's direct corrective feedback in the form

of positive comments by giving the sign of black rectangle. After the students received teacher's corrective feedback, they made corrections and made revision. The teacher gave the sign for the right revision so that the students feel motivated to do revision.

The data is also supported by taking from interview with teacher that he gave direct corrective feedback because by giving direct corrective feedback, they can directly know their errors, they can enrich their vocabulary, they can revise their grammar error, and do self-correction so that they will collect the product of writing in excellent product. From the finding above, it can be concluded that giving correction and doing revising is important part of the process of writing to create good writing products.

The research finding for the students' responses in terms of attitude to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of the students have a greater tendency for believing that teachers must always correct their errors, whereas a few of the students answered sometimes have this feeling. All of the students think that making errors in English is necessary to learn more, but most of the students are always worried about making errors when they write in English after receiving teacher's corrective feedback, and a few of the students answered sometimes are worried and never worried. Most of the students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing, and less than a half of the students answered that they do not feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing.

Most of the students answered that making error in writing is negative, whereas a few of the students answered that making error in writing is positive. The students prefer to receive direct corrective feedback because they will know the correct answer and do self-correction. From the findings above, it can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude toward the teacher's corrective feedback. The research finding for about the students' responses in terms of action to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of the students answered that they rewrite their work following their teacher's grammar corrections or comments and give their rewriting back to the teacher. This data is supported by documents of the students' writing revision,

it showed that all of the students had collected tasks 1 to 3 and revisions 1 to 3. The teacher needs to know how the students behavioral responses towards teacher's corrective feedback. It is important factor to know the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback and to know the appropriate way to give corrective feedback.

DISCUSSION

From documentation instrument, it is got the result that the students' errors in writing such as in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and content. It is also supported by data from interview with teacher, the teacher said that in writing skill, the errors that they are often made by the students are grammar, spelling, word order, punctuation, run-on sentence, preposition, and capitalization. It is in line with theory of Watcharapunyawong and Siriluck (2013:68) stated that the results revealed that the errors most frequently made by the students were classified into 13 categories, namely noun, adverb, verb, adjective, verb form, preposition, article, spelling, concord, idiom, pronoun, passive voice, and word order. The causes of errors found were mainly from the interference of L1 to the direct translation, the differences of syntactic properties between L1 and L2, and the transfer of L1 systems in L2 writing.

It is also in line with Ellis (2009) stated that direct feedback involves providing the students with the correct form straightaway. This can be done by either crossing the wrong or unnecessary word out, inserting a missing word or writing the right form above or close to the wrong form. The research finding has similarities in the students' errors in writing such as in grammar, spelling, word order, punctuation, run-on sentence, preposition and capitalization. The similarity also in the way how teacher gives direct corrective feedback that is by circling, crossing out the words and providing correct answers directly.

The way how teacher solved the students' errors in writing was the teacher tried to eliminate the errors of the students by training them to speak and write so that the students will be ready to work then. The way to eliminate the errors is by giving direct corrective feedback to the students' writing. It is also important to look the students' ability in writing to choose the proper way to give corrective

feedback. The teacher and the student's perception about corrective feedback also will influence for choosing the type of corrective feedback in writing. It is in line with Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad (2012:230) stated that at a time when writing practices are more and more focused on improving the students' writing skills, written corrective feedback is felt to be absolutely needed in teaching writing. It is in line with Diab (2006) stated that while it needs to do research about the effectiveness of corrective feedback on the students' written errors, it is also important to look at teachers' and students' perceptions of corrective feedback. Teachers are believed to have responsibility for choosing the suitable way of providing such feedback. The research findings above have similarities on the important role of corrective feedback for improving the students' writing. The similarity happens on the importance of teacher's perception and the students' ability in writing in choosing proper way to give corrective feedback.

The research finding for the students' responses in terms of attitude to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of the students have a greater tendency for believing that teachers must always correct their errors. All of the students think that making errors in English is necessary to learn more, but most of the students are always worried about making errors when they write in English after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. It means that corrective feedback has an important role in the students' writing. The students showed positive attitude that they hope their teacher always gives corrective feedback, most of them believe that making errors in writing needs to learn more. Most of the students answered that grammar is the most important in an essay. Most of the students believe that correction in their writing tasks is useful. It is in line Cohen and Calvanti (1990) explained that the positive attitude towards corrective feedback could be due to the students' learning experiences, i.e. focus on grammar. Based on the research findings above, it has similarities in the students' positive attitude towards corrective feedback that they are motivated to learn more and they answered that grammar is the most important in an essay.

Most of the students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing. Most of the students answered

that making error in writing is negative, whereas a few of the students answered that making error in writing is positive. The students prefer to receive direct corrective feedback because they will know the correct answer directly and do self-correction. The students' attitude is important for teacher to do process of teaching learning. From the students answer for questionnaire showed that they prefer the teacher who corrects their essays than classmates or peer feedback and self-correction. The students answered that the teacher should point out grammar errors in the student essay. They also showed positive responses when most of the students answered that they would revise their writing if their errors are corrected by the teacher and choose direct corrective feedback. From the findings above, it can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude toward teacher's corrective feedback. It is in line with theory of Hyland (2003) states that knowing the students' attitudes towards a new language can be very useful for language teachers. If the techniques used to correct errors do not meet the students' preferences, subsequent negative attitudes may emerge. This is why teachers should take into consideration the students' preferences for being corrected.

FINDING

The research finding showed that most of the students always read their teacher's comments or corrections on their grammar. Half of the students answered that they usually study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes, and half of the others always study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes.

Most of the students answered that they always rewrite their work following their teacher's grammar corrections or comments and give their rewriting back to him. Most of the students as many as 62.5% usually try to remember their grammar mistakes, as many as 29.2% the students answer that they always try to remember my grammar mistakes and 8.3% the students answered that they sometimes try to remember my grammar mistakes. It means that the students have positive responses towards teacher's corrective feedback by remembering their grammar mistakes. It is supported by the data from questionnaire for the

students' attitude that showed most of the students agreed that the teacher should point out grammar errors. Most of the students believe that correction in their writing tasks is useful. It is in line with theory of Hyland's case study (2003) it revealed that the students knew that receiving grammar corrections would not immediately improve their grammar, but they believed that getting such feedback continuously would be useful in the long run.

The students give a positive response to teacher's corrective feedback. It is no need to wait for a long time for the students to revise their tasks. The students directly give the revision of writing after the teacher gives corrective feedback. The students also do correction well. One of the writing processes is doing correction. It is important for the teacher to give time for his students to do revision. It is also in line with Brown (2004:335), they are: focus on the process of writing that leads to the final written

products, help student writers to understand their own composing process, help them to build repertoires of strategies for prewriting, drafting, and rewriting, give the students time to write and rewrite. Based on the research finding above, it has similarities in the importance of writing process. The students' responses in terms of action are shown when the students' do revision and give their writing revision back to their teacher.

As many as 37.5% the students answered on questionnaire that they usually ask their teacher about the grammar correction, and 62.5% the students always ask their teacher about the grammatical correction, and then as many as 12.5% the students sometimes ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction, and then 54.2% the students usually ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction, and 33.3% the students always ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction. It means that the students also do consultation with their teacher relates to their grammar correction. the students not only do discussion with the teacher but also they do discussion with their friends after receiving corrective feedback. The teacher needs to know how the students responses to teacher's corrective feedback. It is important factor to know the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback and to know the appropriate way to provide corrective feedback. The students' motivation in learning writing will

influence their action in doing revision after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. It is in line with theory of Ellis (2009, 2010), Guenette (2007) and Leki (1990) agreed that the students' affective and behavioral responses to teacher feedback are critical to the effectiveness of such feedback. How the student's responses to teachers' written corrective feedback are considered as an important factor in its efficacy.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

The research finding of the teacher's corrective feedback showed that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback in the students' foreign language writing. The teacher's corrective feedback was to eliminate the students' error in writing so that the students can directly know their errors, they can enrich their vocabulary, revise their grammar errors, and do self-correction and then they collect the product of writing in excellent product. From the finding above, it can be concluded that giving correction and doing revising is important part of the process of writing to create good writing products.

Suggestion

Teachers should know the students' behavioral responses towards teacher's corrective feedback to know efficacy. The teachers not only focus on the students' writing product but also on the students' process in writing. They should give more attentions to the importance of teacher's corrective feedback to the students' writing and the importance of doing assessment for the students' tasks in writing. The students should have motivation to do writing and do revising. The students should understand that to achieve good product, they should pay attention to writing process such as pre-writing, drafting, revising, proofreading, and publishing. This research finding is hoped to give contribution for the students relates to the importance of teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing, especially for nursing students. Theoretically further researcher

should be able to give contributions with new theories and new ideas relate to corrective feedback. They also can give new findings with different research designs, such as in quantitative research, research and development, classroom action research and so on.

Teachers should do assessment when the process of teaching learning. Practically the students should do writing process such as pre-writing, drafting, revising, proofreading, and publishing to achieve good writing products. They should do revising after the teachers give corrective feedback. They are able to discuss and share their knowledge in writing with the teachers and other the students. Practically further researchers should be able to develop the research relates to teacher's corrective feedback. They are able to add new research findings like adding the variable relates to another type of teacher's corrective feedback such as indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, the focus of the feedback, electronic corrective feedback and reformulation. They are also able to apply the research with different skills such as in listening, reading and speaking.

REFERENCE

- Allman, B., Sara F., Jeffrey O., Sally P., &Vicky S. 2000. *Skills for Successful Teaching*:McGraw-Hill Children's Publishing.
- Alwasilah, C. 2004. *PerspektifPendidikanBahasaInggris di Indonesia dalamKonteksPersaingan Global*. Bandung :Andira
- Amrhein&Nassaji. 2010. Written corrective feedback: What do the students and teachers prefer and why. *Journal of CJAL * RCLA*, 95.
- Anggraeni , W. 2012. *The Characteristics of Teacher's Feedback in The Speaking Activities of the Grade Nine The students of SMP N 2 Depok*(Master's Thesis, Yogyakarta State University: English Education Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts). Retrieved from<http://eprints.uny.ac.id/25678/1/Wahyu%20Anggraeni%2006202241034.pdf>
- Brown, H. M. 1978. *How to Write: A Practical Rhetoric*. Wichita Falls: Midwestern State University.

- Brown, D. 2000. *Teaching by Principles an Interactive*. San Fransisco: Longman
- Brown, D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc
- Cameron, L. 2001. *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campillo, P. S. 2015. *EFL The students' Attitudes and Preferences towards Written Corrective Feedback*. Departament d'Estudis Anglesos: Universitat Jaume I
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. 1990. Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Ed. B. Kroll, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-177.
- Cohen, R.F. & Miller, J.L. 2001. *Reason to Write: Strategies for Success in Academic Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diab, R. L. 2006. Error correction and feedback in the EFL writing classroom: Comparing instructor and student preferences. *English Teaching Forum*, 44(3), 2-13
- Dornyei, Z. 2001. *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Great Britain: (no city) St Edmundsbury Press. Ltd
- Ellis, R. 2009. *Analysing Learner Language*. New York: Oxford
- Enginarlar, H. 1993. Student responses to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System* 21, 193-204.
- Ferris, D. R. 1995. Student reactions to teacher responses in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. R. 1997. The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 31 S-339.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinki, S. 1997. Teacher commentary on student writing: descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6, 1X-182.

- Ghandi, M.&Maghsoudi, M. 2014. The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Spelling Errors.*Journal of English Language Teaching*.Vol. 7: 53-61
- Hashemnezhad, H & Mohammadnejad, S. 2012. A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *Journal of English Language Teaching*. Vol.5: 230-239
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. 2006. Feedback on second language the students' writing.*Language Teaching*, 39, 83–101