

TEACHERS' BELIEF TOWARDS CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN TEACHING WRITING DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC

1st Widodo Widayanto 2nd Haris Dibya Ningsih 3rd Ahmad Syafi'I

1st English Teacher 2nd 3rd STKIP Al-Hikmah

Surabaya, Indonesia

widodoj@gmail.com

Abstract: Writing is the most difficult skill in English, because it has complex process inside. There is a way that usually teachers do to help students in solving theirs writing difficulties, that is giving feedback. The problem is that, is all of the teachers use feedback while teaching writing and are they consider the importance of giving feedback, especially in this pandemic situation? By looking at this issue the researcher wants to know teachers' point of view in giving corrective feedback to the student through teachers' beliefs.

Key words: Corrective feedback, Teacher belief, Writing, Covid-19

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a process of developing ideas becomes a statement and paragraph (Nunan, Terrell, & Brown, 2003). The purpose of the writing process is to deliver the point of view through a paragraph of the word. As a consequence, the writer should integrate each sentence, and strengthen the point of view with some supporting details. Aware of this complex process, it is not surprising to find students facing some difficulties in writing. In research done by Alisha et al (2019) found that the most difficulties faced by students in the writing process are lack of vocabulary mastery and grammar. There are 77.84% of students in this condition. As the result, they get doubt while choosing the word and they have to open their dictionary during the writing process.

Moreover, the student also gets confused in using some tenses and they felt unconfident with their spelling ability.

There is a way that usually teachers do to help students in solving their writing difficulties, that is giving feedback. Feedback has been described as the information given by teachers that boosts the understanding and learning of students, helping students identify their mistakes and correct them accordingly (John Bitchener, 2010). Through feedback, the writer will be aware of their mistake, which makes the reader misunderstand their writing. As the study done by Ellis, Sheen, & Murakami (2008) report students who received focused feedback performed better overall than those who received no feedback, and with improved benefits for the accuracy of English articles compared to an unfocused situation. In addition, the researcher assumes if the teacher can maximize this step students will have good writing quality.

The problem is that is all of the teachers use feedback while teaching writing and are they consider the importance of giving feedback, especially in this pandemic situation? According to the study conducted by Astuti & Solikhah (2021), they found only 45,5% of English Junior high school teachers in Klaten evaluated writing and speaking skills (product, practice, and project). It indicates that there is an obstacle when the teacher wants to give feedback on students' writing.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teachers Beliefs, Student Preferences, Corrective Feedback, Teachers' Belief Teachers' belief is the systems that are found on

the purposes, values, and beliefs teachers hold with the teaching material, method, teaching process, and their understanding of work systems and their roles within. These beliefs and values serve as the background for much of the decision-making and action of the teachers and thus constitute what has been termed the "culture of teaching" (Richards & Lockhart, 2007). The beliefs of teachers affect their teaching behavior, development of learners, direct their decision-making and interactions with their learners. Beliefs help teachers build their planning, curricular decision, and determine what is to be learned in the classroom (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017).

The teacher who fails to analyze their beliefs may lead unanticipated consequences in the classroom, put aside valuable curriculum neglect or marginalize students who need them, misrepresent the intentions or actions of students, and limit their ability as experts (Ausbrooks- rusher et al., 2012). On the whole, it can be concluded that the teacher's belief can bring great effect on building classroom activity, deciding the appropriate teaching method, and considering with the student necessary in the learning activity.

Types of Corrective feedback

This research will use corrective feedback (CF) term which defines as teacher response to learner error. According to Russel and Spada (2006), corrective feedback refers to any feedback given to a learner from any source that provides evidence of language type error in the learner. Specifically, this research will be focus on CF in writing activity, so the researcher will concern with any feedback or error correction given by the teacher to improve students' ability to write correctly.

In general, there are two types of corrective feedback, oral and written. However, corrective feedback has many subtypes. In this subchapter, the researcher will examine some types of corrective feedback based on the expert finding;

1. Direct and Indirect

In direct CF the teacher provides error correction form to the students, it can be crossing out a word, phrase, or morpheme that is unnecessary, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and the correct form is written above or close to the wrong type. Applying direct CF has the advantage that there will find clear error correction which can be considered by the learner, although it may not contribute to long-term learning.

On the other hand, in indirect CF the teacher indicates that there is an error occurring but does not offer the correction. This can be done by marking or underlining the error to make student consider their mistake (Ellis, 2009)

2. Unfocused and focused

In giving corrective feedback on students' writing, the teacher can correct all of the students' errors or only select a specific grammatical problem and ignore the others. Both of the types are called unfocused and focused corrective feedback. Some of the study has been conducted to investigate the effect of focused and unfocused CF on student writing development. Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa (2009) find that focused CF can increase the student writing quality by helping

them to notice their writing error. In contrast, unfocused CF has some risks; the student may confuse and overburden, cause inconsistent and unsystematic ways.

3. Local and Global

Local corrective feedback focuses on grammar and mechanic whether global corrective feedback attention to the content of student writing.

4. Metalinguistic CF

Metalinguistic CF involves giving some kind of explicit comment by using a clue or code to the existence of the error. There are two forms of comment in metalinguistic CF, first by using error codes which write in the margin of the text (e.g., ww = wrong word; art = article), and the second teacher numbers error in the text and write a grammatical explanation at the bottom of the text for each numbered mistake.

CONCLUSION

There is a way that usually teachers do to help students in solving their writing difficulties, that is giving feedback. Feedback has been described as the information given by teachers that boosts the understanding and learning of students, helping students identify their mistakes and correct them accordingly. Through feedback, the writer will be aware of their mistake, which makes the reader misunderstand their writing. As the study reports that students who received focused feedback performed better overall than those who received no feedback, and with improved benefits for the accuracy of English articles compared to an

unfocused situation. In addition, the researcher assumes if the teacher can maximize this step students will have good writing quality

REFERENCE

- Al Hajri, F., & Al mahrooqi, R. (2013). Student Perception and Preferences Concerning Instructors' Corrective Feedback. *The Asian EFL Journal Professional Article*, 70(August), 28–53.
- Astuti, M., & Solikhah, I. (2021). Teacher Perception in Teaching English for SMP in Klaten Regency During Covid-19 Outbreak. *IJOTL-TL*, 6(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl-tl.v6i1.645>.Teacher
- Ausbrooks-rusher, M., Schimmel, C., Edwards, S., Prentza, A. I., Belé, A., & Yuan, L. (2012). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2(7).
- Bestari, A. C., Faiza, D., & Mayekti, M. H. (2020). INSTAGRAM CAPTION AS ONLINE LEARNING MEDIA ON THE SUBJECT OF EXTENDED WRITING DURING PANDEMIC OF COVID-19. *SURAKARTA ENGLISH AND LITERATURE JOURNAL*, 3(1).
- Black, D. A., & Nanni, A. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Preferences and justifications of teachers and students in a Thai context. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 16(3), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2016-1603-07>
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. 63(April), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., & Murakami, M. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as

- a foreign language context. 36, 353–371.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2017). Teachers ' Beliefs in English Language Teaching and Learning : A Review of the Literature. 10(4), 78–86.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p78>
- Horbacauskiene, J., & Kasperaviciene, R. (2017). Learners' preferences towards Corrective feedback in writing assignments in tertiary education. *ExELL*, 3(2), 70–83.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/exell-2017-0002>
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students ' Writing Skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668–674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466>
- John Bitchener, U. K. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207–217.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001>
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Maru, M. G., Nur, S., & Lengkoan, F. (2020). Applying Video for Writing Descriptive Text in Senior High School in the COVID-19 Pandemic Transition. *International Journal of Language Education*, 4(3).
[doi:https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i3.14901](https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i3.14901)

- Mohammad, T., & Hazarika, Z. (2016). Difficulties of Learning EFL in KSA: Writing Skills in Context. 6(3), 105–117. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v6n3p105>
- Mulyadi, M. (2011). Penelitian Kuantitatif Dan Kualitatif Serta Pemikiran Dasar Menggabungkannya [Quantitative and Qualitative Research and Basic Rationale to Combine Them]. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi Dan Media*, 15(1), 128.
- Nunan, D., Terrell, T. D., & Brown, H. D. (2003). When ordering this title , use ISBN 007-123462- 4. In *Language* (Vol. 57).
- Rao, C. S., & Satya Sri Durga, V. (2018). Developing Students' Writing Skills in English-A Process Approach. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 1–5. Retrieved from <http://www.jrspelt.com>
- Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (2007). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (15th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosyida, M. A., Ernawati, S., & Rozak, R. R. (2020). English Teachers' Live Stories of Teaching Writing During COVID-19 Pandemic in an Indonesian EFL Junior High School. *Jurnal Pendidikan Edutama*.
- Russel, Jane, and N. S. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning Teaching*, 133–164.
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback on EFL Student Writers ' Grammatical Improvement. 10(10), 43–49. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n10p43>

- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002>
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. (June), 327– 369.
- Walsh, K. (2010). The Importance of Writing Skills: Online Tools Encourage Succes. Retrieved from <https://www.emergingedtech.com/2010/11/the-importance-of-writing-skills-online-tools-to-encourage-success/>
- Wilén, W., Ishler, M., Hustchison, J., & Kindsvatter, R. (2000). *Dynamics of effective teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Zuhri Dj, M., & Sukarnianti, S. (2015). Using Hypnoteaching Strategy to Improve Students' Writing Ability. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 15(2), 185. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v15i2.101>