USULAN
SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LUAR NEGERI

The 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium,
December 1st, 2015, Selangor University Malaysia.

Pengusul:

Dr. Hartono, M.Pd
NIP: 104 9009 0182
NIDN: 0723096201

UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH MALANG
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN

OKTOBER, 2015

HALAMAN PENGESAHAN
SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LUAR NEGERI

Judul Kegiatan	:	Seminar Internasional
Peserta	:	
a. Nama Lengkap	:	Dr. Hartono, M.Pd.
b. NIDN	:	0723096201
c. Jabatan Fungsional	:	Lektor Kepala
d. Program Studi	:	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
e. Nomor HP	:	081333602211
f. Alamat email	:	hartonobi@yahoo.com
Pelaksanaan Kegiatan	:	The 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium, December 1st, 2015, Selangor University Malaysia
Biaya Penelitian Keseluruhan	:	Rp. 6.000.000,00

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015

Mengetahui
An. Ketua Program Studi,
Sekretaris,

Pengusul,

Bayu Wicaksono, M.Ed., PhD.
NIP. 104 0611435

Dr. Hartono, M.Pd
NIDN. 0723096201

Mengetahui:
Dekan FKIP,

Dr. Poncojari Wahyono, MKes
NIP.196201121990021001

BIODATA PENGUSUL SEMINAR INTERNASIONAL LN

I. IDENTITAS DIRI

1.1	Nama Lengkap	:	Dr. Hartono, M.Pd
1.2	Jabatan Fungsional/Gol	:	Lektor Kepala/IV-A
1.3	NIP/NIK/NIDN	:	104 9009 0182/0723096201
1.4	Tempat dan Tgl lahir	:	Kediri, 23 September 1962
1.5	Alamat Rumah	:	Perumahan Muara Sarana Indah B-5, Mulyoagung, Dau, Malang
1.6	No Telepon/Faks	:	0341463084
1.7	Nomor HP	:	081333602211
1.8	Alamat Kantor	:	Jl. Raya Tlogomas 246 Malang
1.9	No Telepon/Faks	:	0341-464318 Ext. 121
1.10	*e-mail*	:	hartonobi@yahoo.com
1.11	Bidang Keilmuan	:	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

II. RIWAYAT PENDIDIKAN

No. Program	S1	S2	S3
2.1. Nama PT	IKIP Malang	IKIP Malang	UM
2.2. Bidang Ilmu	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris	Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
2.3. Tahun Masuk	1982	1988	2008
2.4. Tahun Lulus	1986	1992	2013

III. PENGALAMAN PENELITIAN (bukan skripsi, tesis, maupun disertasi)

Sebagai ketua peneliti selama 5 tahun terakhir dimulai dari penelitian yang paling diunggulkan sampai penelitian tidak diunggulkan.

No.	Tahun	Judul Penelitian	Pendanaan	
			Sumber	Jumlah (Ribu Rp)
3.1	2015	Students' Attitude toward Their Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback on Their Composition	UMM	25.000
3.2	2014	Developing Peer-Assistance Writing Model to Promote Students' Writing Skills: The Synthesis of Topping's and Teo's Models	DIKTI-Hibah Bersaing	Rp. 35.000

3.3	2010	A Model of Collaboration between SMK and Industry for the Effective Teaching of Vocational English	DIKTI-Hibah Bersaing	Rp. 35.000

Tuliskan sumber pendanaan: PDM, SKW, Fundamental Riset, Hibah Bersaing, Hibah Pekerti, Hibah Pascasarjana, RAPID, atau sumber lainnya

lV. PENGALAMAN PENULISAN ARTIKEL ILMIAH DALAM JURNAL (*tidak termasuk makalah seminar/prosiding, artikel surat kabar) Urutkan judul artikel ilmiah yang pernah diterbitkan selama 5 tahun terakhir dimulai dari artikel yang paling relevan menurut Saudara sampai yang tidak diunggulkan.*

No.	Tahun	Judul Artikel Ilmiah	Volume/Nomor	Nama Jurnal
-	-	-	-	-

V. PENGALAMAN PEROLEHAN HKI
Urutkan judul HKI yang pernah diterbitkan 5-10 tahun terakhir.

No	Judul	Nomor Pendaftaran/Program
5.1	Bagaimana Menulis Tesis: Petunjuk tentang Isi dan proses	065463

Semua data yang saya isikan dan tercantum dalam biodata ini adalah benar dan dapat dipertanggungjawabkan secara hukum. Apabila di kemudian hari ternyata dijumpai ketidak-sesuaian dengan kenyataan, saya sanggup menerima risikonya.
Demikian biodata ini saya buat dengan sebenarnya untuk memenuhi salah satu persyaratan dalam pengajuan bantuan seminar Internasional.

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015
Pengusul,

Dr. Hartono, M.Pd
NIDN. 0723096201

USULAN ANGGARAN

RENCANA KEGIATAN SEMINAR INTERNATIONAL LUAR NEGERI

1. Kegiatan Seminar: 3rd Postgraduate Research Symposium, December 1st, 2015, Selangor University Malaysia.
2. Anggaran: Rencana anggaran kegiatan seminar internasional sebesar Rp. 6.000.000,-

Malang, 27 Oktober 2015
Pengusul,

Dr. Hartono, M.Pd
NIDN. 0723096201

RENCANA TEMA YANG AKAN DISEMINARKAN

(Usulan ini bisa diganti dengan tema lain yang sedang dibuat)

STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Hartono

Lecturer of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Malang, East Java, Indonesia

hartonobi@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

It has long been assumed by teachers of a second or foreign language and by researchers working in the area of writing instruction that corrective feedback helps students acquire and demonstrate mastery in the use of targeted linguistic forms and structures. Various reasons have been offered for the effectiveness of written feedback. Such feedback has been used as a popular way to guide students in improving their writing skill. Written feedback is assumed to: (1) connect a teacher with a student on individual level and (2) influence students' writing and attitude toward writing. Besides, students prefer teacher written commentary over oral or peer feedback With reference to this assumption, the purpose of this study is, then, to describe: (1) how students' attitude is toward their teacher's written corrective feedback on their composition, (2) how students' attitude is toward their peer's written corrective feedback on their composition and (3) the problems the students face in giving peer's written corrective feedback on their composition. This study employed the descriptive research design. It was intended to describe students' attitude toward their teacher's as well as their peer's written corrective feedback on their composition. In order to collect the data, two procedures are applied. First, some items in the questionnaire are made to be repetitive – though these items might appear redundant – in order to provide a means to check the reliability of the learners' responses. Second, the language of the questionnaire is translated into Indonesian to avoid misunderstanding of the questions on the part of the respondent (students) while giving their responses to the questions. Furthermore, in order to gain the data on the problems the students face in giving peer's written corrective feedback on their composition, an in dept-interview guide will be used. The interview guide will be focused on elaborating the kinds of linguistic as well as non linguistic problems. Beside the in dept-interview guide, documentary analysis will also be used. The document will be obtained from the students' works on corrective feedback. The steps in analyzing the data are presented as follows: (1) classifying the data into their types (i.e. teachers' and peers', direct and indirect, global and local written corrective feedback); (2) summarizing the overall distribution of students' responses to each item of the questionnaire; (3) showing the number and percentage of responses from each student who chose the available response options; and (4) determining whether students' response is considered positive or negative. The next steps are classifying and describing the problems the students face in giving peer's written corrective feedback on their composition based on the results of the in dept-interview guide and documentary analysis.

Key words: *attitude, written corrective feedback, direct-indirect correction, global-local correction*

STUDENTS' ATTITUDE
TOWARDS WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Hartono

Lecturer of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Malang, East Java, Indonesia

Abstract: This article reports on a research finding on learners' attitude toward their teacher's and peer's written corrective feedback on their composition. Eighteen students from various years were involved in this study. The questionnaire on a three-point Likert scale – showing options of *agree*, *uncertain*, and *disagree* – was used to collect the data of the study. The result of data analysis showed that: (1) the learners generally showed positive attitude toward both the teacher's and the peer's written corrective feedback; (2) they even felt challenged or encouraged when their teacher or their peer always corrected the errors they had made in their writing tasks; (3) they indicated more positive attitude toward direct than toward indirect written corrective feedback; (4) they expected their most frequent errors in their writing tasks to be corrected; (5) they preferred their global errors to be corrected to their local errors.; and (6) they preferred their errors to be corrected by their teacher to their peer.

Key words: *attitude, written corrective feedback, direct-indirect correction, global-local correction*

For any writing teacher, finding out effective ways of helping students develop their writing abilities is a primary concern. It has long been assumed by teachers of a second or foreign language and by researchers working in the area of writing instruction that corrective feedback helps students acquire and demonstrate mastery in the use of targeted linguistic forms and structures. As a result, they have been most concerned with discovering the most effective ways of providing corrective feedback so that students improve the accuracy of their writing. Research findings have shown that giving corrective feedback to students' composition improves their writing skill (Nirwani, 2007 – through her autonomous writing instruction model; Teo, 2007 – through her Socio-interactive Writing for English Language Learners (SWELL) writing method; and Lestari, 2008 – through her interactional approach to the teaching of writing. Other researchers, Bitchener and Knoch (2008), found that the students who received all three written corrective feedback options (direct corrective feedback above each targeted error as well

as written and oral linguistic explanation; corrective feedback above each targeted error as well as written linguistic explanation; corrective feedback above each targeted error) outperformed those who did not receive written corrective feedback.

Various reasons have been offered for the effectiveness of written feedback. Such feedback has been used as a popular way to guide students, especially those who are learning the language in which they are writing, in improving their writing skill. Written comments can: (1) connect a teacher with a student on individual level and (2) influence students' writing and attitude toward writing. Besides, students prefer teacher written commentary over oral or peer feedback (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997).

However, the question arises as to which type is more beneficial for accuracy improvement: direct or indirect type of written corrective feedback? **Direct** corrective feedback may be defined as the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure by the teacher to the student above or near the linguistic error. It may include the crossing out of an unnecessary word/phrase/ morpheme, the insertion of a missing word/phrase/ morpheme, or the provision of the correct form or structure. On the other hand, **indirect** corrective feedback is that which indicates that in some way an error has been made. This may be provided in one of four ways: underlining or circling the error; recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line; or using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is (Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

Over the years, arguments have been advanced for both approaches (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). On one hand, those supporting indirect feedback suggest that this approach is best because it requires students to engage in guided learning and problem solving and, as a result, promotes the type of reflection that is more likely to foster long-term acquisition. On the other hand, those more in favor of direct feedback suggest that it is more helpful to students because it: (1) reduces the type of confusion that they may

experience when they fail to understand or remember, for example, the meaning of error codes used by teachers, (2) provides them with sufficient information to resolve more complex errors in, for example, syntactic structure and idiomatic usage, and (3) offers more immediate feedback on hypotheses that may have been made.

Haswell (2005) noted that peer corrective feedback of undergraduate writing seems to be the least studied of practices now very common in college writing classroom. Toping (1998) stated that peer review appeared capable of yielding outcomes at least as good as, and sometimes better than, teacher assessment. However, many questions about peer corrective feedback remain unanswered. Most previous studies have focused on numeric ratings assigned by student peers to analyze their validity and reliability (e.g. Hughes & Large, Mowl & Pain cited in Cho & Schunn, 2006). However valid and reliable they may be, the value of peer comments for student writers is unknown. Evidence suggests that students actually find the task of reading and commenting on peers' papers to be more helpful for revising than attempting to address their peers' suggestions. Students have reported concerns that peers don't take the task seriously, aren't as qualified as the instructor in the subject matter, have had too little training in writing or practice at making comments, and are simply not the readers assigning grades (Cho & Schunn, 2006).

However, extensive review of research findings on error correction shows that the current status of written corrective feedback in second language teaching remains ambiguous. In this case, no current standards exist on whether, when, which, or how student error should be corrected. Besides, there are few widely accepted linguistic criteria of grammatical and lexical correction in foreign language teaching. Research and literature on the subject (error correction) is quite speculative and relatively scant. Thus, it needs to be validated by a great deal of empirical experimentation. Therefore, Hendrickson (1988) lists the "five fundamental questions and reviews the literature that addresses the issues of

error correction, namely: Should errors be corrected?; (ii) If so, when should errors be corrected?; (iii) Which learner errors should be corrected?; (iv) How should learner errors be corrected?; and (v) Who should correct learner errors? Truscott (1996) claimed that error correction is even both ineffective and harmful, exposing the fact that there is no satisfactory research evidence to support the belief that the corrective feedback is effective in helping learners improve the accuracy of their writing over time. In addition, the major focus of written corrective feedback has been on the way teachers treat learners' errors. Little, if any, has been known about learners' attitude toward written corrective feedback addressed to them (Leki, 1990).

Based on the fact that written corrective feedback (error correction) in second language teaching remains ambiguous and that the main focus on the written corrective feedback is on how to treat students' errors, this study is intended to investigate the neglected areas of written corrective feedback, namely:

1. How is learners' attitude toward their teacher's written corrective feedback on their composition?

2. How is learners' attitude toward their peer's written corrective feedback on their composition?

With reference to the above statement of problems, the purpose of this study is, then, to describe: (1) how learners' attitude is toward their teacher's written corrective feedback on their composition, and (2) how learners' attitude is toward their peer's written corrective feedback on their composition.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study was intended to describe students' attitude toward their teacher's as well as their peer's written corrective feedback on their composition. The written

corrective feedback was, first of all, differentiated in terms of whether they belong to *teachers'* or *peers'* written corrective feedback. Next, they were classified into *direct* and *indirect* written corrective feedback. The former did not only indicate the presence of the students' errors, but also provided clues or tips on how the students correct their own errors. This type of corrective feedback was applied whenever both the teacher and the peer assumed that the students would not be able to correct certain errors they have made in their composition. The latter might indicate either the presence or the specific location of the students' errors. This type of corrective feedback was applied whenever the teacher and the peer as well assumed that the students would be able to discover an acceptable solution to certain errors in their work. Finally, they were categorized into *global* and *local* written corrective feedback. The former refers to the correction of the errors which interfered with the intelligibility of messages or sentences. The latter refers to the correction of the errors which did not interfere with the intelligibility of messages or sentences

Eighteen students were the source of data of this study. They were randomly selected from those who were taking or had taken the Writing III course which focused on essay writing. These students were chosen with the consideration that they had experienced in joining the prerequisite writing courses – Writing I, focusing on sentence building and Writing II, focusing on paragraph development – and, therefore, they were assumed to have received corrective feedback treatments. These students were, then, asked to respond to a questionnaire on a three-point Likert scale.

The questionnaire on a three-point Likert scale – showing options of *agree*, *uncertain*, and *disagree* – was used to collect the data of the study. The items of the questionnaire were constructed by identifying all possible sorts of attitudes showed by the students toward the written corrective feedbacks they had received from their teachers as

well as from their peers during their study periods. The teachers' written corrective feedback was represented by Items 1 – 15; while the peers' written corrective feedback was represented by Items 16 – 25. Teachers' direct written corrective feedback was stated in Item 4, while their indirect written corrective feedback was stated in Items 2, 3, and 5. In terms of peers' direct and indirect written corrective feedback, the former was stated in Item 18, while the latter was stated in Items 16 and 17. At last, teachers' global and local written corrective feedback was stated in Items 10 and 11 respectively, while peers' global and local written corrective feedback was stated in Items 21 and 22 respectively.

Table 1
The Questionnaire Result

Item	Question	D %	N %	A %
1.	Whenever my teacher assign me to write, I want him/her to correct the errors I have made in my writing tasks.			100
2.	I hope my teacher indicates the presence of the errors I have made in my writing tasks.			100
3.	I hope my teacher indicates the location of the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	11.11		88.89
4.	I hope my teacher provides clues or tips on how I should correct the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	5.56		94.44
5.	I hope my teacher only gives general comments in my writing tasks.	88.89		11.11
6.	I hope my teacher only gives scores in my writing tasks.	88.89	5.56	5.56
7.	I hope my teacher only discusses our writing tasks in class.	83.33	5.56	11.11
8.	I hope my teacher does not always correct the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	83.33		16.67
9.	I hope my teacher only corrects the most frequent errors I have made in my writing task.	5.56		94.44
10.	I hope my teacher only corrects the global errors I have made in my writing task.	88.89	5.56	5.56
11.	I hope my teacher does not correct the local errors I have made in my writing task.	94.55		5.56
12.	I feel challenged or encouraged when my teacher always corrects the errors I have made in my writing task.			100
13.	I feel embarrassed or discouraged when my teacher always corrects the errors I have made in my writing task.	94.55		5.56
14.	I like my writing errors to be corrected by my teacher rather than by my classmate.	5.56	11.11	83.33
15.	I feel embarrassed when my teacher uses my writing errors as an illustration for class explanation.	50	11.11	38.89
16.	I hope my classmate indicates the presence of the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	5.56	5.56	88.89
17.	I hope my classmate indicates the location of the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	11.11	5.56	83.33
18.	I hope my classmate provides clues or tips on how I should correct the errors I have made in my writing tasks.	5.56	5.56	88.89
19.	I hope my classmate only gives general comments on my writing tasks.	55.56		44.44
20.	I hope my classmate only corrects the most frequent errors I have made my writing task.	72.22		27.78
21.	I hope my classmate only corrects the global errors I have made my writing task.	66.67	5.56	27.78
22.	I hope my classmate does not correct the local errors I have made my writing task.	22.22	5.56	72.22
23.	I feel challenged or encouraged when my classmate always corrects the errors I have made my writing task.		5.56	94.44
24.	I feel embarrassed or discouraged when my classmate always corrects the errors I have made my writing task.	83.33		16.67
25.	I like my writing errors to be corrected by my classmate rather than by my teacher.	83.33	11.11	5.56

In short, all 25-questionnaire items consisted of statements of an attitudinal nature with accompanying scales in the Likert format. The items were clustered in two major categories: (1) the learners' attitude toward their teachers' written corrective feedback; and (2) the learners' attitude toward their peers' written corrective feedback. The former was further categorized into the learners' attitude toward their teachers' direct—indirect and global—local written corrective feedback; while the latter was further classified into the learners' attitude toward their peers' direct—indirect and global—local written corrective feedback.

In order to obtain valid research data, two procedures were applied. First, some items in the questionnaire were made to be repetitive – though these items might appear redundant – in order to provide a means to check the reliability of the learners' responses. Second, the language of the questionnaire was translated into Indonesian to avoid misunderstanding of the questions on the part of the respondent (sudents) while giving their responses to the questions.

The data obtained from the students' completed questionnaire were presented using two basic forms of analysis. Firstly, descriptive statistic analysis was used to summarize the overall distribution of responses to each item of the questionnaire. Secondly, the frequency data analysis was used to show the number and percentage of responses from each student who chose the available response options of *agree*, *uncertain*, and *disagree*. Inferential statistic analysis was not used in this study, however.

The steps in analyzing the data were presented as follows: (1) classifying the data into their types (i.e. teachers' and peers', direct and indirect, global and local written corrective feedback); (2) summarizing the overall distribution of students' responses to each item of the questionnaire; (3) showing the number and percentage of responses from

each student who chose the available response options; and (4) determining whether students' response is considered positive or negative.

FINDINGS

This chapter provides the findings for the two research questions regarding: (1) the learners' attitude toward their teacher's written corrective feedback in their composition and (2) learners' attitude toward their peer's written corrective feedback in their composition. Accordingly, this chapter is divided into two parts, each of which represents the response to one of the two research questions respectively. However, the reliability of the questionnaire is firstly provided before the presentation of research results in order to ensure the findings.

The Reliability of the Questionnaire

Useful questionnaires require high reliability. Some respondents may not necessarily answer each question honestly, or even earnestly. Indeed, in any group of respondents, there is always a chance that some may not even read the questions. Fortunately, there are indications from the result of the present study (see **Table 1** for the questionnaire result) that the respondents read each item carefully and responded in a way that showed high degree of internal consistency. One indicator is the percentage scores for reversely worded items. If the responses indicate roughly equal scores for reversely worded items, then it becomes more convincing to believe that respondents are reading the items and understanding equivalent ones in the same way regardless of wording. Three such pairs items – Items 12 and 13 (100% and 94.44%, respectively); 23 and 24 (94.44% and 83.33%, respectively); and 14 and 25 (83.33%, each for reversely worded items) – although not worded exactly in reverse, provided evidence that the respondents were replying in a reliable manner.

8

Learners' Attitude toward Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback

As for the learners' attitude toward their teacher's written corrective feedback, all of the respondents (learners) preferred the errors they had made in their writing tasks to be corrected (Item 1 = 100%). This indicated that they showed positive attitude toward the teacher's written corrective feedback. In terms of the way how errors should be corrected, they hoped that their teacher indicated the presence of the errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 2 = 100%). In addition, they showed a significant tendency to demand their teacher to indicate the location of the errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 3 = 88.89%). This means that they indicated positive attitude toward indirect written corrective feedback. In addition, there was also a strong tendency that the learners expected their teacher not only indicated the location of the errors they had made in their writing tasks but also provided clues or tips on how they should correct their errors (Item 4 = 94.44%). However, by comparing the percentage between the two different ways of giving written corrective feedback, it can be stated that the learners indicated more positive attitude toward direct than toward indirect written corrective feedback.

Furthermore, the learners indicated a tendency to disagree with their teacher who only gave general comments and scores in their writing tasks (Items 5 and 6 = 88.89% each). This implied that they tended to appreciate their teacher's more detailed written corrective feedback in order to learn more about the way how they should correct their errors by themselves. Concerning the frequency of written corrective feedback, the learners disagreed with their teacher who did not always correct the errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 8 = 83.33%). In other words, they preferred their errors to be always corrected by their teacher. With regard to which errors needed corrective feedback, there was a strong tendency that the learners expected their teacher only to correct the most frequent errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 9 = 94.44%). This might

be due to the notion that from the learner's perspective, it was frustrating to receive a corrected composition with many words crossed out, new words added, and an array of marginal comments – all of these were usually written in red ink. Even few, if not some, students might feel embarrassed and lose confidence when they received their written works corrected in this way. In connection with the types of errors, the learners preferred their global errors to be corrected to their local errors (Items 10 and 11 = 88.89% and 94.44%, respectively). This means that the teacher should give a higher priority for correction of errors which interfered with the intelligibility of sentences or massages than those which did not.

The learners' positive attitude toward written corrective feedback was found when they responded that they felt challenged or encouraged when their teacher always corrected the errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 12 = 100%). This showed that they had no psychological constraint on error correction. When they had to choose either their teacher or their peer who should correct their errors, they preferred their errors to be corrected by teacher (Item 14 = 83.33%). This might indicate that they felt more confident with their teacher's competence in giving written corrective feedback for their writing tasks, and/or they perceived their teacher's correction as being more "face saving." Last but not least, when asked whether they felt embarrassed when their teacher used their writing errors as an illustration for class explanation 50% disagreed, 11.11% neutral, and 38.89% agreed (Item15). This implied that, on one hand, using learners' errors as an illustration for class explanation might become a controversial issue among learners. On the other hand, it might indicate that a greater number of learners did not want their weaknesses in writing composition to be exposed publicly since it would make them embarrassed.

Learners' Attitude toward Peer's Written Corrective Feedback

Generally speaking, the learners' positive attitude toward their peer's written corrective feedback could be seen from the following questionnaire results. Concerning the manner in which error correction was done, the learners expected their classmate to indicate the presence of the errors they had made in their writing tasks. They also hoped that their classmate not only indicated the location of their writing errors but also provided clues or tips on how they should correct the errors (Items 16 = 88.89%; 17 = 83.33%; and18 = 88.89%, respectively). These showed that they could believe in their peer's capability of identifying errors and of providing correction on the errors and could, to a certain extent, learn from their peer's correction as well.

When asked whether their classmate should only give general comments in their writing tasks, 55.56% learners disagreed and 44.44% others agreed (Item 19). This might indicate that the learners perceived peers' written corrective feedback in the form of general comments as a controversial issue. That is to say, some learners thought of a general comment in writing tasks as something beneficial, but some others considered it as something worthless. In relation to which errors needed to be corrected, the learners indicated a tendency to expect their peer not to correct their most frequent errors (Item 20 = 72.22%). They might think that their peer did not know for sure which was considered to be the most frequent error. With regard to which type of errors should be corrected, there was a tendency that the learners preferred their local errors to be corrected to their global errors (Items 22 = 72.22% and 21 = 66.67%, respectively). This might imply that the learners have a less confidence with their peer's competence in identifying the errors which interfered with the intelligibility of sentences.

Finally, the learners' positive attitude toward written corrective feedback became evidence when they responded that they felt challenged or encouraged when their peer

always corrected the errors they had made in their writing tasks (Item 23 = 94.44%). This showed that they did not have any psychological barrier to written corrective feedback among their peers.

DISCUSSION

This study deals with learners' attitude toward written corrective feedback in their composition tasks. In other words, it concerns their psychological response on error correction. It is conducted for at least two considerations. First, among composition teachers, there is still inconsistency in whether they should give error correction to students' works. Some of them give the student's works correction marks, directly or indirectly, and have classroom discussion on the most commonly made errors in the hope that they will know their writing weaknesses. Some others, however, do not give any mark of correction to the works and just discuss the errors in the classroom (Hartono, 1993). In addition, the major focus of written corrective feedback has been on the way teachers treat learners' errors. However, Leki (1990) states that little, if any, has been known about learners' attitude toward written corrective feedback addressed to them.

Studying learners' errors is not only important but also worthwhile in any language learning. Corder (1978) has suggested that a learner's errors provide evidence of the system of the language that he is using (i.e. has learned) at a particular point in the course. They are important in three ways. First, to the teacher, in the sense that they tell him, if he undertakes a systematic analysis, how far toward the goal the learner has progressed and, consequently, what remains for him to learn. Secondly, they provide evidence to the researcher of how language is learned or acquired, or what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of the language. Thirdly, they are indispensable to

the learner himself because we can regard the making of mistakes as a device the learner uses in order to learn them.

However, even though the result of this study showed that most learners (83.33%) preferred their errors to be always corrected by their teacher, the correction should not be done at all times and not all rules. This is so because too much correction on the students' works may cause them to loose self-confidence in their learning. This lack of self-confidence may, in turn, result in such negative attitude toward learning as too much feeling afraid of making mistakes, being discouraged, and even being frustrated. This is in line with what Hendrickson (1991) suggests that, in general, error correction needs to be limited to "manipulative grammar practice" – this implies that more errors may be tolerated during "communicative practice". In his opinion, therefore, teachers need to create a supportive environment in which their students can feel confident about expressing their ideas and feelings freely without suffering the threat or embarrassment of having each one of their oral or written errors corrected.

As far as the type of errors is concerned, the findings showed that the learners preferred their global errors to be corrected to their local errors. In addition, with regard to which errors needed corrective feedback, there was a strong tendency that the learners expected their teacher only to correct the most frequent errors they had made in their writing tasks. These findings seem to be in accordance with Hendrickson's (1991) three hypotheses, stating that: (i) teachers should correct "global" errors, errors that interfere with communication or impede the intelligibility of a massage. Such errors deserve top priority in correction; (ii) errors that are the most stigmatized, that cause the most unfavorable reactions, are the most important to correct; and (iii) errors that occur most frequently should be given top priority. In relation to these hypotheses, we may agree that the correction of one global error in a sentence will clarify the intended message more

than the correction of several local errors in the same sentence. Furthermore, errors that occur very frequently in students' writing should receive top priority for correction. This is so because errors which occur very frequently, if not corrected soon, are very likely to fossilize. The fossilization of errors, will, in turn, result in the more complicated problems in learning the target language.

The other finding showed that the learners indicated more positive attitude toward direct than indirect written corrective feedback. In relation to this finding, Hendrickson (1980) has experienced with various combinations of indirect and direct treatments for correcting composition written by students of inter- mediate Spanish. He requires his students to write five picture story compositions as homework assignments. As they write, the students are encouraged to use self-help resources such as their text book, dictionaries, and grammar books. The students have several days to complete and return the first draft of their picture story composition. Hendrickson, then, proposes the two techniques of treating students' compositions, namely: indirect correction treatments and direct correction treatments. The former may indicate either the presence or the specific location of errors. This kind of treatment is used whenever the teacher assumes that students will be able to discover an acceptable solution for a given error by considering the error itself or by using the appropriate self-help references mentioned above. The latter, on the other hand, does not only indicate the presence of errors in a sentence, but also provides clues or tips on how students can correct their own errors. This correction treatment is applied whenever the teacher assumes that the students will not be able to correct certain errors.

Who should correct the learners' errors? The finding showed that the learners preferred their errors to be corrected by their teacher to their peer. Dealing with this, it is suggested that the teacher be a significant source of information about the target language and to react to errors whenever it seems appropriate to do so. An educator believes that the

14

teacher's function in error correction is "to provide data and examples, and where necessary to offer explanations and descriptions and, more important, verification of the learner's hypothesis (i.e. correction)" about the target language (Corder 1973, in Hendrickson 1978).

In the writer's opinion, although teacher's correction of learners' errors is helpful to many students, it may not necessarily be an effective instructional strategy in all language classrooms. Peer-correction or self-correction with the teacher's guidance may be more beneficial in term of time and effort for some teachers and students. However, this suggests that instructional strategy need to be verified through a number of experimentation since there is little empirical research to test these hypotheses.

Finally, Hendrickson (in Hartono, 1993) proposes at least four critical factors in connection with providing corrective feedback for learners' composition tasks.

Firstly, teachers need to be aware of a student's purpose and goals for communicating in writing. He gives an example by asking such questions as: Does the students need to develop his or her writing skills in the foreign language well enough to compose a class term paper, or to write a master's thesis? Or, does the student simply want to be able to write a letter of invitation or a thank-you note to a friend? In addition, it is supposed that "many readers would be more tolerant of a thank-you note full of errors than they would be of a master's thesis that contains proportionately fewer errors."

Secondly, one has to consider students' written proficiency in the target language at any given time. Hendrickson (1978) has found that as student's level of proficiency increases, they become better equipped to correct their own errors. He also believes that because the beginners have presumably mastered the foreign language system to a lesser degree than have advanced learners, their limited linguistic competence is often insufficient to allow them to locate and find solution to their errors by themselves.

15

Consequently, less advanced students need specific clues about their errors. However, advanced students are better able to correct their own errors if their teacher indicates where the errors are. Thirdly, one should be aware of error types and frequencies as well as an understanding of how these two aspects relate to the students' writing goal. The teacher should give a higher priority for correction of error that interferes with the intelligibility of sentences than errors that do not. Similarly, errors stigmatize the writer from the perspective of native speakers should be among the first corrected. Also, errors that occur frequently in students' composition should be given more immediate attention than those that are less frequent.

The last, and possibly the most critical factor in giving corrective feedback, is the students' attitudes about their nature and correction. The learners' willingness to use a foreign language – and to make errors – is one characteristic of a successful language learner. A student's attitude toward learning involves self-control and self-confidence whereby the learner can attempt self-expression without feeling threatened by making errors and being corrected. This statement means that the teacher should be able to create a healthy learning environment in which students recognize that making errors is, indeed, a natural phenomenon in learning any new skills, including foreign languages.

In addition to this, a more positive attitude would be to seek information actively on the correctness and appropriateness of one's efforts to communicate. Such attitude toward learning from errors should be cultivated by the language teacher. Commonly, students who show low self-confidence in their ability to express themselves in a foreign language need a greater of supportive feedback on their errors than do their more confident peers. Language teachers can help build student self-confidence by focusing on high priority errors and tolerating less important ones. And, it may be better to give low

self-confident students more credit for the content of writing (or their ideas) rather than for the form of their composition.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the learners generally showed positive attitude toward both the teacher's and the peer's written corrective feedback. They even felt challenged or encouraged when their teacher or their peer always corrected the errors they had made in their writing tasks. More specifically, they indicated more positive attitude toward direct than toward indirect written corrective feedback. There was also a strong tendency that the learners expected their most frequent errors in their writing tasks to be corrected. Next, they preferred their global errors to be corrected to their local errors. Then they preferred their errors to be corrected by their teacher to their peer. It is suggested, therefore, that teachers of writing give written corrective feedback in each composition task they assign to their students by considering: (1) how students' errors should be corrected; (2) which students' errors should be corrected; (3) when students' errors should be corrected.; and (4) who should correct students' errors.

References

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. 2008. The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research* 12 (3): 409 – 431.

Cho, K. & Schunn, C. D. 2006. Typology and perceived helpfulness of comments from novice peer reviewers and subject matter experts. http://wcx.sagepub.com, (accessed October 19, 2008).

Corder, S. P. 1978. The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5: 161 – 170.

Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. 1997. Teacher written commentary on student writing: description and implication. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 6: 155 – 182.

Ferris, D R., & Robert, B. 2001. Error feedback in l2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 10: 161 – 184.

Hartono. 1993. The role of error correction in improving students' achjievement in composition. Master Thesis. Postgraduate Program of IKIP Malang, Indonesia.

Haswell, R. H. 2005. NCTE/CCCC's recent war on scholarship. *Written Communication,* 22: 198 – 223.

Hendrickson, J. M. 1988. Error correction in foreign language teaching: recent theory, research, and practice. In Croft (Ed.), *Reading on english as a second language.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthorop.

Hendrickson, J. M. 1980. The treatment of error in written work. *Modern Language Journal,* 64: 217 – 221.

Hendrickson, J. M. 1991. Error and error correction in lnaguage teaching. Occational paper, *RELC*.

Leki, I. 1990. Coaching from the margin: Issues in written response. In *Second language writing: research insight for the classroom.* ed. B. Kroll, 57 – 68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lestari, L. A. 2008. The interactional approach to the teaching of writing and its implications for second language acquisition. *TEFLIN Journal* 19 (1): 42 – 56.

Nirwani, S. (2007). Applying autonomous writing instruction model to improve the second year students' writing skill of sman 7 Malang. Master Thesis. Postgraduate Program of State University of Malang, Indonesia.

Peterson, S. S. & Kennedy, K. 2006. Sixth-grade teachers' written comments on student writing. *Written Communication,* 23 (1): 36 – 62.

Teo, A. 2007. SWELL: A writing method to help english language learners. *English Teaching FORUM,* 45 (4): 18 – 25.

Topping, K. 1998. Peer correction between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research,* 63(3): 249 – 276.

Truscott, J. 1996. The case against grammar correction in l2 writing class. *Language Learning*, 45: 327 – 369.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Hartono is a lecturer at English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Malang, East Java, Indonesia. He has published some conceptual and research articles in *Alternatif* journal, a scientific journal published by Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Malang. In addition, he has also published some books, especially English for Specific Purposes (ESP) serial.