CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter shows Corrective Feedback, Coded Corrective Feedback, Feedback from Second Language Acquisition Theory, Feedback from Socio-cultural Theory, the Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback, and the Previous Study and Research Gap.

2.1 Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback is one type of negative feedback. Negative feedback is seen as feedback which indicates students' utterance lacks veracity or linguistically deviant (Ellis, 2009). Meanwhile, positive feedback is seen as feedback which affirms that students' response to an activity is correct. The definitions of corrective feedback can be seen into two perspectives; Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Socio-cultural (Ellis, 2013). In SLA perspective, corrective feedback is a facilitator of L2 acquisition in understanding the grammatical features (Long, 1996; Lyster, 2004). Moreover, in socio-cultural perspective, corrective feedback is a tool used to help to scaffold learning in social interaction and assist the subsequent internalization of new linguistic form (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

The practice of corrective feedback can be delivered by the teacher in two ways; written and oral. Both oral and written CF has several types of its corrective feedback (Ellis, 2008 & 2009). The types of oral CF are recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal. Recast CF happens when the corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects the utterance in some way (e.g. phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical). When the corrector repeats the learner utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress called as repetition CF. Clarification request will be found when the corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said. Explicit correction can be seen when the corrector indicates an error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction. Then, elicitation CF happens when the corrector repeats part of the learner utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it. When the corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error is known as paralinguistic signal.

In addition, written CF has two types of feedback, direct and indirect corrective feedback (Bitchener, 2008). Direct corrective feedback is feedback given by the teacher by indicating the error and giving the correction for the error existed (Ellis, 2008). The error can be an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, verb tenses, noun ending sentence structure. Meanwhile, indirect corrective feedback is feedback given by the teacher by indicating the error only and asking the students to correct the error existed by them. Yet, Ellis (2008) classified each

WCF types (direct and indirect CF) have its own types. Direct corrective feedback has meta-linguistic CF with brief grammatical description, focus and un-focus, and reformulation. Meanwhile, indirect corrective feedback has coded and un-coded, and meta-linguistic CF use of error code.

2.1.1 Direct corrective feedback

Giving feedback using direct CF happens when the teacher indicates the error and provides the correction form. The error can be an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, verb tenses, noun ending, articles errors, and sentences structure. Example 1 illustrates direct CF given by the teacher.

---

        a   *a*   *the*
A boy stole ^ doll from ^ girl. He escaped with having ^ doll. When the boy was
        over   *a*   *a*   *saw* *a*
going ~~through~~ ^ bridge over ~~the~~ river he ~~found~~ ^ toy in the river.

EXAMPLE 1

Direct CF has the advantage that it provides students with explicit guidance about how to correct the error existed in students' writings. In contrast, it has also a disadvantage that it doesn't engage students in the process of learning and it may not contribute to long-term learning.

2.1.1.1 Meta-linguistic CF with brief grammatical description

As second type of meta-linguistic CF, meta-linguistic CF with brief grammatical description is part of direct CF. This feedback happens when the teacher provides students the meta-linguistic explanations of the errors. The use of this feedback is uncommon, because it takes much more time consuming than another type of meta-linguistic CF. It also forces the teacher to be able to possess sufficient meta-linguistic knowledge and to write clear and accurate explanations for a variety of error. Example 2 illustrates meta-linguistic CF with brief grammatical description.

---

(1)   *(2)*   *(3)*
A boy stole doll from girl. He escaped with having doll. When the boy was
    (4)   *(5)*   *(6)*   *(7)* *(8)*
going through bridge over the river he found toy in the river.

Notes: (1), (2), (5), (6), and (8)—you need 'a' before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.
(3)—you need 'the' before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously.
(4)—you need 'over' when you go across the surface of something; you use 'through' when you go inside something (e.g. 'go through the forest').

EXAMPLE 2

2.1.1.2 The focus and unfocused CF

The focus and unfocused CF is another types of direct CF. When the teacher choose to correct all of the students' errors, this case called as unfocused CF. The process of correction in unfocused CF is difficult for students because there are a variety of the error they have to be corrected.

Whereas, focused CF is feedback given by the teacher that only focus on a single error. In Sheen (2007), the teacher only corrects the article errors in students' writing. That's why focused CF is more effective for students and helps students in correcting their writing, because the focus of their correction is only a single error.

2.1.1.3 Reformulation CF

Reformulation CF is also part of direct CF. In this feedback, the teacher identifies an error and she/he needs to construct a native speaker version of that part of the text containing an error. Students then revise by deciding which of the native-speaker's reconstructions which is accepted. The example 3 illustrates reformulation CF.

Original version : As he was jogging, his tammy was shaked.   *Reformulation   : As he was jogging, his tummy was shaking.*   *tummy   shaking* *Error correction : As he was jogging his ~~tammy~~ was ~~shaked.~~*   **EXAMPLE 3 (from Sachs and Polio 2007: 78)**

2.1.2   Indirect Corrective Feedback

Indirect CF is feedback given by the teacher by indicating students' error in their writings without correcting it. This can be done by underlining or circling the error existed in students' writings. Indirect CF is divided into two; coded and un-coded CF.

2.1.2.1 Coded CF

Coded CF is feedback given by the teacher by indicating the error and giving the codes for the error existed. Coded CF is students' favourite feedback (Ferris & Roberts, 2001), because it doesn't take much time consuming in doing the correction. The example 4 illustrates the coded CF.

A boy stole X doll from X girl. He escaped with having X doll. When the boy was going Xthrough bridge over XtheX river he found X toy in the river.

Notes: X = missing word
X __X = wrong word

EXAMPLE 4

2.1.2.2 Un-coded CF

Un-coded CF is feedback given by the teacher by indicating the error only without giving the codes. This feedback takes much time consuming for students in doing the correction, because students have to think hard to solve the clues which are only the underlined words or sentence. In contrast, this feedback gives a big impact for students in their awareness in writing. So that, students will pay attention at the accuracy of their writings and think carefully before they write. The example 5 is for un-coded CF.

> *A boy stole X doll from X girl. He escaped with having X doll. When the boy was going Xthrough bridge over XtheX river he found X toy in the river.*
>
> **EXAMPLE 5**

2.1.2.3 Meta-linguistic CF

Meta-linguistic CF use of error code is also part of indirect CF. The correction given by the teacher commonly uses abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors. The labels can be placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin. For this feedback, students need to work out to correct the error existed from clues provided for their revision text. The error codes used by the teacher in giving feedback in students' writing have a lot of advantages. Firstly, students who received correction using error codes improved their accuracy over time in only two of the four categories of error she investigated (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982). Students are also assisted by the error codes in self-editing their writings (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). The example 6 illustrates meta-linguistic CF use of error code.

> *art   art   art*
> *A boy stole doll from girl. He escaped with having doll. When the boy was*
> *Prep. art   art   WW art*
> *going through bridge over the river he found toy in the river.*
>
> **EXAMPLE 3**

2.2 Coded Corrective Feedback

As stated before, coded CF is known as feedback given by the teacher by indicating the error and giving the codes for the error existed. Coded CF is more preferable (48%) than un-coded CF (19%), because teacher doesn't take much time consuming in marking the errors and doing the correction (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Coded CF is also found as feedback which can be a long-term learning since it can gain language accuracy. There are five categories of grammatical features which are analyzed using coded CF; verb errors, noun-ending errors, articles errors, wrong words, and sentence structure errors. The errors were marked by teacher using codes; *V* for verb errors, *N* for noun-ending, *Art* for article errors, *WW* for wrong words, and *SS* for sentence structure errors.

2.3 Academic Writing

The definitions of writing are variously stated by some experts. According to Rivers (1981), writing is conveying information or expression of original ideas in a consecutive way in the new language. Brown (2001) also claimed that writing is a thinking process. Furthermore, he states that writing can be planned and given with an unlimited number of revisions before its release. In addition, Elbow (1973) in Brown (2001) also says that writing is a two-step process. The first process is figuring out the meaning and the second process is putting the meaning into language. Writing represents what we think. It is because the writing process reflects things, which stay in the mind.

Academic writing always defines as a form of evaluation that asks students to demonstrate knowledge and show proficiency with certain disciplinary skills of thinking, interpreting, and presenting (Irvin, 2010). Chris Thaiss and Terry Zawacki (2010) in Irvin (2010) found what academic writing is and its standards. They came up with three characteristics. Firstly, academic writing must have clear evidence in writing that the writer(s) have been persistent, open-minded, and disciplined in study. Secondly, it should have the dominance of reason over emotions or sensual perception. Thirdly, it also has an imagined reader who is coolly rational, reading for information, and intending to formulate a reasoned response.

2.4 Feedback from Second Language Acquisition Theory

In Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, usually feedback represents as an input in a learning process. Krashen (1982) in his theory, *The Input Hypothesis,* claims that students acquire language in only one way; by understanding messages or receiving 'comprehensible input'. Students progress along the natural order by understanding input that contains structures at their next 'stage' (structures above their current level of competence). That is to say, students move from stage i (their current level of their competence) to $i+1$ (the next level of their competence) by understanding input containing $i+1$ (input that students haven't known before). Understanding means that the students not only acquire the form, but also the meaning of the message. Thus, acquisition takes place when the students understand language containing i+1. Actually, input is

the important element for students to lead them acquiring languages. Yet, students don't simply acquire what they heard. There is a significant contribution of the internal language processor called as Language Acquisition Device (LAD) which helps students acquiring languages (Chomsky cited in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). In *The Input Hypothesis*, Krashen highlights that comprehensible input (*i +1)* can be interpreted by students by the help of students' Language Acquisition Device (LAD). Besides LAD, comprehensible input will not also function in acquiring language until it gets involved in interaction.

Long (1983) argues that comprehensible input isn't enough for students to acquire language. In fact, students don't only need input to acquire language, but they also need an interaction with their interlocutor to help them in acquiring language. Interactional modification is also known as negotiation of meaning. It is used to overcome the communicative breakdown as a result of the students' limited L2 resources (Ellis, 2013). It is conversational strategies which include confirmation checks (one speaker seeks confirmation of the other's preceding utterance through repetition of what was perceived to be all or part of preceding utterance), comprehension checks (one speaker attempts to determine whether the other speaker has understood a preceding message), and clarification requests (one speaker seeks assistance in understanding the other speaker's preceding utterance through questions or statement such as "I don't know" or imperative such as "please repeat") to process meanings.

Students' acquisition can't be reached only from the input received. There must be an effort to use the input for communication. The effort must be as the

comprehensible output. The output is needed to lead students in acquiring languages. Swain (1985) believes that acquisition occurs after students can use the language from the input they have received. The output is also known as a students' meaningful production of language. The output is important for the students in two ways; to push students to use alternative way in order to express a message precisely, coherently, and appropriately; and to force students to move semantic processing which is a characteristic of the early stage of SLA to syntactic processing. In the output hypothesis, the output has three functions; noticing function (students will discover the gap between what they want to say and what they can say, and realize what they know and what they don't know), reflective function (the interlocutor will let students to speak or write freely, and through the process of speaking or writing, students will realize the use of a particular word or phrase that they don't understand and try to fix it), and hypothesis testing function (students are provided opportunities to test their hypotheses on the target language by judging the comprehensibility and linguistic correctness of their utterances when it is compared with feedback obtained from their interlocutors (Izumi, 2003 in Lu, 2010)) (Swain, 1985).

2.5 Feedback from Socio-cultural Theory

In socio-cultural theory, the acquisition occurs in a process of interaction rather than as a result of interaction (Ellis, 2009). This theory believes that L2 acquisition is an interacted-process which cannot be treated as individual-based process, but rather as one shared between the individual and other persons (the

students and the experts). The interaction refers to exchange the information between the experts (the students' interlocutors/the teacher) and the students in which there is an indication that an utterance has not been understood entirely, one of them need to interrupt the conversation in order to understand what the conversation is about (Gass & Selinker, 2001 in Zhang, 2009). The process of interaction needs a medium to deliver what they are talking about which is called as a psychological tool (i.e. language). The students need a guidance to use language to help them acquire new information from the expert. Guiding students to be able to use language is also known as scaffolding.

One of the common ways of scaffolding is by giving feedback. To create successful scaffolding, the experts or the teachers have to grab students' attention; manage students' behaviours by reducing their freedom in doing their task grumpily; guide them to keep in their right track in terms of their goals of learning; give some critics and some examples; and control their frustration (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976 in Zhang, 2009). So that, giving appropriate scaffolding to L2 students can help them to develop their linguistic knowledge (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002).

Actually, there are three levels of developmental; the actual developmental level, a level of potential development, and the level which lies beyond the learner (Vygotski, 1978). The first level is the level of developmental of children's mental functions which they achieved by completing the development cycles by themselves, while the third level (level lies beyond the learners) is the level which learner is unable to perform the task even the expert

(assistance) is provided. The level of potential development is the level in which learners have solved problem with the assistance of an expert or through collaboration with peers. The second level is also known as Zone Proximal Development (ZPD). Learners' ZPD is effective in helping and enabling them at giving the correct form during the feedback session.

2.6 The Studies on Written Corrective Feedback

Several studies (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a; 2010b; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, R., et al., 2008; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Robb, T., Ross & I. Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984; Sheen, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008) have investigated the effectiveness of different types of written corrective feedback for students. Some experts (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Lalande, 1982; Robb, T., Ross & I. Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984) have investigated the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback. Some others also have investigated the effectiveness of focused and unfocused corrective feedback (Ellis, R., et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007). Furthermore, the other experts have investigated the effectiveness of coded and un-coded CF (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Truscott & Hsu, 2008).

The effectiveness of direct and indirect CF can be seen from several studies (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a; 2010b; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Lalande, 1982; Robb, T., Ross & I. Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984). These studies, except Lalande (1982), divided

the students into four groups; direct CF with written meta-linguistic explanation, indirect CF, direct CF with oral meta-linguistic explanation, and no feedback (control group). The results show that students who received direct CF with oral explanation outperformed three other groups. Meanwhile, Lalande (1982) examined the effectiveness of direct and indirect CF. The result shows that indirect CF were more successful in reducing written errors over time. Indirect CF also has a benefit for students, because it helps students to engage them in guided-learning and problem-solving. In 2001, similar study also examined the effectiveness of direct and indirect CF. In addition, this study add no feedback group as control group.

Ellis, et al. (2008) and Sheen (2007) examined the effectiveness of focused and unfocused CF. Both Ellis, et al. and Sheen divided students into three groups; direct CF with direct and indirect article use (unfocused), direct CF with written meta-linguistic explanation for the article use (focused), and no feedback (control group). Ellis found that there are no significant differences between focused and unfocused. Meanwhile, Sheen found that group 2 (direct CF with written meta-linguistic explanation for the article use (focused)) outperformed group 1 and 3.

The study of the effectiveness of coded and un-coded CF is also investigated by Ferris & Roberts (2001) and Truscott & Hsu (2008). Both studies divided students into three groups; coded, un-coded, and no feedback (control group). Ferris & Roberts found that the two indirect CF (coded and un-coded) outperformed no feedback group in self-editing their revision texts. Meanwhile, Truscott also found that coded and un-coded CF groups outperformed no feedback

group in self-editing, but it is only in students' revision text only, it didn't find in students' new piece of writings.

2.7 Related study and research gap

This study is based on Ferris and Roberts' study (2001) and Fathman & Whalley's study (1990). Ferris & Roberts' study focuses on the effectiveness indirect (coded and un-coded) corrective feedback and its effect. Indirect CF occurs when the teacher indicates some errors exist, but she/he does not provide the correction (Ferris, 2001). In this case, the teacher lets the students to know mistakes existed in their writing and leave them to solve their problem by themselves. Indirect CF is preferable for most student writers because it engages them in "guided learning and problem solving" (Lalande, 1982), leading to reflection about linguistic forms that may foster long-term acquisition (James, 1998; Reid, 1998b), and helps students to make progress in accuracy over time more than direct CF does (Ferris et al., 2000; Ferris & Helt, 2000; Lalande, 1982).

Ferris & Roberts (2001) study's investigated 72 ESL learners in six week long study (12 hours in total). The purpose of the study is to examine how explicit error feedback should be in order to help students to self-edit error their own writing. This study compares students' self-edit error ability in three groups; coded (underlined and description), un-coded (underlined only), and no feedback. Each group is asked to write the 50-minutes essay and collected it to the teacher. There are five categories of errors which are marked by the teacher in students' essays as feedback. The table below is the explanation and the examples.

Table 2.1
Table of description of error categories

Categories	Descriptions	Examples
Verb errors	All errors in verb tense or form, including relevant subject–verb agreement errors, two-word verb, verb formation, voice, and tense.	A computer have (V) many effects for human potential.
Article errors	Article or other determiner incorrect, omitted, or unnecessary.	Computer (Art) becomes a hindrance for human.
Noun ending errors	Plural or possessive ending incorrect, omitted, or unnecessary; includes relevant subject– verb agreement errors.	A computer is one of proof (N) the current technological development.
Wrong word	All specific lexical errors in word choice or word form, including preposition and pronoun errors. Spelling errors only included if the (apparent) misspelling resulted in an actual English word.	With a computer, we can do anything easier such us (WW), studying, searching some resources, and etc.
Sentence structure	Errors in whole sentence or clause aberrant, subject formation, verb missing, verb complement/object complement, prep. Phrase/infinitive mix-up, dangling/misplaced modifier, sentence fragment, run-on sentence, parallel structure, relative clause formation, word order, gapping error, extraneous words, awkward phrasing.	A computer has been faster in developing and progressing (SS).

(Adopted from Ferris & Roberts (2001))

In the following meeting, students will be given back their first essays with feedback given and students study the feedback given. After studying the feedback, students are asked to do 20-minutes revision on their own essay, and collect it to the teacher. The categories of errors marked by the teacher are also same as the first essay. After collecting their essay, students are also asked to complete a "Grammar Knowledge Questionnaire". The questionnaire is used to know they way in which students preferred to receive feedback about their error.

The result shows that both groups received feedback significantly outperformed the no feedback group on self-editing task, yet there is no significant in both groups received feedback. In addition, the result of the questionnaire shows that the most popular feedback choice (48%) was for the teacher to mark the error and label it with an error code (coded CF), followed by only 19% said that they want the teacher to mark the error but not label it.

Unfortunately, this study only conducts feedback in one task. Thus, the result cannot be justified as final students' level in writing skill and was not comparable since the opportunity given by the teacher was not as much as the students need to revise their writing. Also, this study only focused on grammatical error, not on content of writing too. The future research is needed to make the result more general by giving the students more opportunity to revise their essays as they understand the feedback given in each of their essay by improving the design into three times and also focusing the study on content writing too.

As a study that conduct the role of teacher corrective feedback on grammatical errors and content writing, Fathman & Whalley study (1990) was chosen as a study to support this study in term of their framework about content score guide. Fathman & Whalley study (1990) examined how to response students' writing. This study was conducted to continue to test new hypothesis about how and when teachers should correct errors and comment on content. It is an experimental study because the researchers divided students into four group; group who received feedback on form only, group who received feedback content only, group who received feedback both form and content, and group who

received no feedback. The participants of the study were 72 students enrolled in intermediate ESL college composition class at two different colleges. The participants were at similar proficiency English levels. Un-coded corrective feedback was used as feedback from teachers on grammatical errors focused students on *form,* while teachers' comments on content focused students on the content of their writing. Grammatical errors which are underlined are verb forms, tenses, articles, and agreement. For content feedback, it consisted of general comments that were not text specific. The comments included positive comments such as "good description", "interesting narration", and "imaginative story". The comments were also general suggestions like "add details", "improve transition", and "develop paragraph".

The result showed that when teachers underlined grammatical errors (gave un-coded corrective feedback) in students' texts, students showed significant improvement in grammatical accuracy. All students made fewer grammar errors in rewriting their compositions. Moreover, general comments giving encouragement and suggesting revisions helped improve the content of composition rewrites. However, all students (irrespective of the kind of feedback they received from the teacher) improved the content of their compositions when they rewrote them. In addition, grammar and content feedback can be provided separately or at the same time without overburdening the student. Students whose errors were underlined and who were given general comments on content improved significantly in both grammar and content when they rewrote their compositions.

2.8 Theoretical framework

Based on different perspectives (SLA and Socio-cultural), we can see that feedback plays an important role in learning process. It can be seen from the literature review above in previous study part that feedback gives a lot of positive effects on students' performances and writings. Through feedback, students can realise how far they understand the materials and how should they do to achieve learning goals.

This study focused on the analysis of students' writings in order to know how teacher's feedback, coded corrective feedback, works in improving the quality of students' writings and how direct corrective feedback changes students' content writing. The study was guided by Ferris & Roberts (2001) framework in relation the errors of grammatical features analyzed. These features consist of verb errors, noun-ending errors, article errors, wrong words, and sentence structure errors. In addition, this study was guided by Fathman & Whalley (1990) study in term of scoring of the content in students' writing. The content feedback scoring guide was completely adopted from Fathman & Whalley (1990) study.