

## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

This chapter shows the information about background of study, research questions, purposes of study, scope of study, and significance of study.

#### **1.1 Background of Study**

Feedback is needed either for evaluation or appreciation. A teacher usually gives feedback to evaluate students when they make some mistakes. Evaluation does not mean that the teacher gives the judgment on the students, whether they are right or wrong. In addition, evaluation here means that the teacher gives supportive and constructive feedback to provide positive student learning opportunities and to enhance the student learning experience. Sometimes, the teacher also gives feedback only to appreciate students' work. Feedback in this context is needed to increase students' confidence and motivation, both intrinsic (wanting to learn) and extrinsic (needing to learn) in the learning process (Irons, 2008).

Feedback is given by the teacher in different ways. Feedback can be given by implicitly reformulating what students say, explicitly correcting students' errors, repeating the errors that the students make, providing comments or information related to the students' errors, and asking clarification from the students (Ellis, 2009). These kinds of feedback are usually found in speaking class and given

orally. Most often, feedback is given in written form in writing class. In the written form, teachers usually underline or circle the students' errors, directly correct the errors and provide the correct form, provide metalinguistic clue, even provide a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of correct usage.

Feedback is seen as potential for learning from different perspectives. According to sociocultural theory, corrective feedback "provides learners with dialogically negotiated assistance as they move from other-regulation towards self-regulation" (Lyster, et.al., 2013). In both structural and communicative approaches, corrective feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation (Ellis, 2009). Also, it contributes to ensure linguistic accuracy. Furthermore, it guided students to the problem solving and to reflection about linguistic forms that may foster long-term acquisition (Ferris and Roberts, 2001).

A body of research has investigated the effectiveness of feedback in classroom instruction, both in oral and written instruction. In term of oral instruction, some studies have investigated the effectiveness of prompts and recast in the written and oral production (Algarawi, 2010; Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010). Those studies revealed that groups receiving corrective feedback outperformed than the no-feedback group regarding their accuracy of using targeted grammatical features. Studies on written corrective feedback (Bitchener 2008; Bitchener and Knoch, 2008; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Sheen, 2007) have examined how feedback might improve the accuracy of students' grammatical features in their writing. On particular, those studies have compared some methods of feedback on the accuracy of students' writing. The findings were in

line with the oral feedback studies revealing that the groups with some methods of feedback have significant improvement on their writing compared to the no-feedback group.

The studies on written corrective feedback outlined above have focused on the comparison of different methods of feedback giving and their effects. However, those studies examined only just two relatively simple functions of English articles. Therefore, the results of those studies cannot be generalized to other areas of grammatical features – extending beyond the articles. Besides, those studies were not conducted in the context of second language writing classes, so it is interesting to see how such treatment is implemented in the second language writing classes. Further research is required to understand whether or not students gain the linguistic resources from feedback given by teacher.

In response to the issue identified above, this study aimed at examining how metalinguistic corrective feedback works in changing students' quality of writing in the second language context, involving some targeted linguistic features and the writing content.

## **1.2 Research Questions**

Based on the background of the study, this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How does metalinguistic corrective feedback work to change students' quality of writing?

2. To what extent does metalinguistic corrective feedback change students' quality of writing?

### **1.3 Purposes of Study**

The purposes of this study are to investigate how metalinguistic corrective feedback worked in changing students' quality of writing and to examine how far the written corrective feedback given improved students' writing.

### **1.4 Scope of Study**

This study focused on examining teacher's feedback in English Department in one of state universities in Jakarta. This study mainly concerned the teacher's metalinguistic corrective feedback and to what extent it works on students' writing, particularly in the revision texts and new piece of writing in English for Academic Communication Class.

### **1.5 Significance of Study**

The result of this study was expected to be useful for the teachers, students and other researchers. Generally, this study could give contribution on the ideas of types of corrective feedback for those who have not known yet. For the teachers, this study could give them information in what ways written corrective feedback can be given and meaningful for the students' learning. In

addition, this study could become a reference for another teacher who will teach the same course later to implement the meaningful written feedback for the students to help them improve their writing. For other researchers who intend to conduct a research with the same topic, hopefully this study could provide references. Particularly, this study was conducted to consolidate the findings of previous study revealing that direct correction with metalinguistic feedback is more effective than direct corrective feedback only (Sheen, 2007).