

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter contains of some literatures that are reviewed to help the researchers to analyze the data and to answer the research question. This chapter is divided into two sub chapters. They are corrective feedback and classroom writing activity.

A. Feedback

Feedback is any information that provides information on the result of behaviour. Voerman, Meijer, Korthagen and Simons (2012, p. 1108) states that feedback as information provided by the teacher concerns about the performance or understanding of the student, with reference to a goal and aimed at improving learning. Feedback is a key component of foreign language writing programs around the world, with product, process, and genre approaches all employing it as a central part of their instructional repertoire (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 15). It is a significant concern of students and teachers alike and both feel it as an important part of the writing process. It is therefore not surprising that much has been written about the issue both in teacher education and second language research literature.

In accordance to explanation mentioned on the earlier paragraph, it can be conclude that feedback is an information or comment which is given to students as advice, criticism, suggestion, or correctness about how good or

useful something to a performance. It can be written or oral from or combination of all them.

1. Definition of Corrective Feedback

Lightbown and Spada (1999, p. 172) define corrective feedback as indication to the learners that his or her use of the target language is incorrect. Moreover, it can be stated that feedback is defined as the information “given back” to individuals about the adequacy of their actions. Additionally, Chaudron (1988, p. 150) defines corrective feedback as “the true” correction which succeeds in modifying the learners inter language rule so that the error is eliminated from further production. Cole and Chan (1994, p. 227) states that corrective feedback is an extended form of feedback. They include augmented feedback given to students as well as instructional procedures intended to rectify errors or inadequacies in learning. Considering those definition provided by the experts above, it can be understood that corrective feedback is an action given by the teacher to eliminate errors made by the learners in producing the target language. It includes prompts, hints, suggestion regarding strategy use, remainders about methods, further demonstrations and explanations.

2. The Role of Feedback

The roles of feedback are described variously by different researchers. In the sense of behaviorists, it is believed that the environment plays important roles to provide crucial input and impacts greatly to the child’s language development. In this notion, language is seen as a

fundamental part of total human behavior in which observable responses and the relationship between those responses and events surrounding them are taken into account. In this case, effective language is considered effective language behavior to be the production of correct responses stimuli. In short, language learning is closely related with the concepts of stimulus-response and habit formation, and errors are to be avoided as they may become a permanent part of the students.

From this view, it is clearly perceived that feedback plays crucial roles on the development of students. Based on the nativist theories, however, language acquisition is innately determined. It is claimed that the environment is of much less importance, and consequently ascribe less importance to the feedback. In addition, researchers advocating the cognitive/developmental position attribute greater importance to the environment than to an innate knowledge of language (Lightbown and Spada, 2006, p. 41). Cognitive or developmental researchers emphasize cognitive efforts on the part of the learners and their ability to learn. It is asserted that students might get subject-verb agreement correct, not because he knows the rule, but because it has been encountered so often that the subject pronoun activates the correct form. However, as the cognitive efforts of the students are emphasized, the researchers take it that both teacher and student are responsible for this input: the teacher for providing relevant and appropriate feedback, and the student for exposing himself to it and finally noticing and using it.

3. Types of Corrective Feedback

When teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), teacher used corrective feedback in order to help students to improve their English skill. They can use both oral and written corrective feedback to encourage students to make progress. Oral and written corrective feedback played a significant role in second language acquisition, as the explanation bellow:

a. Oral Corrective Feedback

The categories below are all from Lyster and Ranta's model (Lyster and Ranta, 1997, pp. 46-48).

- 1) Explicit correction refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect. Example:

S: My sister can cooks the cake.

T: My sister can cook the cake.

- 2) Recasts involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error. Without directly indicating that the students' utterance was incorrect, the teacher implicitly reformulates the students' error or provides the correction.

Example:

S: You should go to see doctor.

T: the doctor.

- 3) Clarification requests indicate to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the

utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. This is a feedback type that can refer to problems in either comprehensibility or accuracy, or both. Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 47) coded feedback as Clarification requests only when it followed a student error. Example:

S: "I want to school with my friend a yesterday"

T: "Pardon me? What do you mean by "want"?."

- 4) Metalinguistic feedback contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. Metalinguistic comments generally indicate that there is an error somewhere. Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student. Example:

S : "We look at the people yesterday."

T : "What's the ending we put on verbs when we talk about the past?"

- 5) Elicitation refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student.

First, teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to “fill in the blank” (e.g., “It’s a . . .”). Such “elicit completion” moves may be preceded by some metalinguistic comment such as “No, not that. It’s a ...” or by a repetition of the error as in the following example:

S: “The big dog runs fastly”

T: “The big dog runs fastly? The big dog runs...”

Second, teachers use questions to elicit correct forms (e.g., “How do we say X in English?”). Such questions exclude yes/no answers: A question such as “Do we say that in English?” is metalinguistic feedback, not elicitation.

Third, teachers occasionally ask students to reformulate their utterance.

S :”My father cleans the plate.”

T:”Excuse me, he cleans the??? Plates?

- 6) Repetition refers to the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error. Example:

S : “We is...”

T : “We is? But it’s two people, right? You see your mistake? You see the error? When it’s plural it’s we are.”

b. Writing Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback which is given at the end of the writing process or during the process writing itself can take many types or forms to be used. Regarding with the various findings of research, linguistic accuracy and error correction remain central aspects of corrective feedback. There are several strategies that the teachers can employ to correct their students’ works. Ellis (2009, p. 97) recently surveyed teacher handbooks and empirical studies on written feedback and produced a typology of options for correcting linguistic errors. According to Ellis (2009, pp. 99-102) teachers can provide direct, indirect or metalinguistic corrective feedback. The first involves the teacher identifying linguistic errors and providing students with the correct form. Lightbown and Spada (1999, p. 172) define corrective feedback as “any indication to learners that their use of target language is incorrect” and this feedback can be either explicit or implicit, and may include metalinguistic explanation or not.

On the contrary, indirect feedback entails indicating that an error exists. Students’ attention can be drawn to such errors by indicating and locating the errors in the text using techniques such as underlining or circling, or by indicating in the margin that an error has been made in that line of the text. Metalinguistic feedback, involves the teacher providing the learner with some form of explicit comment on the nature of the errors

they have made. However, there is more than one way to do this. Teachers may opt to number the linguistic errors in the text and provide brief grammatical descriptions for each error at the end of the text. However, this strategy is time-consuming and teachers have generally favored the faster option; the use of an error correction code.

In addition to that, Cole and Chan (1994, p. 247) classified corrective feedback into explicit or implicit feedback. Explicit feedback is unambiguous which is typically directive and most often gives information about right and wrong answer. On the other hands, implicit feedback is often ambiguous. The message given from this feedback is often hidden from the learner. However, much of feedback is of this implicit kind; learners must infer from other actions that things were not quite right and should not be corrected.

There are certainly numerous ways to address students' linguistic errors and it is not being suggested that teachers have to select one strategy and use this and only this method to correct their writing. It is better for the teachers to mix and match error correction strategies. For example, teachers may choose to use indirect error correction methods for more local issues such as morphological errors. However, students may be less capable of self-correcting various lexical errors and more complex, global problems with sentence structure as there is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors. These untreatable errors may require more direct corrective feedback (Ferris, 2002, p. 301).

While the correction of grammatical inaccuracies has received significant attention, teacher feedback is not only concerned with correcting linguistic errors. Teacher response can also include more lengthy commentary and this can address structure, organization, style, content and presentation, as well as grammatical or mechanical issues (Hyland, 2006, p. 87).

According to Ellis (2009, pp. 99-102) teachers can provide direct, indirect or metalinguistic corrective feedback. The basic strategies for providing written corrective feedback can be identified below:

1) Direct Corrective Feedback

The teacher provides the student with the correct form. As Ferris (2006, p. 170) notes, this can take a number of different forms—crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form.

Example 1:

a	a	the
A dog stole↑bone from↑butcher. He escaped with having↑bone. When the dog was		
over a	a	saw a
going through ↑bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		

Direct corrective feedback has the advantage that it provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. This is clearly desirable if learners do not know what the correct form is (i.e. are not capable of self-correcting the error). Ferris and Roberts (2001, p. 165) suggest direct corrective feedback is probably better than indirect corrective feedback with student writers of low levels of proficiency. However, a disadvantage is that it requires minimal processing on the part of the learner and thus, although it might help them to produce the correct form when they revise their writing, it may not contribute to long-term learning. However, a recent study by Sheen (2007, p. 258) suggests that direct corrective feedback can be effective in promoting acquisition of specific grammatical features.

2) Indirect Corrective Feedback

The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. Indirect corrective feedback involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the student's text (as in the example below) or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error.

Example 2:

A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with XhavingX X bone.

When the

dog was going XthroughX X bridge over XtheX river he found X dog in the river.

X =missing word

X __X = wrong word

As already noted, indirect feedback is often preferred to direct feedback on the grounds that it caters to ‘guided learning and problem solving’ (Lalande, 1982, p. 140) and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. For these reasons, it is considered more likely to lead to long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts, 2001, p. 166). The results of studies that have investigated this claim, however, are very mixed. Some studies (for example, Lalande, 1982, p. 147) suggest that indirect feedback is indeed more effective in enabling students to correct their errors but others (for example, Ferris and Roberts’ own study) found no difference between direct and indirect corrective feedback. No study to date has compared the effects of these two indirect types of corrective feedback on whether they have any effect on accuracy in new pieces of writing.

In accordance with the general line of argument by Ferris and Roberts, it might be claimed that indirect feedback where the exact location of errors is not shown might be more effective than indirect feedback where the location of the errors is shown (as illustrated in

Example above) as students would have to engage in deeper processing. Robb et al. (1986, p. 85) investigated four types of feedback including direct feedback and indirect feedback where the number of errors was given in each line of text. They reported no significant difference. Lee (1997, p. 471), however, specifically compared the two types of indirect correction and found that learners were better able to correct errors that were indicated and located than errors that were just indicated by a check in the margin. However, Lee did not consider long-term gains.

3) Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error they have made. The explicit comment can take two forms. The first, by far the most common is use of error codes. Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. ww: wrong word; art: article). These consist of 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. In the latter case, the exact location of the error may or may not be shown. In the former, the student has to work out the correction needed from the clue provided while in the latter the student needs to first locate the error and then work out the correction. Examples of both are provided below. A major issue in error codes is how delicate the categories should be.

A number of studies have compared using error codes with other types of written corrective feedback. Lalande (1982, p. 145) reported that

a group of learners of L2 German that received correction using error codes improved in accuracy in subsequent writing whereas a group receiving direct correction made more errors. However, the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. Robb et al. (1986, p. 91) included an error codes treatment in their study but found it no more effective than any of the other three types of corrective feedback they investigated (i.e. direct feedback and two kinds of indirect feedback). Ferris and Roberts (2001, p. 177) reported that error codes helped students to improve their accuracy over time in only two of the four categories of error she investigated. Longitudinal comparisons between the number of errors in students' first and fourth compositions showed improvement in total errors and verb errors but not in noun errors, article errors, lexical errors, or sentence errors. Ferris (2006, p. 97) found that error codes did assist the students to self-edit their writing but no more so than indirect feedback. Overall, then, there is very limited evidence to show that error codes help writers to achieve greater accuracy over time and it would also seem that they are no more effective than other types of corrective feedback in assisting self-editing.

Example 3:

art.	art.	WWart.
A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog was		

prep.	art.	art.
going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		

Example 4:

Art. x 3;WW	A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone.
Prep.; art.	When the dog was going through bridge over the river he
Art.	found dog in the river.

The second type of metalinguistic corrective feedback is brief grammatical descriptions. Teacher give numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text and providing students with metalinguistic explanations of their errors. An example is provided below. This is far less common, perhaps because it is much more time consuming than using error codes and also because it calls for the teacher to possess sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to be able to write clear and accurate explanations for a variety of errors. Sheen (2007, p. 275) compared direct and metalinguistic corrective feedback, finding that both were effective in increasing accuracy in the students' use of articles in subsequent writing completed immediately after the corrective feedback treatment. Interestingly, the metalinguistic corrective feedback also proved more effective than the direct corrective feedback in

the long term (i.e. in a new piece of writing completed two weeks after the treatment).

Example 5:

(1)	(2)	(3)
A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog was		
(4)	(5)	(6)
going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.		
<i>(1), (2), (5), and (6)—you need ‘a’ before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.</i>		
<i>(3)—you need ‘the’ before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously.</i>		
<i>(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’).</i>		

c. Previous Study

They are other researchers who have conducted the similar research the concern of teacher’s feedback. The thesis written by:

- 1) Adawiyah (2018), student of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. In his research, he focused on the types and the most types frequently used of corrective feedback in speaking activities. The research has the similarity and differences with the researcher’s study. The similarity

between the previous study and the researcher's study is about method of collecting data. Both researchers used the descriptive qualitative method, and exactly the same to examine about type of feedback. And the differences are about the aim and the object research, the aims of previous study are to know the types of corrective feedback in the speaking activities, while the aims of this study are to know the types of teacher's corrective feedback toward student's writing activities.

- 2) Adityas (2008), student of University of Sanata Dharma Yogyakarta, he want to find out about the types of feedback occurs in speaking classroom and the students' perceptions on teacher's feedback on speaking class. Therefore, there are some similarities and differences with the researcher's. The similarities with the researcher are the types of teacher feedback to students and to find out information about the teacher ways to give feedback in teaching learning process. The difference of the researcher's study from Aditya's study is on objective of study. In Aditya's (2008, p. 4) research objective, it is said that the purpose of the study is to find the effect of feedback that occur in speaking class and students' perception of teacher's feedback. In this research, the researcher wants to find out the kind of teacher's corrective feedback and how does the teacher apply in writing activities. In Aditya's research, the results are (1) informal feedback occurred more. The teacher focused more on informal feedback which concerned about grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. (2)

Students' opinion on teacher's feedback were different, the students' response to all of the type of feedback were positive. The students said teacher's feedback led them to move forward. Most of the students were happy when the teacher praised them after they performed well in speaking class, Adityas (2008, pp. 58-59).

- 3) Maslina (2012), Student of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. According to Maslina (2012, p. 8), there are two problems that she wants to find out types of teacher's feedbacks and students' responses on academic writing of sixth semester. Based on this problem, she intended to find out the types of feedback which are used by teacher on students' writing and students' responses on teacher's feedback on academic writing class of the sixth semester, teacher and students will be subject of her research and teacher's feedback on students' responses will be object (Maslina, 2012, pp. 45-46). In her research, mentioned four types of teacher's feedback on students like praise, criticism, suggestion and corrective feedback (Maslina, 2012, p. 4). It is similar with this research that is about feedback but this research focus on one of them; that is corrective feedback. In Maslina's research, two problems she wants to find out that are students' responses and teacher's feedback on academic writing class: it is different from this research, the researcher just want to find out the kind of teacher's corrective and how does the teacher apply. In Maslina's research, the result of the study are (1) there are four types of teachers' feedbacks on

students' writing they are praise, criticism, suggestion and corrective feedback. (2) the students prefer to have feedback from teacher, the students more interested in having feedback in written comment and error feedback which focus on content, organization language and mechanic and mostly interested in having feedback in types of suggestion and corrective, the corrective feedback is given by indicating categorizing of their error writing and providing correct answer (Maslina, 2012, p. 81).

B. Classroom Writing Activities

Writing is and isn't easy thing to do in the classroom. Especially nowadays when students don't have long attention spans. Writing activities is an activity in which the students learn in classroom to create a record or information on media using letters that help students think through key concepts or idea central to a course.

1. The Definition of Writing

Writing is one of the skills in English teaching learning. It is a productive skill. Writing can be very useful for students because it help students to convey their message through their minds in written form. Harmer (2004, p. 31) states that writing is a way to produce language and express the idea, feeling, and opinion. Writing is a process that often influenced by constraints of genres, than these elements have to present in learning activities.

According to Brown (2001, p. 336), writing defines as the process of putting ideas down on paper to transform thought into words, to sharpen the main ideas, to give them structure and organization. Furthermore, Heaton (1989, p. 135) states that writing is complex and difficult to teach and also to learn, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. Writing is about more than making our thoughts, ideas visible, concrete and involves more than making appropriate word choice, or using appropriate grammar, syntax and mechanics.

Based on theories of writing, it can be concluded that writing is communicative act, a way of producing language and sharing ideas that involves more than making appropriate word choice, or using appropriate grammar, syntax and mechanics. Moreover, in the writing is complex and difficult to teach and also to learn, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. Writing also can be tools as a communicative of sharing observation, information, thought or ideas with ourselves and others in written form though the writing process.

2. The Importance of Writing

Writing is the complex process it means that in writing students have to consider many things to build a good writing result. Harmer (2004, pp. 31-33) states that there are many advantages of learning writing. They are as follows:

- a. Writing is often not time- bound in the way conversation is. It means that students have longer time to think than in speaking activity. They can check their grammar patterns.
- b. Writing encourages students to focus on accurate language use because they think as they write; it may provoke development well as they resolve problems which writing puts in their mind.
- c. Writing is often used as a means of reinforcing language that has been thought. They use writing skill to make a note about what they have learnt while learning process happens.
 - 1) Writing is frequently useful as preparation for some other activity.
 - 2) Writing can also, of course, be used as an integral part of larger activity where the focus is on something else such as language practice, acting out, or speaking. As the example, the teacher asks the students to make a short dialogue which they will then act out.
 - 3) Writing is also use in questionnaire type activity

Writing is important to face questionnaire test. In the examination, students are asked their answer in the form of written.

From the explanation above the writer can conclude that writing skill is very important to be learnt. Writing helps us in solving and improving other skills in learning language.

3. The Component of Writing

The stock of vocabulary, grammar and comprehend how to make a correct sentence must be considered to make a good writing. The students' writing score will be evaluated by the scoring system. The aspects of scoring are organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanic (Nurgiyantoro, 2001, p. 48). To make it clear, the researcher will explain each aspect.

a. Organization

It means how the students organize their idea. Whether each paragraph is organize well or not. The organization of the text is fluent in expressing, reveal clearly ideas, good organization, logic sequence, and cohesive.

b. Content

The content refers to the topic and its explanation, discussion, evaluation, and conclusion. It should be clear, specific, and relevant. The good content had to fulfill the criteria such as full of information, substantive make a clear thesis development and relevant with the problem.

c. Language

The students use effective complex sentence construction and make only few faults in the using of grammar.

d. Vocabulary

If the students could choose the correct words as it is function and master informing words.

e. Mechanic

Paragraph is a combination of some sentences which needs good spelling and punctuation. If the use of punctuation is not appropriate, the paragraph will be unreadable. So the students should be mastered in writing good paragraph.

4. English Writing Skill

Heaton (1975, p. 135) state that the writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices, but also conceptual and judgmental elements. The following analysis attempts to group the many and varied skills necessary for writing good phrase into five general components or main areas:

- a. Language use; the ability to write correct and appropriate sentences.
- b. Mechanical skills; the ability to use correctly those conventions peculiar to the written language – e.g, punctuation, spelling.
- c. Treatment of content; the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information.
- d. Stylistic skills; the ability to manipulate sentences and paragraphs, and use language effectively.

- e. Judgment skills; the ability to write in appropriate manner for a particular purpose with a particular audience in mind, together with an ability to select, organize and order relevant information.

5. The Tasks of the Teacher in Writing

Success of writing for the students is not far away from the roles of the teachers in the classroom. The teacher has some tasks in writing class. According to Harmer (2004, pp. 41-42), there are some of teacher's tasks; those are as follows:

a. Demonstrating

Teacher should make the students aware of writing conventions and genre in each type of writing and pay attention to features of writing.

b. Motivating and Provoking

Teacher has to help the students by motivating or provoking them in order to have ideas when the students are lost for words, especially in creative writing tasks.

c. Supporting

Students need a lot of help and comfortable feeling when they write; therefore, when the students are writing in class, teacher is needed to be extremely supportive, always available (except during

exam writing of course), and be ready to help students to solve the problems and overcome the difficulties.

d. Responding

Reaction to students' written work can be in form of responding. When responding, there are suggestions for its improvement, and there is no grading of students' work.

e. Evaluating

The teacher can know the real condition of the students' ability when she or he evaluates the students writing result. Evaluation can also use as consideration for teacher to create a better teaching and learning process. Those are description about the teachers' tasks in writing classroom activities. Hopefully by obeying the tasks, namely demonstrating, motivating and provoking, supporting, responding, and evaluating, it can make the students have more ability in writing.

6. The Process of Writing

In writing there are some important things that the researcher has to notice when the researcher will make writing. According to Harmer (2004, pp. 4-5) states that process of writing has four main elements. Those are planning, drafting, editing, and final version.

a. Planning

The writer has to think about three main issues:

- 1) The purpose of their writing skill since this will influence (among other things) not only the type of the text they wish to produce, but also the language they use, and the information they choose to include.
- 2) The audience they are writing for, since this will influence not only the shape of the writing (how it is laid out, how the paragraph are structured, etc), but also the choice of language.
- 3) The content structure of the piece that is how best of sequence the fact, ideas, or arguments which they have deiced or included.

b. Drafting

One can refer to the first version of a piece of writing as a draft. A number of drafts may be produced on the way to the final version.

c. Editing (reflecting and revising)

After writers produce a draft, then they usually read what the result of the draft is in order to see where it works and where it does not. Perhaps, the order of the information is not clear. Perhaps, the way something is written is ambiguous or confusing.

Reflecting and revising are often helped by other readers (or editor) who moment and make suggestions. Another reader's reaction to a piece of writing will help the author to make appropriate revision.

d. Final Report

After the writer edits their draft, it may be different from the original plan and the first draft because they make the changes which they consider to be necessary. However, in the final version, the writer is now ready to send the written text to intended audience.

One might decide to represent these stages in the following way:

Planning ...drafting... editing.....final draft

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that in producing the final draft which can be served to the readers, it need some steps such as; planning, drafting, and editing.

7. The Problem of Writing

According to Nurgiantoro (2001, pp. 298-299), there are some problems faced by students in learning writing. Those are as follows:

a. Organizing idea

The students usually face problem in writing process such as how to organize the idea into sentences. In writing composition, students will put their ideas and thoughts to be developed become a

good written. It will be better if we start the writing process by choosing theme first before we write the composition. After that we can make an outline to help us in arranging the sentences or paragraphs.

b. Lack of Vocabulary

Vocabularies become complex problem especially in writing. Lack of vocabulary makes students often write uncommunicative sentence. Besides that, they often choose incorrect words in their composition.

c. Grammar Accuracy

Grammar becomes very important aspect in writing. A draft will be said a good draft if grammar which is used is correct.