

CHAPTER IV

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted at English Department of Tarbiyah and Teachers' Training Faculty of Antasari State Islamic University Studies located on Jl. A. Yani Km. 4, 5 Banjarmasin where the subject of this research are lecturer and English Department of Antasari State Islamic University Banjarmasin. The object of this research is lecturer' feedbacks and the students' preferences on the lecturer' feedbacks on writing at English Department of Antasari State Islamic University Banjarmasin. This research aims to investigate the type of feedback that lecturer give on students' writing and students preference toward teacher corrective feedback in writing. This chapter presents the finding of data that is collected from the documentation and interview. This chapter also provides the discussion of the finding.

To get the data related to the lecturer's written corrective feedback the researcher collecting the students' worksheet as the documentation, and doing interview with the lecturer and students'

A. Findings

1. Types of Lecturer's Written Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis (2009, p. 63) to find out the types of teacher's written corrective feedback in writing class. The researcher documented the students' thesis drafts which have been already given corrective feedback by the lecturers. Then the students' thesis drafts were analyzed.

As stated in Chapter II, feedback classification of this study was adapted from Ferris's classification scheme. There are two types of feedback; direct and indirect. The detail of types of lecturers' feedbacks on students' thesis for each writing supervisor at English Department of Antasari State Islamic University Banjarmasin can be seen from these following description below:

a. Direct Feedback

The first data is a form of direct feedback found in students' drafts. Ferris and Roberts (2001) stated that direct feedback is the provision of the correct form by teacher or lecturer to the students' writing so that the student just need to transcribe the correction into the final version of their writing. In students' thesis drafts, researcher found some feedbacks that was catagorized into 6 models; deletion, insertion, substitution, and reformulation. Deletion means erasing the incorrect word in text. Insertion is placing the correct word on the inappropriate post. Substitution means canging the incorrect word and reformulation is rewriting the inappropriate part of student's writing. The category of feedbacks result from students' thesis draft showed below:

Table 4.1 Types of Direct Feedbacks

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Deletion	B	The specialist noticed exercises of the educator and understudies while instructing and learning process (Creswell J, 2014).	-

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Deletion	C	STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON THE USE OF CODE-SWITCHING IN SPEAKING <u>COURSE</u>	-
		<u>LIST OF CONTENTS</u>	-
		Without language, a person will find <u>it</u> difficult to communicate	-
Insertion	A	English translated manga make [^] me know the correct order of word in English sentences.	English translated manga makes me know the correct order of word in English sentences.
		Reading English translated manga make [^] me aware	Reading English translated manga makes me aware
		I agree [^] reading English translated manga help me learn English.	I agree with reading English translated manga help me learn English.

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Insertion	C	^ Feedback from the teacher is an integral part of learning process and it can help the students to reduce gaps and ambiguity.	A Feedback from the teacher is an integral part of learning process and it can help the students to reduce gaps and ambiguity.
		Corrective feedback ^ given to students will encourage them to learn if the information provided can explain where the students' mistakes are and can provide guidance to students to reduce error.	Corrective feedback that given to students will encourage them to learn if the information provided can explain where the students' mistakes are and can provide guidance to students to reduce error.
		The importance of oral corrective feedback in ^ listening.	The importance of oral corrective feedback in teaching listening.
		2. Teaching listening ^	2. Teaching listening as EFL
		A. Listening ^	A. Listening as one of English skills

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Insertion	C	Add "A THESIS BY" before the name on the cover	
		ANTASARI STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY BANJARMASIN 2023 ^	ANTASARI STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY BANJARMASIN 2023 AD/1444 H
		Language is an important and ^ necessary thing in communication.	Language is an important and a necessary thing in communication.
		But in reality, its use is still difficult to ^ implement^	But in reality, its use is still difficult to be implemented
Substitution	A	<u>What are</u> the teacher's activities in using contextual teaching and learning to enhance student's critical thinking skill in learning English?	How do the teacher's activities in using contextual teaching and learning to enhance student's critical thinking skill in learning English?

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Substitution	A	<u>Is</u> contextual teaching and learning able to improve student's critical thinking skill in learning English.	How contextual teaching and learning able to improve student's critical thinking skill in learning English.
		To <u>know</u> the teacher's activities in using contextual teaching and learning to enhance student's critical thinking skill in learning English?	To explore the teacher's activities in using contextual teaching and learning to enhance student's critical thinking skill in learning English?
		To <u>know</u> contextual teaching and learning can improve student's critical thinking skill in learning English.	To describe contextual teaching and learning can improve student's critical thinking skill in learning English.
	C	Feedback <u>from the</u> teacher is an integral part of learning process.	Feedback given by teacher is an integral part of learning process.
		But in reality, <u>its</u> still difficult to implement	But in reality, it is still difficult to implement

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Reformulation	A	<u>I interested to read</u> a visual text like English translated manga than pure text.	I am interested in reading a visual text like English translated manga than pure text.

From Table 4.1 Types of Direct Feedback, it can be concluded that in this type of feedback, the category that is often used by lecturers is the insertion category. The factor that makes this category often appear when lecturers provide written corrective feedback is because students sometimes make mistakes in choosing tenses which ultimately affect the verbs used.

Based on the table 4.1, it was found that there were 12 written corrective feedback in insertion form from the entire student thesis that had been analyzed. In this case, students often forget to add articles and conjunctions so that sentences become incomplete. Other than that, the lecturer only gives feedback in the insertion category to complete sentences that are hanging or incomplete. The example can be seen on table that have been compiled d by the researcher. It showed that lecturer corrected student's wrong word choice from 'make' into 'makes'. It also showed that the lecturer directly corrected and added 'with' in third sentence and also added article 'a' before 'feedback' so the final sentence becomes 'A feedback from the teacher is an integral part of learning process and it can help the students to reduce gaps and ambiguity'.

The second category that is often used is substitution. This error was influenced by the imprecision of word choice. Examples can be seen in lines.

Lecturers have marked mistakes by crossing out words which will be deleted and soon are replaced with appropriate words. Because this is direct feedback, lecturers has immediately written the correct replacement for the part that need to be replaced. The example can be seen on table that have been compiled d by the researcher. It showed that the lecturer directly corrected and changed ‘what are’ into ‘how do’. It also showed that lecturer directly corrected and changed ‘know’ into ‘explore’ and ‘know’ into ‘explore’ to clarify the description of the research findings.

For the third category namely deletion. Usually’ the lecturer deletes words that are deemed unnecessary in sentences. The example can be seen on the table that have been compiled by the researcher. The finding showed that the lecturer crossing ‘it’ in sentence ‘Without language, a person will find it difficult to communicate’. It also found that the lecturer directly corrected and crossing the unnecessary word ‘LIST OF’ in sentence ‘LIST OF CONTENTS’ to avowing wasting of words because ‘contents’ itself can cover the intent of the word ‘list of’.

As for the category that is rarely used by the lecturers, namely reformulation. From some documents that have been analyzed, only found one feedback that belongs to this category. The example can be seen on the table that have been compiled by the researcher. The finding showed that the lecturer reorganized the sentences by replacing and adding a few words from ‘I interested to read a visual text like English translated manga than pure text’ into ‘I am interested in reading a visual text like English translated manga than pure text’.

In the analysis of this research, direct corrective feedback gave the students an ease in the revision process, because they were directly provided with the error correction. As Ellis (2008) stated that direct corrective feedback has the benefit that it provides learners with the explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. It found that in this research, direct feedback here was used to correct more in grammatical matters., like word choices and articles as shown in the table. Since, grammar is seen as the most difficult thing in foreign or second language writing, providing direct corrective feedback might be one of the effective ways to help students dealing with grammatical errors.

b. Indirect Feedback

The second data is a form of indirect feedback found in students' drafts. Ferris and Roberts (2001) stated that indirect feedback is the feedback given by the teacher or lecturer by just indicating that an error exists without providing the correct form, but letting the student identify the error and correct it. In students' thesis drafts, researcher found some feedbacks that was categorized into 3 models; coded, uncoded, and comment. Coded means the lecturer indicates students' error by giving some symbols. Uncoded is the opposite of coded, the lecturer just indicating students' error by underlining or marking it without any symbol. Comment means the lecturer giving written comment related to students' error. The category of feedbacks results from students' thesis draft showed below:

Table 4.2 Types of Indirect Feedbacks

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	Feedback
Coded	B	Marked part of the logo on the cover with letter “spasi?” and “font”	
		Marked each part of significant of study with > and letter “3”	
	C	<u>Theoretical Description</u> with up arrow sign with letter ‘Chapter II’	
		<u>Evaluative feedback</u> “1”	
		<u>Strategic feedback</u> “2”	
		Definition of Keyterms (Side arrow “B”)	
	Uncoded	A	<u>According</u> to <u>Creswell</u> (2018) the foundation of the mixed method of mixed method design consist of a blend of qualitative and quantitative research technique and method.
Creswell (2018) highlighted that <u>explanatory sequential</u> is a combination research method that combines quantitative and qualitative research method sequentially, where in the <u>first stage</u> the research is carried out using quantitative and in the <u>second stage</u> it is carried out using qualitative.			
<u>According</u> to Jaya (2017), reading is an ability that allows someone to receive information.			

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	
Uncoded	B	GENDER DIFFERENCES OF STUDENTS' LISTENING STRATEGIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION >	
		Undergraduate Thesis >	
		Circle the number of the page	
		<u>A.</u> Definition of Listening	
		<p><u>As emphasized by Anderson, et al. (1998)</u> they state that listening skills and speaking skills are both important vital aspects because communication cannot be established face-to-face unless both skills are developed simultaneously.</p>	
		<p><u>As stated by Go & Wills (2006),</u> listening is not only a medium for obtaining education, but also a medium for understanding about the world and dealings with humans.</p>	
	C	<p>Nevertheless, there are still problem that students often encounter when listening, such as understanding intonation and stress, overcoming redundancy and noise, predicting, understanding everyday vocabulary, different accents, and so on (<u>Ur, 2007, p. 11-20</u>).</p>	

Category	Lecturer	Students Writing	
Uncoded	C	Consequently, <u>Renukadevi</u> believed that EFL learners who have acquired knowledge of certain technique and strategies are able to apply them to listening assignments.	
		Listening provides input in second language acquisition for coming to good terms with <u>grammatical structures, lexical unit, and phonological awareness.</u>	
		<u>STUDENTS' PERCEPTION ON THE USE OF CODE-SWITCHING IN SPEAKING COURSE</u>	
		There are many arrow signs before table at the Chapter III	
Comment	C	Put the number of the second page and so on at the top of paper	

From Table 4.2 Types of Indirect Feedback, it is known that in this type of feedback, the category that is often used by lecturers is the uncoded category. Based on the result of the data analysis from some documents, this type is often found in theoretical review, title pages, sub-chapter titles and also page numbering. The example can be seen on the table that have been compiled by the researcher. It found that the lecturer underlined most of the things that related to theory.

Coded feedback is another category that is often used after uncoded feedback. Something that often marks this category of feedback is an arrow which is usually given more information after it. From the findings in students' thesis drafts, this category is usually used to correct the position, size and number of things

such as the placements of chapters, spacing, and also the minimum number of sentences in one paragraph. For example, in the table it can be seen that the lecturer marked part of the logo on the cover with letter “spasi?” and “font”. It means student have to pay more attention to the size of the spacing and the font used in the parts that have been marked. It also found that the lecturer marked each part of significant of study with > and letter “3” that means the number of sentences in each significant of study should be at least 3 sentences. As matters that related to numbering, the lecturer marked sentences such as ‘evaluative feedback’ and ‘strategic feedback’ and the added number to each sentences which intends for student to separate the explanation of these two points in more detail by separating it with the main point.

From the analysis of the research, the use of indirect corrective feedback was more to help students organizing and generating the ideas in their thesis rather than for grammatical features like direct corrective feedback. In the stage of generating idea like that was then required the students to think deeper in order to clarify each idea to be well understood by the readers. In here, the reader was their lecturer itself. Thus the use of indirect corrective feedback could be one of the ways that can be used by lecturer to stimulate students to be a dependent learner who was able to solve their own problems since it demanded students to correct their own errors. This idea was supported by the study of Lalande (1982) who found that indirect corrective feedback is indeed more effective that it provides to ‘guided learning and problem solving’ as students have to engage in deeper processing.

Based on the table 4.1 types of direct feedback and 4.2 types of indirect feedback, it can be concluded that the type of written corrective feedback that is

often used direct feedback. Based on the 12 thesis drafts that have been analyzed, there were 23 direct feedbacks and 21 indirect feedbacks have been found. For the direct type, there were 4 deletion, 12 insertion, 6 substitution, and 1 reformulation. Whereas for the indirect type, there were 6 coded and 14 uncoded. With a slight difference in the total number, it can be seen that both of feedback are often used by lecturers to correct student thesis.

2. Students Preferences Toward Lecturer's Written Corrective Feedback

Six students were interviewed to determine their preferences regarding written corrective feedback provided by the lecturer on their thesis. All of the students interviewed agreed that corrective feedback from the lecturer is extremely useful and beneficial for enhancing their writing. However, they hold divergent views on how written corrective feedback should be provided.

All interviewed students prefer direct feedback than indirect feedback. The students have suggested that this type of feedback is clear on what they have to revise. Below are how they express their opinion:

“Very clear and easy to understand” (Student 3).

“I immediately know what i should do next” (Student 2).

“Clearer and more focused. This can minimize misunderstanding between me and my supervisor” (Student 4).

The students in the aforementioned excerpts assert that lecturer direct feedback is straightforward, simple, and will not lead to confusion when revising

their thesis. One of the benefits of lecturer/teacher direct feedback is that it provides students with the explicit guidance and information required to correct their writing errors. (Ellis, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2016; Beuningen, 2010).

Apart from positive opinions above, it is necessary to see how this feedback does have a large enough impact on improving student' writing skills.

“The feedback given by the lecturer actually does not have that much effect on student' writing skill because basically it is just a direction” (Student 1).

“It makes me a little bit lazy actually” (Student 4).

According to the students' justifications, direct feedback hinders their independence. This demoralizes students and has no effect on their writing skills. It is consistent with Ellis's (2008) assertions regarding the drawbacks of direct feedback. It does not train students to be autonomous learners because all they have to do when revising is copy and paste the error corrections they received from the teacher.

The students chose indirect feedback as the second choice. There are four emerging themes based on students' statements. First, the fact that this feedback is confusing. This point is described as follows:

“When I got home, I forgot what the signs means” (Student 4).

“Sometimes I do not understand the signs” (Student 5)

In the aforementioned excerpts from students' comments, it is made abundantly evident that the feedback symbols are the primary cause of confusion among students. The second factor, this feedback is ambiguous. It requires the learner to identify the error and what needs to be revised. They are confused by

these reasons. This is consistent with Chandler's (2003) assertion that indirect feedback may fail because it does not provide students with enough information to correct intricate errors.

“the instruction is so ambiguous and that make me confused about which part to revise” (Student 3).

“I expect to get clear feedback but I did not get it” (Student 4).

Based on statement above, students did not get the clear instruction. Again, this leads the students to confusion.

The third point describes that this feedback is difficult to be understood' below are the excerpts:

“Hard for me to understand this feedback” (Student 4).

“I'm having a hard time to understanding this feedback. This is and obstacle for me to revise” (Student 6).

“Hard for me to understand what should I fix in my thesis” (Student 2).

It is possible that the previous reasons, which are unclear and perplexing, make it difficult for students to comprehend this feedback, and they have stated that it will not assist them in revising their writings.

The last point indicates that this type of feedback is time consuming. Follow by the statement below:

“I need more time to understand the signs” (Students 3)

“I really racked my brain to think about the purpose of this feedback”
(Student 1)

According to the students, it needs more time and effort in revising writing with indirect feedback in it. This is very difficult for students. Besides that, a lot of time is wasted just for thinking about the meaning of the signals when other pages also need revision.

Based on student interviews, it can be concluded that indirect feedback is perplexing, unclear, difficult to comprehend, and time-consuming due to the use of signs and symbols. This is consistent with Ferris's (2003, p. 52) assertions that indirect feedback is perplexing and time-consuming. Students must consider the significance of signs and symbols used in their writing. The circling, underlining, or abbreviations affixed to the error are perplexing. The students' justifications for preferring indirect feedback over direct feedback are elaborated upon.

None of the students chose indirect feedback, despite the fact that it could help them become independent learners by requiring them to independently rectify errors that have been marked by their lecturer. Some researchers (Ferris & Rooberts, 2001; Beuningan, 2010; Lalande, 1982 in Storch, 2010; Bitchener, Young, Cameron, 2005) concur that indirect feedback has greater potential for long-term pupil improvement than direct feedback. Interestingly, almost all of the reasons why students detest indirect feedback are identical to the reasons why they prefer direct feedback. They would rather receive feedback that is obvious, simple to understand, and effective than feedback that is unclear, difficult to understand, and time-consuming. This study's findings are similar to those of previous research (Chandler, 2003; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Lee, 2005) in which direct feedback

was selected as the most preferable form of feedback for the subject for various reasons.

B. DISCUSSION

1. Types of Lecture's Written Corrective Feedback

Based on the research conducted on students' proposals and theses at the English Department of the Antasari State Islamic University in Banjarmasin, the researcher intends to examine the types of lecturers' written corrective feedback to student writing. The following results will be discussed:

a. Direct Feedback

On the basis of the analysis of the research findings, it can be inferred that direct corrective feedback is the most prevalent form of corrective feedback used by lecturers, as it is provided in almost all student thesis and proposal manuscripts.

In this instance, the lecturer provided direct correction by highlighting the student's writing error with the correct form. In the writing of the students, the lecturer provided direct corrective feedback by highlighting the error word in various ways. This research discovered that lecturers frequently underlined and circled incorrect words and placed the correct word above or below them. It helped students plainly comprehend their error. Students could also revise it effectively because the lecturer already included the correct form.

D. Ferris (2002) categorizes direct feedback into four categories, namely deletion, insertion, substitution, and reformulation. Deletion means erasing the incorrect word in writing or text. Lecturer deleted the place information in the title.

Then, there is substitution which means changing the incorrect word by the correct word. The third type is insertion that means placing the correct answer on the inappropriate post. At the same time, reformulation means rewriting the part that is wrong from the student's writing by giving an example of how they should write correctly. All of the example can be seen in table 4.1.

b. Indirect feedback

As stated by Ellis (2009, p. 63), the teacher provided indirect corrective feedback by using signals to indicate the student's error without providing the correct form. The teacher underlined and crossed out the incorrect word, but did not include the correct form. Additionally, they utilized the question mark when a word or sentence was uncertain.

Indirect feedback divided into three types; coded, uncoded and comment. For coded ones, there is usually a certain code that will be used by lecturer, such as the example in table 4.2. in indirect type, lecturers mostly use arrows and underlining some words in student thesis. lecturers also provide comments on student writing related to what they have written and what they should write to fix it. All of the example of indirect feedback can be seen in table 4.2

2. Students Preferences Toward Lecturer's Written Corrective Feedback

The researcher figured out that nearly all of the students have a favorable attitude toward the teacher's use of feedback to rectify oral activity errors. This finding is similar to that of Katayama's (2007, pp. 289–305) study, which found that students viewed teachers correction of errors in the learning and teaching

environment favorably. Students believe they learn more when their teacher constantly corrects them.

The students evaluate the usefulness of the feedback based on its ability to identify their mistakes so that they can revise their work accordingly, as evidenced by their comments above. In addition, they stated that receiving feedback helped them determine what to write and how to improve their writing. Haster (2001, pp. 14-17) states that feedback provides students with information regarding their performance on a paragraph assignment.

Although the students who were interviewed were all in agreement that receiving corrective feedback from the teacher is highly valuable and helps to enhance their writing, they had varying ideas on how that feedback should be offered. Some of the feedback provided by the teacher does not always clearly express what should be rectified or revised; as a result, it occasionally leads students to not fully comprehend what the purpose of corrective feedback is. Some students would rather have the lecturer correct their work in great detail, while others would rather have the lecturer correct their work in a more general sense.

From the result of the interview, it was found that all students prefer direct feedback compared to the indirect feedback. As already mention in the finding that there are several points that strengthen the reasons why students prefer direct feedback. First of all, of course students prefer feedback that is easy to understand and does not ambiguous. Students also prefer feedback which speeds up the time in their revision process. This are the reasons why students prefer direct feedback over indirect feedback.

The result of this study actually in contrast with Lalande's (1982) statement conclude that most student writers prefer indirect feedback because it engages them in guided learning and problem solving. The issue whether feedback should be given directly or explicitly and indirectly or implicitly has also attracted the attention of researchers in the field. The research findings on the issue of direct and indirect feedback showed that students get benefits from the two types of feedback.

Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to all contexts. Besides the statement from Lalande, there still another study that strengthens the reasons why direct feedback is preferred by students. Ferris (2011) believed that direct feedback would show positive effects than indirect. This is because direct feedback is easier for students to act on and requires less knowledge and effort on their part.

In conclusion, it can be said that some students do not fully comprehend the corrections made by the lecturer in their written work. They would rather receive a thorough correction from the lecturer so that they can comprehend the errors that they have made in the writing that they have submitted. On the other hand, claim that they do not mind receiving some marks for their writing as long as the lecturer provides specific information or a remark alongside the marks, which will allow them to quickly comprehend what should be improved.