THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

THESIS

Presented to:

State Islamic Institute of Kediri

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement

For the Degree of *Sarjana* in English Language Education

By:

IKA ROHMANIA FATMA

9322.182.15

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION

FACULTY OF TARBIYAH

STATE ISLAMIC INSTITUTE OF KEDIRI

2019

DECLARATION OF AUTHENTICITY

Nama   : IKA ROHMANIA FATMA

NIM   : 9322. 182. 15

Judul   : THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

I hereby declare that the thesis and the work presented in it are my own and it has been generated by me as the result of my own original research. It does not incorporate any materials previously written or published by another person except those indicated in quotations and references. No portion of this work has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or institution of higher education. Due to this fact, I am the only person responsible for the thesis if there is any objection or claim from others.

This thesis is to fulfill the requirement for the degree of *Sarjana (S1)* in English Study Program, State Islamic Institute of Kediri (IAIN).

Kediri, July 12st 2019

The researcher,

IKA ROHMANIA FATMA
NIM. 932218215

APPROVAL PAGE

This is to certify that the bachelor's *Thesis* of Ika Rohmania Fatma has been received and approved by the advisors for further approval by the board of examiners.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

IKA ROHMANIA FATMA
NIM. 9322.182.15

Approved by:

Advisor I,

Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd
NIP. 198409092011012018

Advisor II,

Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I
NIP. 198607022015032003

RATIFICATION SHEET

"THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS"

IKA ROHMANIA FATMA
NIM. 9322.182.15

Has been examined by the Board of Examiners of State Islamic Institute of Kediri
on September 24th, 2019

1. Main Examiner
   Dr. Ary Setya Budhi Ningrum, M.Pd
   NIP. 198204302008012011   (   )

2. Examiner I
   Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd
   NIP. 198409092011012018   (   )

3. Examiner II
   Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I
   NIP. 198607022015032003   (   )

Kediri, September 24th, 2019
Acknowledged by Dean of Faculty of Tarbiyah
State Islamic Institute of Kediri

Dr.H. Ali Anwar, M. Ag
NIP.19640503 199603 1 001

NOTA KONSULTAN

Kediri, July 2019

Nomor :
Lampiran : 4 (empat) berkas
Hal : Bimbingan Skripsi
Kepada
Yth. Rektor Institute Agama Islam Negeri
(IAIN) Kediri
Di Jalan Sunan Ampel 7
Ngronggo Kediri

Assalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb

Memenuhi permintaan Bapak Rektor untuk membimbing pesunyusunan skripsi mahasiswa tersebut di bawah ini:

Nama : IKA ROHMANIA FATMA
NIM : 932218215
Judul : THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Setelah diperbaiki materi dan susunannya, kami berpendapat bahwa skripsinya telah memenuhi syarat sebagai kelengkapan ujian akhir Sarjana Strata Satu (S-1).

Bersama ini terlampir satu berkas naskah skripsinya, dengan harapan dalam waktu yang telah ditentukan dapat diajukan dalam sidang munaqosah.

Demikian agar maklum dan atas kesediaan Bapak, kami ucapkan terimakasih.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb

Advisor I,

Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd
NIP. 198409092011012018

Advisor II,

Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I
NIP. 198607022015032003

NOTA PEMBIMBING

Kediri, 1 July 2019

Nomor   :
Lampiran   :
Hal   : Bimbingan Skripsi
Kepada
Yth. Rektor Institute Agama Islam Negeri
(IAIN) Kediri
Di Jalan Sunan Ampel 7
Ngronggo Kediri

Assalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb

Memenuhi permintaan Bapak Rektor untuk membimbing pesunyusunan skripsi mahasiswa tersebut di bawah ini:

Nama   : IKA ROHMANIA FATMA
NIM   : 932218215
Judul   : THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT WRITING OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Setelah disepakati materi dan susunannya sesuai dengan beberapa petunjuk dan tuntutan yang diberikan dalam sidang munaqosah yang dilaksanakan pada tanggal mei 2019 kami dapat menerima dan menyatakan hasil perbaikannya.

Demikian agar maklum dan atas kesediaan Bapak, kami ucapkan terimakasih.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr.Wb

Advisor I,   Advisor II,

Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd   **Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I**
NIP. 198409092011012018   NIP. 198607022015032003

MOTTO

Start where you are.

Use what you have.

Do what you can.

(Arthur Ashe)

DEDICATIONS

This thesis is dedicate to

- ➢ Thanks to Allah SWT who always guide me and take care to be a good person.

- ➢ Thanks to my beloved Dad "Suparman", and My beloved Mom "Choirotul Eni Masruroh" who always give me prayer, advice, support, motivation, love, understand me, and always accompany me to finish my thesis.

- ➢ My beloved sister Indah and Dita who always give me support, spirit and motivation.

- ➢ Thank to my big family who always give me support, spirit and motivation.

- ➢ My Respectable Advisors Mrs. Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd and Mrs. Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I thanks for giving great guidance, time, advice, criticism and suggestion.

- ➢ Thanks to my friends especially Rr.Desi, Nisa A, Royhanah D for your support, motivation, and time to me and my friend that I can't write their name one by one, from IAIN Kediri and another.

Thanks for your attention, spirit, prayer, support, love, inspiration to me to do this project. I wish ALLAH SWT will give you good feedback and always bless you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.

First and foremost, Praise to Allah SWT, God the Almighty. I would like to express my greatest gratitude to Allah SWT for His blessing upon me in the form of guidance in completing this final project so that it could be accomplished.

The writer believes that this project won't finish without any help and support from several people that gave the help and support directly and indirectly. Thus, the writer would like to appreciate and thanks to:

1. Dr. Nur Chamid, MM as the principle of IAIN Kediri
2. Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd and Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd. I as my advisors who always give me guidance and suggestions in writing my thesis.
3. All of the lectures that taught me in English Department for giving knowledge, study experience and advice.
4. All staff in Faculty of Tarbiyah who help me finish the process of my thesis.
5. The Headmaster of SMPN 1 Mojo who gave me permission to do my research there.
6. All of staff of SMPN 1 Mojo who help me in process collecting the data.

The researcher realized that this research was not perfect. There were many mistakes in this research. Thus, the researcher apologized for the mistakes and the researcher hope that this research could give meaningful knowledge for the readers. Several suggestions and criticism are needed to make this research better.

Kediri,   July 2019

Researcher,

ABSTRAK

Fatma, Ika Rohmania (2019). *The Effectiveness of Direct Written Corrective Feedback on Descriptive Text Writing of Junior High School Students*, English Language, Faculty of Tarbiyah, State Islamic Institute of Kediri. Advisors: (1) Dr. Sri Wahyuni, M.Pd, (2) Ima Fitriyah, M.Pd.

Keywords: *Descriptive Text, Direct Written Corrective Feedback, Writing Skill.*

Writing is a communication tool in written form. This skill is important part of conveying thoughts, ideas, and organizing in sentences or paragraph. One of media that can be used to check the correct of writing is direct written corrective feedback. The aim of this research is to investigate and describe the effectiveness of the use of direct written corrective feedback on descriptive text writing of junior high school students.

The design of this study was quasi-experimental, the participants were divided into two groups, experimental and control group. The participants of this study were 71 eight grade students from SMPN 1 Mojo in academic year 2018/2019. There were 36 students of experimental group by VIII-H and 35 students of control group by VIII-I. The data were gained by using test (pretest and posttest) and analyzed by using ANCOVA in SPSS 21 version of windows.

The result shows that the mean of pretest score of experimental group was 73.37 and the control was 77.07. In the posttest, the mean score of experimental group was 84.73 and the control was 83.45. The result of statistical computation of ANCOVA shows that the significant value is 0.030. It is less than 0.05 (0.030<0.05). since the significance value was smaller than 0.05 statistically, there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. It means that the students who write descriptive text and corrected by using direct written corrective feedback is better than students who are not given a correction by using direct written corrective feedback. Based on the result of the test, the researcher concludes that using direct written corrective feedback is effective in teaching writing descriptive text at SMPN 1 Mojo.

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDIXES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background of the study, research question of the study, the objective of the study, hypothesis of the study, the significant of the study, the scope and limitation of the study, and definition of key term of the study.

A. Background of the Study

In Indonesia, English is considered as a foreign language that is taught at every level of education ranging from basic education to higher education. In teaching English as a foreign language, four skills are taught to speaking and listening as receptive skills, writing and reading as productive skills. According to Allan and Vallete (1981) as cited in Fatimah (2017), writing is difficult skill for students to learn. Writing and speaking are productive skill. Writing must go through a process to spend it, in contrast to speaking writing is a complicated process Coklat (2001) as cited in Fatimah (2017). So it can be said that writing is not an innate process from birth, but it comes from a learning process.

Writing is a communication tool in written form such as email, business letters, newspapers, diaries, and so on. This skill is important part of conveying thoughts, ideas, and organizing them in sentences or paragraphs. As harmer (1998) shows that writing skill are finally recognized as important skill for language learning. He stressed the importance of students such as encouraging learning, writing skills as a compulsory subject.

In Indonesia, the purpose of teaching writing is to enable EFL students to master functional texts and monologues in the form of genres such as descriptive, narrative, procedures, and reports (Ministry of National Education, 2006). Various genres of text writing have social functions, the purpose of text and the meaning of the type of text, however, a study conducted by Widiati (2003) reveals that teaching writing in the Indonesian context has not been able to answer student questions. Many students find it difficult to develop ideas and pour ideas into paragraphs and even more complicated in grammar and diction. Very difficult and complicated to teach writing, many teachers ignore it because it requires deep knowledge and enough time to practice. Compared to the other three skills, it is considered the most difficult language skill to be achieved by students and to be taught by teachers (Alwasilah, 2004).

To improve students' writing skills, a teacher need to be aware an approach to teach writing through guidance and providing feedback (Leki & Carson, 1994). The teacher must help and encourage his students to master writing. Various activities are needed to be implemented in the classroom so students can develop their ideas.

For EFL, learning to write in English is more challenging than learning to speak, read and listen. Chitravelu, Sithamparam and Choon (2005) as cited in Jusoh (2016) give their opinion that writing is a very complex skill. The writer not only know the subject, goals, sense spectators, but also need the writer needs to have the command language, convention, organizational skills, mechanical and writing

process. Writing also need preparation, revise, edit, and read the evidence. Since the writing is considered as a complex process.

Based on preliminary study, the ability of students in writing is unsatisfactory, it occurs because generally students do not care about their grammar and vocabulary. They write down directly what they think regardless of their writing true or not. They feel that they do not need to consult their writing to the teacher, so they write their duties freely. To support that, corrective feedback is the most effective way to show student errors. Researchers Choudron (1998) as cited in Rhomawati (2018) state that, corrective feedback is only to emphasize that teachers use to remind students of mistakes and the teachers try to tell about student mistakes. Corrective feedback and guidance for students to develop sentences, Lightbown and Spada (1999). Students can obtain these instructions in several ways. according to Polio (2012) as cited in Rhomawati (2018), states that corrective feedback regulates some knowledge and helps students to check the wrong information and then ensures errors will not return automatically.

The first study from Yahya (2016), investigated the effects of various types of feedback written by the teacher focused on simple English and past articles. The second study was Ismayanindar (2015). She investigated the teacher feedback technique used in teaching descriptive text, the student's response of the teaching writing descriptive text, and the problems faced by the teacher in teaching descriptive text. The study revealed that teacher's corrective feedback techniques was appropriate

and effective for the second years students of SMP N 1 Sragen in teaching descriptive text.

There are many strategies that can be used to improve the writing ability for students. One of them is written corrective feedback. Bitchener and Knoch (2008) argues "Written Corrective Feedback to help students gain and demonstrate mastery in the use of targeted linguistic form and structure". In addition, Russell and Spada (2006), also state Corrective feedback refers to any feedback given to students, from any source, which contains evidence of student error in the form of language ". That means that feedback in language teaching takes the form of positive reinforcement or correction for students. Allan and Vallete (1981) as cited in Fatimah (2017) state that it is difficult for students to write in English. They often feel bored because their teacher just asks them to open a dictionary when they want to write. Therefore, the output of text with grammatical errors and miss organization of text are the most common mistakes in their writing.

Feedback is expected to help students revise and develop their writing. This study explain students' writing skills before and after using direct written corrective feedback techniques and hopefully it makes a difference between them. The author is interested in investigating the effectiveness of direct written corrective feedback implemented by English teachers to improve the writing skills of junior high school students in descriptive texts and students' responses to direct written corrective feedback from teachers. Therefore, the title of this research is "The Effectiveness of

Direct Written Corrective Feedback on Descriptive Text writing of Junior High School Students".

B. Research Question of the Study

The formulation of the problem in this research can be stated as the follows: "Do students who get Direct Written Corrective Feedback have better Descriptive text writing skill than those who do not get Direct Written Corrective Feedback?"

C. The Objectives of the Study

Based on the statement of problem, the objectives of the study is to investigate and describe the effectiveness of the use of direct written corrective feedback on descriptive text at SMPN 1 Mojo.

D. Hypothesis

H_0: There is no significant difference between students' writing skill getting direct written corrective feedback and writing skill not getting direct written corrective feedback.

H_a: There is a significant difference between students' writing skill getting direct written corrective feedback and writing skill not getting direct written corrective feedback.

E. The Significance of the Study

The result of the study will be useful for students, teacher, and further researcher.

1. For Students, it can increase students' interest and motivation in learning to write English properly and correctly.

2. For Teachers, this study provides some information and also a model in applying direct written corrective feedback from teachers that is used to improve students' writing skills in the learning process of writing. Thus, this study can be used as a reference or guide for applying direct written corrective feedback to teachers in the learning process of writing.

3. Further researchers, this study provides some information about the process of teaching writing to students in junior high school. Thus, the results of this study can be used as a reference or inspiration for conducting similar research in different fields.

F. The Scope and Limitation

In this study, the researcher only focuses on teaching writing descriptive text by using Direct Written Corrective Feedback at the eighth grade of SMPN 1 Mojo in academic year 2018/2019.

G. Definition of the Key Term

To avoid misinterpretation and misunderstanding, the following terms are provided:

1. Writing,

The activity or skill of making coherent words on paper and composing text. Writing is producing writing as one of the communication media. So by writing students can express knowledge, messages, and comments in a writing. Writing is the last part to be taught after learning to listen, speak and read does not mean writing is not important. Writing is often referred to as one of the complicated things for students and it makes the assumption that writing is a practical skill.

2. Descriptive Text

Descriptive text are describe, explain, or represent something. For example, objects, people or places. Descriptive genre can also be defined as the way how things look, smell, taste, feel, or sound.

3. Direct Written Corrective Feedback

In this study, the term written corrective feedback is as defined by Lightbown and Spada (1990) indications for leaners that the use of the target language is incorrect. This is written information given to students about the linguistic errors they have made (Loewen, 2012; Sheen, 2007). The form of giving written corrective feedback can be direct and indirect. Ellis (2009) states that indirect written corrective feedback is feedback written by the teacher which involves showing that the student has made a mistake without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining errors or using the cursor to show negligence in the student text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. As a result, this involves deciding whether to show the exact location of the error. Meanwhile, direct written corrective feedback is written feedback where the teacher gives students the correct mistakes. So in this study, when researchers mentioned direct written corrective feedback, it meant a technique to provide written feedback by actually correcting mistakes made by students.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents the review of literature. It discusses about writing, teaching writing, writing process, writing assessment, problem in writing, descriptive text, feedback, and types of feedback.

A. Writing

According to Byrne (1984) as cited in Fatimah (2017) writing is a basic skill in learning English. Writing is a productive skill because it requires skills to produce a writing in the form of text symbols such as letters and numbers that are used in the rules of logical words, paragraphs. According to Troyka (2013) as cited in Fatimah (2017) states writing is not only about letters or symbols. Writing is a way of communicating that shows ideas, feelings, or thoughts from writers who have created and revealed in written form that aims to provide information, convey messages, and make literary works in written form.

Writing is very difficult for students-writers because they are required to write in their own writing, to fend for themselves to improve their writings without interaction or feedback from other friends or teachers, Byrne (1984) as cited in Fatimah, (2017). However, students arrange and organize their own ideas in such a way that readers can understand their writing. Writing is very challenging for students because it needs an entirely different set of competence and fundamentally different from speaking Brown, (2001). As a result, the teachers need to offer guidance in

helping them write better; the guidance is then called feedback Lewis (2002) as cited in Pertiwi (2013).

The process of writing according to Hammer (2004) as cited in Sari (2017), writing has four stages. The first stage is planning, where the author plans and produces ideas. The second stage is to arrange where the author places their ideas in words and sentences. The third stage is editing where the author looks back or designs and then edits it by adding information, changing ambiguous information, correcting something that is unclear or confusing and then choosing a different word form. The final stage is the final form in which he reads the text after being edited, reflected, and revised.

The teacher must allow students to plan and produce what they want to write. After that, the teacher provides a guide for putting students' plans into words. In writing, a teacher is better to encourage student confidence to develop their ideas freely. The next step is to edit the text. Students must review their work then add information, change ambiguity, and revise it to get the best final writing. Feedback will definitely play important assistance for students, especially in the editing and revising phase. As proposed in this study, implementing a feedback partner is very valuable.

B. Teaching Writing in Junior High School

Writing encourages students to focus on using accurate language. However, this is quite separate from the problem of the writing process and genre. In fact,

students do not write to become better writers. Hammer (2004) states that there are three ways to help them learn better. Teacher explained as follow:

1. Get students to plan to write

    Before students start writing, we can ask them to think about what they will write. When students plan, we ask them to think not only about the content but also about the purpose of their writing and who they are targeting.

2. Encourage students to compile, reflect, and revise the writing.

    Students sometimes find difficulty in writing. As teachers we might give them some care. One way to encourage compilation, reflection and revision is to get students involved in collaborative writing. We can make a pair of groups of students work together on a piece of paper. It can respond to each other's ideas. Then make suggestions for changes. Finally, give appreciation to the successful group of finished products.

3. Respond to student writing

    The teacher can read their draft and then make written suggestions about how the text can be rearranged. The other, the teacher asks students to reformulate their writing to their own version to make it better. Reformulation will be beneficial for students who compare their version with their teacher. The teacher can respond to student writing. But their friends also responded in their own way and that will make their writing good.

C. The Writing Process

The writing process is a series of stages or activities that the author passes when they are compiled. According to Harmer (2004), writing has four stages. They are planning, compiling, editing (revising) and the final version. Each stage is explained below:

1. Planning

At this stage, students gather information by planning what will be written. They also decide the purpose of writing, the type of text, the language used, and the information chosen. Students must also consider the organization of ideas and content structures. At this stage, students produce their ideas. The teacher helps students to produce their ideas with various tasks.

2. Drafting

The next writing stage is preparation. The draft refers to the first version of an article. Therefore, preparation is the first production stage to get ideas using complete sentences and reflect the general conventions of writing. Students pour their ideas into sentences and then paragraphs. At this stage, they have not focused on accuracy. Content and meaning are things they must focus on. They began writing drafts on a piece of paper and then they will be revised.

3. Editing (Revision)

Editing as part of the writing process must first be done by the author and then again by colleagues or adults, using the appropriate editing marks. Just as in revisions, it is better to ask students to make several "passes" through their writing,

checking only one area at a time, such as spelling, paragraphs, or commas. Ask students to first read their work aloud for themselves (quietly), check doubts or disorders, which can lead to grammar or punctuation problems. Have students cross out and replace instead of erasing, which quickly erodes the design into stains and holes, Sundem (2006:).

4. Final version

The final stage is the final version. This stage refers to the process of tidying up the text for grammar, spelling, punctuation, sentence structure, and accuracy in preparing the final draft. After editing the draft and making the necessary changes, students make their final draft and are ready to publish their writing.

D. Writing Assessment

In teaching writing, the teacher needs to monitor student improvement so they know how far students master writing skills. The teacher can monitor their development through scores obtained by students in writing. The teacher gets scores from the instruments they use to assess students. In short, teacher need assessment types to get student grades to monitor increase students' ability to write.

Blaz (2002) defines valuation as whatever method is used to better understand true knowledge possessed by a student. Assessment functions as a monitor student understanding of specific units or concepts, to provide valuable feedback students about what progress has been made and what still needs to be improved. In addition, O'Malley and Pierce (1996) state that valuation information is needed by administrators, teachers, staff, developers, students and parent to help determine the

right program placement and teaching activities as well in monitoring student progress.

There are two reasons why teachers must do written assessment. That the first is making conclusions about language skills, and the second is making decisions based on these conclusions. Because teachers cannot directly observe one's language abilities, they use student responses to test items as data from which the teacher make conclusions about the abilities that underlie the test performance. This conclusion is then used as data to create variety decisions at the individual, classroom, or program level Weigle, (2002). In short, assessment can be defined as any method used to infer students' languages ability.

E. Problem in Writing

Writing is not easy. Reymond (1980) states that an experienced writer will often do more than one paragraph for more than one hour- not including the thoughts and researchers who entered before the actual writing. Therefore, many problems faced by teachers and students. The first problem is the problem of "less capable writers". Less capable writers leap over the writing process by skipping pre-written strategies to generate ideas. Students may need a lot of time to write down their ideas. The suggestion for this problem is that the teacher must teach writers who are not good at the writing process. Teachers also need to give their full attention to them, to show them how to plan writing through pre-written activities. The second is the problem "I can't write English". Students usually give up writing and believe they cannot write. The solution is the teacher must apply the writing process to students.

The teacher can lead students through pre-writing, drafting, and revision activities. By doing this, students can see that writing is needed a development process that requires time and effort. The last problem is the "teacher response" problem. Writing teachers often spend hours reading and marking student papers. Suggestions for this problem the teacher can work with students to develop their written work through student-to-student conferences.

F. Descriptive Text

Descriptive text is intended to imagine someone, something, place, and animal, Djauharie (2001) and part of the factual genre. Social function is to describe a certain person, place, or object. Written descriptions are the process of creating visual images and sensory impressions through words. More often, descriptions are part of other writings and are used to inform the audience about how something or someone sees an audience for something from the author's perspective.

Descriptive genre can also be defined as the way things look, smell, feel, feel, or sound. In addition, descriptive writing is a genre that asks students to describe experiences, emotions, situations, qualities, and characteristics. This genre encourages students' ability to create written accounts from certain experiences. What is small, it allows a lot of artistic freedom (the aim is to paint a clear and moving picture in the reader's mind).

Description is writing that uses clear details to capture scenes, settings, people or moments. Shinoda, (2008) states that the description is written in English text that

the author describes an object. Descriptive text is a type of written text, which has a specific function to give a description of an object (human or nonhuman), Pradiyono (2007).

There are three types of writing descriptive (describing the people, places, and items).

1. The people

In describing the people, the description of the physical appearance (height, weight, age), characteristics (hair color, eye, skin), and a sign that can be identified (scar, sign born) is required to make a clear view of the people who are described.

2. Place

In describe the place, description must be set so readers can clearly imagine scene described. Also, additional information about the impression or attitude-owned a person is very important to make a description clearer.

3. Objects

To describe a thing, the authors should have imagination good about it being described. It is necessary to help the reader get a clear picture as author mean in the description.

Writing descriptive have the following characteristics:

a. Writing descriptive good include a lot of details sensory which palpable the painting the image and appeals to all the senses vision, hearing, touch, smell and taste if necessary. Posts descriptive can also paint a picture feelings, place or thing pronounced the author.

b. Writing descriptive good often use figurative language such as the analogy, imagery, and metaphors to help to paint a picture in mind the reader.

c. Writing descriptive good used the right language. Adjective general noun, and verb passive not have a place in writing descriptive good. Use adjectives and noun specified and verb action strong illustrate directly on the image you painted in mind the reader. Writing descriptive good compiled.

d. Some way to organize the writing of descriptive included: chronological (time), spatial (location), and the order of interest. When describing a person, you may start with physical description, followed by how it is thought, feel, and the Act.

Texture descriptive divided into two parts: identification and description. The identification is part where the author of descriptive text identifying the phenomena that will be described. The descriptive describe the quality parts, and character. Text description focuses on the participation of specific. Usually use present tense simple.

G. Feedback

According to Keh (1990) as cited in Mujiburrohman, (2013) defines feedback is input from readers to authors by providing information for revisions. Information can be in the form of directions, suggestions, or requests. In this case, the reader provides feedback on writing errors and then feedback can be a direction for writers to improve their writing on the same writing or even the next writing they will make. Through feedback, readers can give some suggestions for better writing such as adding articles, paying attention to the agreement of sentences or even feedback can

also be a request from readers to writers to do something for writing such as asking the author to write clearly. Supporting that definition, for effective feedback, Reid (1993) states that students must understand responses, take responses to their writing, and ultimately improve writing.

Harmer (2001) considers that feedback is in response to students' work rather than assessing or evaluating what they have done. According to him, the essence of feedback can be in the form of comments on how the texts appear to the teachers, how successful the teachers think about the work the students have done, and how it can be improved. Supporting this view, Harmer (2004) states that this kind of feedback becomes more and more appropriate when student levels increase and they can use it to help.

Based on the above definition, it can be concluded that feedback is a procedure in the writing process to provide information for revisions in a certain way depending on the type and purpose of the assignment in the learning process of writing. Providing feedback in student writing is an important aspect of the writing process because it can help writers to develop their writing skills by learning from their mistakes.

H. Types of Feedback

According to the Nation (2009), there are two types of feedback as oral and written feedback. Oral feedback is defined in response in the form of dialogue between the author and source feedback. Written feedback feedback in response in written form providing the eternal note that can be used to measure progress and Act

as remember. Progress can be seen from the author of the draft is error decreased or not.

The type of corrective feedback researchers have data oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback from observed in the class when teaching the learning process. Researchers obtain data from observations for learning process in the classroom activities, which teaching and learning process of simple past and the introduction of lessons. Futhermore, researchers also collected student worksheets to obtain suitable data.

1. **Oral Corrective Feedback**

In oral corrective feedback, there are six types in oral corrective feedback, namely: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elisitasi, repetition by Lyster & Ranta (1997).

a. Explicit

Explicit correction is when students' make their mistakes in speech, the teacher immediately shows that the students' sentence is wrong then the teacher presents the correct sentence.

S: "They attend the zoo last week."
T: "No. You should apply (ed) or verb 2."
    "They attended the zoo last week. Repeat please!"
S: "They attended the zoo last week."
T: "Yes, good."
(Observation on March, 27th 2018)

b. Recast

When a students' speech contains an incorrect form or error, the teacher points out that the students' speech is wrong, then the teacher declares the students' fault and the teacher gives the correct form.

S : "Whitebor"
T : "Not whitebor but whiteboard"
S : "Whiteboard"
T : "Yes, good."
(Observation on March, 27th 2018)

c. Clarification Request

Clarification request is the teacher gives several repetitions or rearranges the words of the student because in the students' communication it is not true or has not been received by the teacher, so the teacher must give a reformulation.

S : "This cake was made by I"
T : "Are you sure?"
S : "I can borrow the broom?"
T : "Pardon? I don't understand"
(Observation on March, 28th 2018)

d. Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistic Feedback is the teachers response to the students' speech, but the teacher does not serve the correct form, the teacher usually asks questions and applies comments regarding the students' sayings.

S : "It has ear"
T : "How many ears?"
S : "Two ears"

T : "So, the correct sentence is?"
S : "It has two ears"
T : "Great!"
(Observation on March, 29th 2018)

e. Repetition

Repetition is the teacher's response when the students' utterance contains an error and the teacher immediately accustoms the intonation to attract students' attention to confirm that the students' speech is wrong.

S : "My hobbies swimming"
T : "My hobbies ?"
S : "My hobby is swimming."
(Observation on March, 31th 2018)

2. Written Corrective Feedback

Siriluck (2008) as cited in Rhomawati (2018) proposed different types of teacher feedback shows a variety of techniques in supplying feedback. Feedback divided by to rate a correction by teachers. There are two types of written corrective feedback, namely: direct feedback and indirect feedback, which is divided into two types, namely: (a) coded feedback, (b) uncoded feedback.

A typology of teacher options for correcting linguistic errors in students' written work. These options have been identified by inspecting both teacher handbooks, Ur (1996) and published empirical studies of written feedback (Robb, Ross, and Shortredd 1986; Chandler 2003; Ferris 2006). A basic distinction needs to be made between the options involved in (I) the teacher's provision of CF and the

students' response to this feedback. Clearly, CF can only have an impact if students attend to it. Thus, many accounts of CF must consider both aspect.

Type of CF	Description	Studies
A. Strategies for providing CF		
1. Direct WCF	The teacher provides the student with the correct form.	Lalande (1982) and Robb *et al.* (1986).
2. Indirect WCF	The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction.	Various studies have employed indirect correction of this kind, Ferris and Roberts (2001); Chandler (2003).
a. Indicating + locating the error	This takes the form of underlining and use cursors to show omissions in the student's text.	
b. Indication only	This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.	Fewer studies have employed this method, Robb *et al.* (1986).

a) Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback is done when the teacher corrects students' errors on their work by providing the correct structural or lexical forms (Lalande,1982;

Semke, 1984; Robb et al., 1986). Accredit to the teacher by supliying accurate correction form for students in order to justify the students' mistakes in written.

According to Ferris (as quoted in Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). Direct written corrective feedback is the provision of correct forms or linguistic structures by the teacher to students above linguistic errors. This is a form of written feedback where the teacher gives the correct form by crossing out unnecessary words, phrases or morphemes, entering missing words, phrases or morphemes, and writing the correct shape or structure above or near the wrong shape. Additional forms of direct feedback can include written meta-linguistic explanations such as provisions of rules and examples at the end of student scripts with references back to places in the text where errors have occurred.

As already noted, there are other types of written corrective feedback called indirect corrective feedback. This indirect corrective feedback is given by the teacher to indicate that there is an error but does not provide a correction. This takes the form of underlining and using the cursor to show negligence in the student text. However, Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest that direct written corrective feedback may be better than indirect written corrective feedback with low-level authors of low language skills because it provides students with explicit guidance on how to correct their mistakes.

b) Indirect Corrective Feedback

The teacher points out the error by circling or underlining without providing corrections (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). The teacher just gives crosswise, underlying and circling to indicates that the students' written is incorrect. Indirect corrective feedback divided into two types, namely: coded and un-coded.

a. Coded Feedback

Code feedback also referred to as the error identification (Lee, 2004), which occurs when teachers shows students error in writing and then teacher brief without provide the correct form of student worksheet. In the observation of researchers not found code feedback provided by the teacher.

b. Un-coded Feedback

Un-coded feedback contained as indirect feedback, it can be mentioned in error locations in learners' written, disclosed (Ferris, 2002) as cited in Rhomawati (2018). The teacher gave crosswise in student's error sentence, the teacher is not giving the right sentence but just a crosswise that there is an error in the students' sentence.

I. Review of Previous Study

Here are some relevant studies that related to my study: first, the "Thesis" by Anisya Ayu Devinta Firdauzi. She has written a thesis (2016) entitled "Using Direct Written Corrective Feedback to Improve Eight Grade Students' Spelling Accuracy in SMPN 15 Yogyakarta". She used a Classroom Action Research (CAR) method in her

study. She also used students draft, field note, and questionnaire. By the end of the study she concluded that Direct Written Corrective Feedback helped the students to improve their spelling accuracy in writing.

Second is thesis by Uli Tri Utami. She has written a thesis (2012) entitled "Improving Students' Writing Skill Through Teacher's Direct Feedback in SMAN 1 Jogonalan". She used a Classroom Action Research (CAR) method in her study. She also used interview, field notes, class observation, documentation, and writing test. By the end of the study she concluded that teacher Direct Feedback can improve students' writing skill.

Third is Article by Nimas Ismayanindar. She has written an article (2015) entitled "The Teachers' Feedback Technique in Teaching Descriptive Text at the Second Year of SMPN 1 Sragen". She used source from event, informant, and document. The techniques of collecting data are the observation, interview, and document analysis about the writing teaching- learning process. By the end of the study of the analysis shows that teacher corrective feedback techniques appropriate and effective for the second year student of SMPN 1 Sragen in teaching descriptive text. By using this technique, the students are capable to knowing their errors, the reason and correct it.

Fourth is Article by Ubayu Yahya. He has written an article (2016) entitled "The Use of Written Corrective Feedback to Improve the Tenth Grade Students' Writing Skill of Descriptive Text". He used qualitative research and uses instruments

such as interview, field note, questionnaire, and students' written text. By the end of this study he conclude that most students who get teacher's direct corrective feedback have better understanding about the errors in their written text especially in simple present tense. It can be seen that from 88 students' errors, direct corrective feedback gets 48% definitely like and 38% like, indirect corrective feedback gets 2% definitely like, 8% like and 2% do not like and metalinguistic corrective feedback gets 2% like.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter discusses methodology that is used by the researcher in the research. It consists of: research design, variable of the study, population and sample, treatment, procedure, instrument of the study, data collection method, and data analysis.

A. Research Design

This study investigated the effectiveness of direct written corrective feedback on students' descriptive writing. This study uses quantitative research and use quasi-experimental research that does not take the sample randomly. A quasi experiment is a study that includes a manipulated independent variable but lacks important control (e.g., random assignment), or a study that lacks a manipulated independent variable but includes important controls. It represents the most valid approach to the solution of educational problems, both practical and theoretical and to advancement of education as a science L.R Gay, (1992). So a quasi-experiment has some features of a well conducted experiment but not others. The experimental group will be taught by using *direct corrective feedback* and control group will be taught by using *indirect corrective feedback*.

The researcher does experiment by giving treatment to the subject of the study to know that there is any effectiveness of direct written corrective feedback on descriptive text by comparing two groups of study (experimental and control group).

The experimental group taught by using direct written corrective feedback and control group taught by using indirect written corrective feedback. They study as usual in the school. Before and after doing treatment the researcher gives two kind of tests to the students in both groups, namely pre-test and post-test. Pre-test in this study is to know the ability before treatment using direct written corrective feedback. Post-test is to know the progress of students ability after treatment using direct written corrective feedback.

Table. 3.1 Research Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental group	Pre-test	Direct Written Corrective Feedback	Post-test
Control group	Pre-test	Indirect Written Corrective Feedback	Post-test

B. Variable of the study

Variables are characteristics that tend to differ from individual to individual, through two more individuals who may have the same variable properties or sizes. It can be concluded that the variable is a condition or characteristic manipulated by experiment, control, and observation. In this study there are two variables which are divided into dependent variables and independent variables. The dependent variable in this study is writing skill; while the independent variable is direct written

corrective feedback. In the process of this research, there are also intervening variables that cannot be measured, such as anxiety, fatigue, and student motivation that can influence the results of this study. The others are foreign variables. Intervening and extraneous variables can influence the results of research.

C. Population and Sample

The population of the researcher is the second grade students of SMPN 1 Mojo. The researcher takes SMPN 1 Mojo and chooses the second grade in the academic year 2018/2019 as the population of the study. It consists of ten classes. They are VIII A, VIII B, VIII C, VIII D, VIII E, VIII F, VIII G, VIII H, VIII I, and VIII J.

In this research, the researcher takes two classes, VIII I and VIII H as the sample of the study, since they have same quantity. Then the researcher takes VIII H as the experimental group while VIII I as the control group. One group will be give conventional method in teaching learning process while the other group will be taught by using direct written corrective feedback.

D. Instrument

Before collecting data, the researcher must use instrument to get the data. The instrument of the research as a tool or facility that used by the researcher for collecting data. In this study the researcher conducted test (pre-test and post-test) as an instrument.

1. Pre-test

Pre-test is used to get data about how far knowledge students' writing skill before giving treatment. The researcher giving the pre-test to both of groups, experimental and control group. In this test, the time is limited. The researcher give testing to the students to make paragraph of descriptive text.

2. Post-test

The last step of experimental researcher is giving post-test to both group, experimental and control group. The aims of pre-test are to know the increasing of students writing skill after getting treatment and to know the result of the treatment whether is effective or not.

E. Reliability of the Instrument

Test reliability is when the test level that is measuring is consistent, forming one time after another. Donald ary stated that the reliability of a measuring instrument is the level of consistency by measuring whatever it measures. Most essay tests were evaluated by analytic assessment. Usually, analytical scoring systems use rating scales or guidelines such as grammatical use, vocabulary, mechanics, relevance and fluency. It has been stated above about analytical assessment.

Table 3.2 Scoring rubric

(adapted from Jacobs (1981) in Weigle)

Categories	Score	Criteria
Content	30-27	Excellent to very good: knowledge- substance- etc.
	26-22	Good to Average: some knowledgeable of subject- adequate range- etc.
	21-17	Fair to Poor: does not show knowledgeable of subject – little substantive- etc.
	16-13	Very poor: does not show knowledgeable of subject- non- substantive- etc.
Organization	20-18	Excellent to very good: fluent expression-idea clearly stated- etc.
	17-14	Good to average: somewhat copy- loosely organize but main idea stand out- etc.
	13-10	Fair to poor: non fluent-ideas confused or disconnected- etc.
	9-7	Very poor: does not communicate-no organization- etc.
Vocabulary	20-18	Excellent to very good: sophisticated range effective word/ idiom form, choice, usage.
	17-14	Good to average: adequate range-occasional errors of words/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured.
	13-10	Fair to poor: limited range-frequent errors of words/idiom form, choice, usage-etc.
	9-7	Very poor: essential translation-little knowledge

		of English vocabulary
Language use	25-22	Excellent to very good: effective complex construction- etc.
	21-19	Good to average: effective but simple construction-etc.
	18-11	Fair to poor: major problem in simple/ complex construction
	10-5	Very poor: virtual no mastery of sentence construction rules-etc.
Mechanics	5	Excellent to very good: demonstrates mastery of convention- etc.
	4	Good to average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization- etc.
	3	Fair to poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization-etc.
	2	Very poor: no mastery of conventions determine by errors of spelling punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing- etc.

(adapted from Jacob (1981) in Wigle (2002: 116))

Score: <u>The number gotten</u> =
The maximal score

Table 3.3 Criteria Students' Score

No.	Grade	Level	Range of score
1.	A	Excellent	80-100
2.	B	Good	60-80
3.	C	Fair	40-60
4.	D	Poor	0-40

F. The treatment

Treatment is used to determine whether the use of direct written corrective feedback in teaching writing descriptive text. Here, the experimental group was given direct written corrective feedback while the control group did not. Before providing care, the researcher tells the purpose of using direct written corrective feedback to the teacher and students well. The steps are described on the table:

Table 3.4 of Treatment

STAGES	ACTIVITIES	
	Experimental group	Control group
Pre-teaching	a. Greeting b. Getting class attention c. Explain about Descriptive text d. Give the pre-test	a. Greeting b. Getting class attention c. Explain about Descriptive text d. Give the pre-test
Main teaching	e. Giving direct corrective feedback	e. Giving indirect corrective feedback to

	to student that have done in writing	student that have done in writing
	f. Paper that has been given a streak of feedback is returned to the student's	f. Paper that has been given a streak of feedback is returned to the students
	g. The students have to repair it	g. The students have to repair it
Post-teaching	h. Giving evaluation	h. Giving evaluation
	i. Review what have learned	i. Review what have learned
	j. Closing	j. Closing

G. Data Collection Method

This research data uses quasi-experimental research. The procedure of this method collects data from the pre-test, treatment, and post-test studies. Pre-test must be done to find out the writing of students before getting treatment. This treatment is done where researchers apply the techniques used to improve writing skills using direct written corrective feedback method as learning media. The last is the post-test, this test is used to find out the writing of students after getting treatment. In the process of collecting data, there will be several steps. First the study selected samples (experimental group and control group). Second, the study provides a pre-test of the sample. Which, when, research provides several treatments for samples. Third, the study gave post-test to the sample. And furthermore, the test results of the test results.

Then compare the average values of the two groups. (Covariant analysis) score research using the SPSS program.

H. Data Analysis

Data analysis techniques are an important way to find out the learning process that is done to succeed or not. Pre-test is given to students before treatment, and the post-test is given after treatment. This is used to compare the results of the pre-test and post-test in experimental class and control class. The use of ANCOVA (covariant analysis) to analyze data from pre-test and post-test statistically. ANCOVA is a procedure where statistics are made for the dependent variable, the purpose of this ANCOVA is to adjust the post-test means for differences between groups in the pre-test, because the differences can occur with the whole group. In this case ANCOVA is carried out using the SPSS program.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter present the conclusion and suggestion related to the research. It describe conclusion about concerning the research question in the first chapter. Finding of the research lead to the conclusion and the suggestion concern direct written corrective feedback on writing skill of descriptive text.

A. Conclusion

The objective of this research was to know the effectiveness of direct written corrective feedback on descriptive text. The study revealed that there was a significant difference in the students writing skill taught using direct written corrective feedback learning media better than do not get direct written corrective feedback as a student learning at SMPN 1 Mojo. Based on ANCOVA output, the result of the study shows that there is a significant difference between the students writing skill taught by using direct written corrective feedback than do not get direct written corrective feedback as a student learning at SMPN 1 Mojo.

The result of statistically computation of ANCOVA shows that the significance is 0.030. it less than 0.05 (0.030 < 0.05). it means that direct written corrective feedback is effective. Based on the ANCOVA output above, this research concluded that null hypothesis is rejected. As the null hypothesis was rejected, it

means that statistically there is significant difference between direct written corrective feedback.

B. Suggestion

Based on the result of the research, the research would like to give some suggestions to the English teachers, students, and further researcher. Hopefully, the researcher is useful for them.

1. For English teacher

    Direct written corrective feedback has been helped students to develop their idea in writing descriptive text. In addition, it can make students to build their writing. The result of the research showed that direct written corrective feedback was effective in teaching writing descriptive text.

2. For the Students

    The researcher hopes that the Direct written corrective feedback hopefully can increase students' interest and motivation in learning to write English properly and correctly.

3. For Further Researcher

    Based on the result of the research, the suggestion for the further research is conducting direct written corrective feedback can overcome the difficulty of students in writing.

REFERENCE

Alwasilah, A. C. (2004). *The tapestry of English language teaching and learning in Indonesia*. Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: *A ten-month investigation. Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2008). The Value of Written Corrective Feedback for Migrant and International Students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3): 409-431.

Blaz, Deborah. (2002). *A Collection of Performance Tasks and Rubrics: Foreign Laguages.* New York: Eye On Education, Inc.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy Second Edition*. New Jersey: prentice hall regents prentice – all, Inc.

Chandler, J. (2003). "The Efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing'. *Journal of Second Language Writing 12: 267-296.*

Chitravelu, Sithamparam and Choon (2005). *ELT Methodology Principle and Practice. (2nd Ed.)* Shah Alam, Penerbit Fajar Bakti Sdn.Bhd

Depdiknas, (2006), *Bahan pelatihan terintegrasi berbasis kompetensi guru SMP*, Jakarta: Depdikbud.

Djauharie, Otong Setiawan, (2001), *Genre*, Yrama Widya: Bandung.

Ellis, R, (2009), A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types, *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.

Fatimah, Siti and G. Suharto, (2017), Using Peer Feedback Technique to Improve Students' Writing Skills: A Quasi-Experimental Study Among Secondary Students, *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)*, 40-48.

Ferris, D.R. and B. Roberts. (2001). "Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?". *Journal od Second Language Writing*, 10, 161 – 184.

Firdauzi, Anisya Ayu Devinta, (2016). *Using Direct Written Corrective Feedback to Improve Eight Grade Students' Spelling Accuracy in SMPN 15 Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Sananta Dharma.

Gay, L.R. (1992), *Education Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*, London: Charles E. Milton Keynes Philadelphia Company.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to Teach English*. England: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of Language Teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, Jeremy. (2004) *How to Teach Writing*, England; Pearson Education, Inc.

Ismayanindar, Nimas. (2015). *The Teacher's Feedback Technique in Teaching Descriptive Text at The Second Year of SMP N 1 Sragen*. *Unpublished Research Paper*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.

Jacobs, G, and Small, J, (2003), Combining Dictogloss and Cooperative Learning to Promote Language Learning. *The Reading Matrix*, Vol. 3, No. 1

Jusoh, Juhari et. al, (2016), Corrective Feedback Improves Students' Writing Skill in ESL: A Quasi-Experimental to Language Pedagogy, *Reseachegate,* 1-16.

Keh, L.Claudia. (1990). Feedback in the Writing Process: A model and Methods for Implementation. *ELT Journal*, Volume 44/4 Oxford University Press.

Lalande, J.F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: an experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.

Lee, I. (2004). How Do Hong Kong English Teachers Correct Errors in Writing?. *Education Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 1, 153-169.

Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL quarterly*, 28(1), 81-101.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loewen, S, (2002), *The Role of Feedback in A Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.)*, The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lyster & Ranta (1997). "Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms". *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 19*: 37–66. Retrieved 20 July 2013 from http://people.mcgill.ca

Mujiburrohman, Muhammad. (2013). Improving Students' Descriptive Text Writing Achievement by Using Error Correction Feedback. ©*Pancaran,* Vol. 2, No. 1, hal 173-184.

Nation P.,S.,I. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge.

O'Malley, J.M., & Pierce, L.V. (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners*. San Francisco: Longman.

Pardiyono, (2007), *Pasti Bisa! Teaching Genre-Based Writing*, Yogyakarta: Andi.

Pertiwi, Indri Eka, (2013), Teacher's Feedback on Students' Descriptive Texts, *Journal of English and Education* 2013, 1(1), 96-103.

Reid, M. Joy. (1993). *Teaching ESL Writing*. New Jersey: Tina B. Carver.

Reymond, James C, (1980), *Writing*. New York: Harper and Row Publisher, Inc.

Rhomawati, Lilis, (2018), *Teacher Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing at Eleventh Grade Students of SMK Dian Kirana 1 Sragen*, Surakarta: Universitas Muhamadiyah Surakarta.

Robb, T., S. Ross, and I. Shortreed. (1986).'Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality'. *T E S O L Quarterly* 20: 83-93.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching*, 133 – 134.

Sari, Mardhiyati Ambar, (2017), Students' Response of Teacher's Written Feedback on Their Writing, *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 10 (2), 2017, 291.

Siahaan, S. and K. Shinoda, (2008), *Generic Text Structure*, Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Sundem, G. (2006), *Improving Students Writing Skills*. Huntington Beach: Shell Education.

Supiani, (2017), Teaching Writing Skill Through Collaborative Writing Technique: From Theory to Practice, *JEELS*, Vol.1 No.1, 37-52.

Ur, P. (1996). A Course in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Utami, Uli Tri, (2012). *Improving Students' Writing Skill Through Teacher's Direct Feedback in SMAN 1 Jogonalan*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.

Weigle, S.C., (2002), *Assessing Writing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widiati, Utami. (2003). *Training EFL writing students in Indonesia in the use of strategies for peer response*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Monash University.

Yahya, M. Ubayu, Suhartono, (2016), The Use of Written Corrective Feedback to Improve the Tenth Grade Students' Writing Skill of Descriptive Text, *Journal of English Teaching and Research*, 46-58.