

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discusses about some theories related to this research such as Perception, Perspectives on Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback, Types of Written Corrective Feedback:

#### A. Perception

Perspective and perception are different but, actually that is same things. According to Robert E. Slavin, perception is a person interpretation of stimuli. Perception of stimuli is not a straight forward as reception of stimuli, instead, it is determined by our mental state, past experience, knowledge, motivations, and many other elements.<sup>1</sup> Similar base on Leavitr, perception in the narrow sense is the vision, the way people perceive things. In a broader sense perception is the view or understanding that is the way people perceive something or interpret something.<sup>2</sup> So, people give perception according to they accept the something that their get from their own experince or from what they see and understand.

A main goal of perception is to reclaim, or estimate, objective properties of the physical universe.<sup>3</sup> Perception is much decided what is the best description of the universe, or the best action to consider, given (i.e., conditioned on) the current state of sensorial.<sup>4</sup> Additionally, perception is the process by which we organize and interpret our sensory impressions in order to give meaning to the environment. As pointed out, a situation may be the same but the interpretation of that situation by two individuals

---

<sup>1</sup> Robert E. Slavin, *Educational Psychology : Theory Into Practice* 8 Edition, (United States Of America : Pearson Education, 2006) 168

<sup>2</sup> Drs. Alex Sobur, *Psikologi Umum Edisi Revisi* (Bandung :Pustaka Setia 2016) 385

<sup>3</sup> Donald D. Hoffman, *The Influence Theory Of Perception* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 153.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 157

may be immensely different. People give perception based on what they can accept something they notice from the world they can see.

Perception is about the way people receive and perceived something that happen from noticing the object people might see. Although people see same event, everybody might have different perception, because people have different way to understand something.

## **B. Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback**

The function of written corrective feedback was debated for along time. It was appearance since Truscott publish an article, “The case against grammar correction in L2 classes” in 1996. In that article Truscott claim that error correction is necessarily ineffective and increase students’ anxiety.<sup>5</sup> Truscott’s statement that corrective feedback is ineffective relies on both practical and theoretical arguments. His practical doubts pertain to teachers’ capacities in providing decent and consistent feedback and to learners’ ability and willingness to use the feedback effectively. In some year followed he repeatedly published some article to presented objections of the use of corrective feedback. His major arguments are summarized as follows<sup>6</sup>:

1. Second language development involves complex learning processes rather than the simple process of passing information from teacher to student.
2. Related to the notion of complex learning processes, research has shown that in acquiring certain grammatical features, L2 learners follow a natural pre-determined acquisition order,
3. Not all learning is equal. Learning which does not affect learners’ underlying, developing system and which only results in a superficial,

---

<sup>5</sup> Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction In L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 269–327.

<sup>6</sup> Yuan-Yuan Meng, Written Corrective Feedback: A Review Of Studies Since Truscott (1996), *Tesolalwebjournal*, 69-84.

transient form of knowledge, is “pseudo-learning.” Pseudo- learning in means a superficial and possibly transient form of knowledge

4. From a practical perspective, grammar correction is unlikely to be successful as it requires that many other conditions be met.
5. The inherent unpleasantness of correction triggers much anxiety in students and discourages them from experimenting with the language
6. The time spent on providing and processing low-level grammar feedback diverts the attention of both teacher and student from other high-level aspects of writing such as organization and content.

Nevertheless, opposition to this theory was not quiet and strong contradiction came from Ferris. Ferris states that Truscott’s arguments were premature and weak given the rapidly growing research evidence that gives notice that effective error correction can and does help L2 student writers if the feedback is selective, prioritized, and unambiguous.<sup>7</sup> she also write some article maintain his argument such as *Preparing teachers to respond to student writing*. In this article, he writes some advice and approach to give some feedback and respond in students writing. Base on Ferris it is important to preparing future teachers to respond to second language.<sup>8</sup>

Ferris (2002) also suggests three implications for EFL teachers, that:<sup>9</sup>

1. They should not expect error free written production from the students
2. they should not expect accuracy improvement overnight

---

<sup>7</sup> Hussam Rajab, A Case Study of EFL Teachers’ Perceptions and Practices in Written Corrective Feedback, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2016. 119-131.

<sup>8</sup> Dana Ferris, Preparing teachers to respond to student writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2007. 165–193.

<sup>9</sup> Mitra Samiei Sarkhanlou, *The Effect Of Explicit Written Corrective Feedback On Implicit And Explicit Knowledge*, University Of Malaya Kuala Lumpur, 2016.

3. The English Foreign Language students differ from the native ones, need appropriate feedback or corrective feedback and need appropriate instruction.

The one implicit point of agreement in Truscott and Ferris articles was that the existing data are insufficient to resolve the question of whether error correction can be an effective way to improve the accuracy of L2 writing. Chandler also conducted a research about efficacy of various kinds of error.<sup>10</sup> The experimental group that corrected the grammatical and lexical errors marked by the teacher on each assignment before writing the next assignment with a control group that did not. And the result, underlining the error can increase accuracy in students writing. In other word, give error feedback in students writing is effective to use.

### **C. Types of Written Corrective Feedback**

There are many kind types of written corrective feedback. However, it is important to know it, because not only are there many types, but also there is ongoing debate about which type is the best and most effective to use. It should be noted that most research focuses on the individual aspects of each form and how students respond to it. Research seldom discusses the practicality of each and more importantly, which form instructors prefer and use.

According to Ellis has indicated a clear categorization of how teachers can correct linguistic errors in students' assignments. There are six types of written corrective feedback, namely, direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focused and unfocused, electronic, and reformulation.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Jean Chandler, The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing.

<sup>11</sup> Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology Of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *Elt Journal*, 63, 97-107.

## 1. Direct CF

Within direct feedback the teacher involves providing the student with the correct form. This can be done by crossing the wrong or unnecessary word, and then inserting a missing word or writing the right form above or close to the wrong form.

Based on Ellis direct CF has advantage that can provides learners with clearly information and guidance about how to correct their errors. It is the best technique for beginner or low level proficiency students that do not know what the correct form is. However, direct CF has a disadvantage, that is 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.

Example of direct written corrective feedback :

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

## 2. Indirect Feedback

In contrast to the previous type, indirect feedback consists of showing that there are Disputes an error, but without giving students the right form. Indirect feedback can take two forms: either locating the error or just suggesting the error without telling the learner its exact location. Similarly, Bitchener states that indirect feedback promotes reflection on existing knowledge or partially

internalized knowledge and “is more likely to foster deeper processing during the consolidation phase of the learning process”.<sup>12</sup>

Based on to Lalande, indirect feedback provides learners with the competence of problem solving and guided learning, fostering learners to reflect on their own mistakes. This is why it is preferable to direct feedback and, moreover, it is more likely to convey to long-term learning. However, beginner student that had low proficiency may not have enough linguistic knowledge to correct their errors even when they are pointed out.

Example of indirect written corrective feedback :

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

### 3. Metalinguistic Feedback

This type of feedback is given by proving a hint about the error, like its nature or an explanation of the grammar. The first case –telling the learner the nature of the error- matches the goal of using a correction code, although it is not exactly the same. Error codes are abbreviations used to label the nature of the error, such as grammar, vocabulary or spelling, among others. Then, students have to elaborate their own correction.

Similarly, metalinguistic information can be given in the form of explanations on the grammar related to the errors made. This is far less common, perhaps

---

<sup>12</sup> Bitchener, J. (2012). A Reflection On ‘The Language Learning Potential’ Of Written CF. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 21, 348-363.

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. This is less common than error codes. The explicit comment can take two forms:

- a. Use of error codes, i.e. abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin. e.g. art = article, prep = preposition, sp = spelling, ww = wrong word, t = tense, etc.
- b. Metalinguistic explanations of their errors, e.g. numbering errors and providing metalinguistic comments at the end of the text.

Example of metalinguistic written corrective feedback

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

#### 4. Focused and Unfocused Feedback

The focus of the feedback' is a category used by Ellis to refer to the teacher's correction of all- or most- errors (unfocused feedback) or to only one or two specific types of errors (focused feedback). Authors like Sheen et al. provide evidence on focused written feedback to enhance linguistic accuracy.

Bitchener explains that focused feedback is beneficial to students because it directs the learner's attention to only one or a few categories at one time.<sup>13</sup> In other words, having an entire paper marked with ink covering content, structure, organization, flow, punctuation, grammar, spelling, and punctuation can cause

---

<sup>13</sup> Bitchener, J. (2012). A Reflection On 'The Language Learning Potential' Of Written CF. *Journal Of Second Language Writing*, 21, 348-363.

confusion or lack of focus. Students frantically work to revise and correct all of these errors, regardless if they understand the reasoning behind them.

Ellis suggests that treating corrections is more complex in unfocused feedback since the learner needs to attend to many types of errors, being unable to focus much on each of them. Then, focused feedback is more effective in that the learner can review diverse corrections of one single error and get evidence to understand why what was written is wrong and to obtain the right form. However, he explains that an advantage of unfocused feedback is that it tackles a great variety of errors, so although it might not be as powerful in the acquisition of specific features as focused feedback in the short term, it is in the long run.

#### **5. Electronic Feedback**

This type of written feedback is a modern one since it includes the use of new technologies in both the teacher's correction and the student's expected subsequent response. This category, known as 'electronic feedback', consists of selecting the error and providing the learner with useful and appropriate online links with examples of correct usage.

Ellis reports on some advantages of electronic feedback. The first one is that the teacher is no longer the responsible for judging what is a correct form and what is not. He suggests that an approach based on usage would be more reliable since teachers' intuitions can be erroneous. Another advantage is that it promotes students' independence as they are in charge to choose the corrections which they consider best apply in the text.

#### **6. Reformulation**

This type of feedback involves the rewriting of the learner's text. Students are responsible for using such resources to correct their errors or not and for how to



do it. This technique is described by Cohen as a way “to preserve as many of the writer’s ideas as possible, while expressing them in his/her own words so as to make the piece sound native-like”. The learner’s text is reformulated and they have to identify the modifications that have been made.

Original version: As he was jogging, his tammy was shaken.

Reformulation: As he was jogging, his tummy was shaking.

Tummy shaking

Error Correction: As he was jogging his ~~tammy~~ was ~~shaked~~