

BAB V

CONCLUSION

A. Conclusion

This study compared the WCF preferences of lecturers and students. It used a Likert-scale questionnaire to gauge the preference of feedback in four types: direct, indirect, focused and unfocused feedback. Lecturers chose direct feedback as their choice and the students have the same preference with the lecturers' choice. Students and lecturers preference were compatible. Lecturers rarely used indirect feedback in giving the students correction. Lecturers give indirect feedback only for high level students. It is hard to understand for low students to explore lecturers' indirect feedback. Therefore, Lecturers give different feedback in each student. Lecturers provide feedback based on the ability possessed by the students.

In contrast, students prefer unfocused feedback than focused feedback while the lecturers chose focused feedback in correcting the students' errors. Lecturers usually give feedback to the most complex error. Some lecturers let the students' error such as: misspelled, punctuation, mechanics, etc. Even, some lecturers only focused on surface error. Besides, students expect their lecturer to give more unfocused feedback in their writing. Indicating all the errors help the students easier revise their text. Students can focus on correcting the error that lecturers' marked

B. Suggestion

From the findings, some suggestions need to be pointed for the reader. As a student, understanding lecturers' feedback is not easy. Some students get problems in understanding it. This research helps the students knowing the lecturers choice in giving the feedback for the students. They can understand the feedback from the type of feedback that lecturers used. Meanwhile, lecturers can provide the appropriate feedback based on the students' preference as found in this research.

For further researcher, this study is limited to the preference of 5 lecturers and 55 students at State Islamic Institute (IAIN) of Kediri. It might be extended to include a larger number of lecturers and students in different institute. The study is also limited to elicit the CF types used in response to writing. The next researcher might use all the types of WCF in identification the lecturers and students' preference. In addition, this study only used a questionnaire in collecting the data. Interview or direct observation can be used to investigate the lecturers and students' preference in detail. Lecturers' feedback is still difficult to understand for the students. Misunderstanding usually happens between the lecturers' perception and students' understanding. To find out the solution, a further study can be carried out about the effectiveness of lecturers' preference in WCF type.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed, Abdel Hamid. (2010). Students' Problems with Cohesion and Coherence in EFL Essay Writing in Egypt: Different Perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal (LICEJ)*. Vol. 1, No. 4, 211-221
- Aridah, aridah., et al. (2017) lecturer Practices and Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback and their Implication on Writing Instruction. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol. 7, No. 1, 112-124.
- Ary, Donald., Jacobs, Lucy Cheser., Sorensen, Chris., & Razavieh, Asghar. (2010) *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). Canada, Wadsworth.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193 – 214. <http://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Black, Douglas Aaron., Nanni, Alexander. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback: Preferences and Justification of Lecturers and Students in a Thai Context. *Journal of Language Studies*. Vol. 16, No. 3, 99-144
- Najmaddin, Shler M-A. (2010) *Teachers' and Students' Perceptions of Types of corrective feedback in writing*. (Thesis: Bilken University)
- Creswell, John W. (2012). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research.* (4th ed). United State of America
- Elam, Jesse R. (2016). Indirect and Direct Feedback in L2 Composition: Using Corrective Feedback (CF) in Japanese EFL. *Bulletin of Tokyo Denki University, Arts and Sciences*. No.14, 71-78
- Ellis, R. (2009). Typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*. Vol. 63, No. 2, 97-107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36, 353-371. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Ellis, Rod., ET AL. (2010). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *SSLA*. Vol. 28, 339–368
- Eslami, Elham. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*. Vol. 98, 445-452

- Evans, C., & Waring, M. (2011). Student lecturer assessment feedback preferences: The influence of cognitive styles and gender. *Learning and Individual Differences*. Vol. 21, No. 3, 271–280.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). Treatment of error in second language student writing (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.2173290>
- Klimova, Blanka. (2015). The Role of Feedback in EFL Classes. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science*. Vol. 199, 172-177
- Li, Haisan., He, Qingshun. (2017). Chinese Secondary EFL Learners' and lecturers' Preferences for Types of Written Corrective Feedback. *english Language Teaching*. Vol, 10, No. 3, 63-73
- Liskinasih, Ayu. (2016). Corrective Feedback in CLT-Adopted Classroom Interaction. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 1, No. 1, 60-69
- Najmaddin, Shler M-A. (2010). *Teachers' and students' perceptions of types of Corrective Feedback in Writing* (A Master's Thesis: Bilkent University)
- Nanda, Rizki Putri., et al. (2010). Students' Writing Errors in an EFL Classroom. *Consortium of Asia-Pacific(CAPEU)*. ISSN: 2527-8037
- Sari, Eny Maulita Purnama. (2015). *Interlingual Errors And Intralingual Errors Found In The English Narrative Text Written By Smp, Smk And University Students' In Lampung*
- Shipale, Saara S M., & Kangira, Jairos. (2017). Lecturers' and Students' Perceptions and Preference about ESL Corrective Feedback in Namibia: Towards an Intervention Model. *World Journal of English Language*. Vol. 1, 11-19.
- Siauw, Melina Febrianti. (2018). Oral Corrective Feedback in an Intermediate EFL Conversation Class. *Kata*. Vol. 18, No. 2, 63-70
- Tangkiengsirisin, supong., Karla, Rusma. (2016). Thai Students' Perceptions on the Direct Vs Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: A Thai University Context. *Arab English Journal (AWEJ)*. Vol. 7, No. 3, 161-176
- Tasdemir, Muhammad Saleh., & Arslan, Fadime Yalcin. (2018). Feedback Preference of EFL Learners with Respect to their Learning Styles. *Lecturer Education Development*. Vol.5, No. 1481560, 1-17.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17 (4), 292– 305. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003>

Utami, Tossi Ana Ari. (2014). *Improving the Ability in Writing Descriptive Texts through Brainstorming Technique for Grade VIII Students at SMPN 1 Piyungan*(Thesis: Yogyakarta State University).