

Corrective Feedback Towards Student's English Writing of Hospital Administration Students at Stikes Baptist Hospital Kediri

Yoyok Febrijanto

STIKES RS Baptis Kediri

Email: yoyokfeb@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objective was to describe the corrective feedback English writing of Hospital Administration students at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri using descriptive qualitative approach. The subjects was 9 students of second semester. Collecting data about corrective feedback used questionnaire and interview about students' response in terms of attitude. Analysis data based on three concurrent flows of activities: data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The result showed that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback in students' English writing by circling the students' errors and providing the correct answer in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and content. The data from questionnaire for students' attitude showed most of students agreed that the teacher should point out grammar errors. The students have positive responses by remembering their grammar mistakes and feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing. They answered that they will revise their writing if their errors are corrected by the teacher. It can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude to teacher's corrective feedback.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, students' attitude, and English writing

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, difficulty in English communicating is not only in speaking but also in writing. Students find a lot of difficulties in writing, there is a possibility to make errors, even a single one of errors. Therefore, giving correction is appeared as a part of producing a writing work. In fact, in learning, everyone needs a process and making errors is a part of language learning process. The results revealed that the errors most frequently made by the students were classified into 13 categories, namely noun, adverb, verb, adjective, verb form, preposition, article, spelling, concord, idiom, pronoun, passive voice, and word order. (Watcharapunyawong and Siriluck, 2013). Jenwitheesuk (2009) investigated the causes of L2 writing errors in third year college students' written works. The study revealed that their errors were mainly caused by a lack of syntactic knowledge. Rachmajanti and Sulisty (2008) state that writing itself is a process. This process consists of planning, drafting, editing (reflecting and revising), and finally writing a final version. Therefore, giving writing feedback on the student's draft is considered as one of sub processes in writing.

English skills of reading, listening, speaking and writing support Hospital Administration students to communicate with others when they are working in hospital.

They should be able to communicate well not only in oral but also in written because it is important for creating effective communication with health-workers and patients. The teacher's corrective feedback is hoped to give good effect for students' writing. Taran (2011) states that writing plays a key role in administration today. How effectively administrator is able to communicate through writing can have a major impact on the impression they make to other workers. Whether it is writing memos about patients, drafting emails to other healthcare providers, or creating papers and presentations for academic study and research, all administrators must have the ability to express themselves clearly, effectively, and professionally through their writing.

METHOD

The study used descriptive qualitative approach and the objective was to describe the corrective feedback English writing of Hospital Administration students at STIKES Baptist Hospital Kediri. The subjects was 9 students of second semester in academic 2022/2023. Collecting data about corrective feedback used questionnaire and interview about students' response on behavioral and affective aspects. Behavioral aspect is the students' action on the feedback. In this case the action is the students' revision after receiving corrective feedback from the teacher. Affective aspect, it means that the students' attitudinal response to teacher's corrective feedback in writing, the indicator of the students' attitudinal response is to know the students' tendency to respond favorably or unfavorably towards teacher's corrective feedback in writing. The questionnaire for students' response in the terms of action to teacher's corrective feedback consists of 7 description of actions, and then the sheet has been completed by 5 answers such as "never", "rarely", "sometimes", "usually", and "always" that can be chosen one by giving the mark (√) in the column. The questionnaire for students' response in the terms of attitude to teacher's corrective feedback consist of 23 questions in multiple choice that the students can choose one by giving mark (X) to the answer. Analysis data based on three concurrent flows of activities: data reduction, data display, and conclusion.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The research finding showed that the teacher's corrective feedback in the students' writing by circling the students' errors and providing the correct answer. It means that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback because he wrote the right answer directly on students' writing. The students' errors in writing were in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and content. The researcher did coding for teacher's direct corrective feedback in the form of providing correct answer by giving the sign of purple triangle and for the code for teacher's way to circle the error is by using green checklist. When the teacher wants to eliminate extra words in students' writing, he crossed out the extra words, coding for this case is brown square.

The teacher also gave comments and suggestions about the content, he gave comment and suggestion both in the middle and the end of the students' essay. The comments and suggestions such as "Spelling please!", "Capital letter please!", "Check your spelling!", "Do not use correction pen to much!", "Pay attention to your grammar, capitalization, spelling, and punctuation!", "It is better if you add...", "It is better if you

use your own words or, It is better if you make paraphrasing”, “Please make it clearer”, “Fragment!”, “Run on sentence!”, “Word order!”, “What does it mean?”. The researcher did coding for teacher’s direct corrective feedback in the form of comments and suggestions by giving the sign of yellow rectangle. The teacher gave appreciation to students’ writing by giving positive comments such as “Good picture!”, “Nice design!”, “Good job!”, “Very good!”, “Keep learning!”, “Keep writing more and more!”, “I do appreciate your writing...”, “You do correction well!”, “You have done good improvement!”, “You do it well!”. The researcher did coding for teacher’s direct corrective feedback in the form of positive comments by giving the sign of black rectangle. After the students received teacher’s corrective feedback, they did correction and made revision. The teacher gave the sign for the right revision so that the students feel motivated to do revision.

The data is also supported by taking from interview with teacher that he gave direct corrective feedback because by giving direct corrective feedback, they can directly know their errors, they can enrich their vocabulary, and they can revise their grammar error, and do self-correction so that they will collect the product of writing in excellent product. From the finding above, it can be concluded that giving correction and doing revising is important part in the process of writing to create good writing product. The research finding for the students’ response in terms of attitude to teacher’s corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of students have a greater tendency for believing that teachers must always correct their errors, whereas a few of students answered sometimes have this feeling. All of the students think that making errors in English is necessary to learn more, but most of the students are always worried of making errors when they write in English after receiving teacher’s corrective feedback, and a few of the students answered sometimes are worried and never worried. Most of students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing, and less than a half of students answered that they do not feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing.

Most of the students answered that making error in writing is negative, whereas a few of students answered that making error in writing is positive. The students prefer to receive direct corrective feedback because they will know the correct answer and do self-correction. From the findings above, it can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude to the teacher’s corrective feedback. The research finding for about the students’ response in terms of action to teacher’s corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of the students answered that they rewrite their work following their teacher’s grammar corrections or comments and give their rewriting back to the teacher. This data is supported by documents of students’ writing revision, it showed that all of the students had collected tasks 1 to 3 and revisions 1 to 3. The teacher needs to know how the students behavioral response towards teacher’s corrective feedback. It is important factor to know the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback and to know what the appropriate way to give corrective feedback.

DISCUSSION

From documentation instrument, it is got the result that the students’ errors in writing such as in grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, preposition, article and

content. It is also supported by data from interview with teacher, the teacher said that in writing skill, the errors that they are often made by students are grammar, spelling, and word order, punctuation, run on sentence, preposition and capitalization. It is in line with the theory of Watcharapunyawong and Siriluck (2013:68) stated that the results revealed that the errors most frequently made by the students were classified into 13 categories, namely noun, adverb, verb, adjective, verb form, preposition, article, spelling, concord, idiom, pronoun, passive voice, and word order. The causes of errors found were mainly from the interference of L1 in relation to the direct translation, the differences of syntactic properties between L1 and L2, and the transfer of L1 systems in L2 writing.

It is also in line with Ellis (2009) stated that direct feedback involves providing students with the correct form straightaway. This can be done by either crossing the wrong or unnecessary word out, inserting a missing word or writing the right form above or close to the wrong form. The research finding has similarity on students' errors in writing such as in grammar, spelling, and word order, punctuation, run on sentence, preposition and capitalization. The similarity also in the way how teacher gives direct corrective feedback that is by circling, crossing out the words and providing correct answer directly.

The way how teacher solves student's errors in writing is the teacher tries to eliminate the errors of students by training them to speak and write so that the students will be ready to work then. The way to eliminate the errors is by giving direct corrective feedback in the students' writing. It is also important to look the students' ability in writing to choose the proper way to give corrective feedback. The teacher and students perception about corrective feedback also will influence for choosing the type of corrective feedback in writing. It is in line with Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad (2012:230) stated that at a time when writing practices are more and more focused on improving students' writing skill, written corrective feedback is felt to be absolutely needed in teaching writing. It is in line with Diab (2006) stated that while it needs to do research about the effectiveness of corrective feedback on students' written errors, it is also important to look at teachers' and students' perceptions of corrective feedback. Teachers are believed to have responsibility for choosing the suitable way of providing such feedback. The research findings above have similarity on the important role of corrective feedback for improving students' writing. The similarity happens on the importance of teacher's perception and students' ability in writing in choosing proper way to give corrective feedback.

The research finding for the students' response in terms of attitude to teacher's corrective feedback in foreign language writing showed that most of students have a greater tendency for believing that teachers must always correct their errors. All of the students think that making errors in English is necessary to learn more, but most of the students are always worried of making errors when they write in English after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. It means that corrective feedback has an important role for students' writing. The students showed positive attitude that they hope their teacher always gives corrective feedback, most of them believe that making errors in writing needs to learn more. Most of students answered that grammar is the most important in an essay. Most of the students believe that correction on their writing task is useful. It

is in line Cohen and Calvanti (1990) explained that the positive attitude towards corrective feedback could be due to students' learning experiences, i.e. focus on grammar. Based on the research finding above, it has similarity on the students' positive attitude towards corrective feedback that they are motivated to learn more and they answered that grammar is the most important in an essay.

Most of students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing. Most of the students answered that making error in writing is negative, whereas a few of students answered that making error in writing is positive. The students prefer to receive direct corrective feedback because they will know the correct answer directly and do self-correction. The students' attitude is important for teacher to do process of teaching learning. From the students answer for questionnaire showed that they prefer the teacher who corrects their essays than the classmates or peer feedback and self-correction. The students answered that the teacher should point out grammar errors in the student essay. They also showed positive response when most of the students answered that they will revise their writing if their errors are corrected by the teacher and choose fo direct corrective feedback. From the findings above, it can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude to teacher's corrective feedback. It is in line with theory of Hyland (2003) states that knowing students' attitudes towards a new language can be very useful for language teachers. If the techniques used to correct errors do not meet students' preferences, subsequent negative attitudes may emerge. This is why teachers should take into consideration students' preferences for being corrected.

The research finding showed that most of the students always read their teacher's comment or correction on their grammar. A half of the students answered that they usually study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes, and a half of others always study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes.

Most of the students answered that they always rewrite their work following their teacher's grammar corrections or comments and give their rewriting back to him. Most of the students as many as 62.5% usually try to remember their grammar mistakes, as many as 29.2% students answer that they always try to remember my grammar mistakes and 8.3% students answered that they sometimes try to remember my grammar mistakes. It means that the students have positive response towards teacher's corrective feedback by remembering their grammar mistakes, it is supported by the data from questionnaire for students' attitude that showed most of students agreed that the teacher should point out grammar errors. Most of the students believe that correction on their writing task is useful. It is in line with theory of Hyland's case study (2003) revealed that students knew that receiving grammar corrections would not immediately improve their grammar, but they believed that getting such feedback continuously would be useful in the long run.

The students give positive responses to teacher's corrective feedback. It is no need to wait for a long time for the students to revise their tasks. The students directly give the revision of writing after the teacher gives corrective feedback. The students also do correction well. One of the writing process is doing correction. It is important for the

teacher to give time for his students to do revision. It is also in line with Brown (2004:335), they are: focus on the process of writing that leads to the final written

Products, help student writers to understand their own composing process, help them to build repertoires of strategies for prewriting, drafting, and rewriting, give students time to write and rewrite. Based on the research finding above, it has similarity on the importance of writing process. The students' response in terms of action is shown when the students' do revision and give their writing revision back to their teacher.

As many as 37.5% students answered on questionnaire that they usually ask their teacher about the grammar correction, and 62.5% students always ask their teacher about the grammatical correction, and then as many as 12.5% students sometimes ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction, and then 54.2% students usually ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction, and 33.3% students always ask her friend about the grammar comment or correction. It means that the students also do consultation to their teacher relates to their grammar correction. The students not only do discussion with the teacher but also they do discussion with their friends after receiving corrective feedback. The teacher needs to know how the students response towards teacher's corrective feedback. It is important factor to know the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback and to know what the appropriate way to give corrective feedback. The students' motivation in learning writing will influence their action in doing revision after receiving teacher's corrective feedback. It is in line with theory of Ellis (2009, 2010), Guenette (2007), and Leki who (1990) agreed that students' affective and behavioral responses to teacher feedback are critical to the effectiveness of such feedback. How students response to teachers' written corrective feedback is considered as an important factor in its efficacy.

CONCLUSION

The research finding about teacher's corrective feedback showed that the teacher gave direct corrective feedback in students' foreign language writing. Data from interview with teacher showed that the main problem when nurses work, they face difficulty in writing documentation, the nurses have to remember well all of the information relates with patient and records it in documentation. The teacher's corrective feedback was to eliminate the student's error in writing so that students can directly know their errors, they can enrich their vocabulary, revise their grammar error, and do self-correction and then they collect the product of writing in excellent product. From the finding above, it can be concluded that giving correction and doing revising is important part in the process of writing to create good writing product.

Most of students say that they feel more motivated to go on learning when the teacher corrects their error in writing. Most of the students answered that making error in writing is negative, whereas a few of students answered that making error in writing is positive. The students answered that the teacher should point out grammar errors in the student essay. They also showed positive response when most of the students answered that they will revise their writing if their errors are corrected by the teacher and choose for direct corrective feedback. From the findings above, it can be concluded that most of the students have positive attitude to teacher's corrective feedback.

The research finding showed that most of the students always read their teacher's comment or correction on their grammar. A half of the students answered that they usually study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes, and a half of others always study their grammar mistakes and correct their grammar mistakes. Most of the students answered that they always rewrite their work following their teacher's grammar corrections or comments and give their rewriting back to him. The students give positive response to teacher's corrective feedback. It is no need to wait for a long time for the students to do revision, the students directly give the revision of writing after the teacher gives corrective feedback. The students also do correction well. One of the writing process is doing correction. It is important for the teacher to give time for his students to do revision.

REFERENCE

- Allman, B., Sara F., Jeffrey O., Sally P., & Vicky S. 2000. *Skills for Successful Teaching*: McGraw-Hill Children's Publishing.
- Alwasilah, C. 2004. *Perspektif Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris di Indonesia dalam Konteks Persaingan Global*. Bandung :Andira
- Amrhein&Nassaji. 2010. Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why. *Journal of CJAL * RCLA*, 95.
- Anggraeni, W. 2012. *The Characteristics of Teacher's Feedback in The Speaking Activities of the Grade Nine Students of SMP N 2 Depok* (Master's Thesis, Yogyakarta State University: English Education Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts). Retrieved from <http://eprints.uny.ac.id/25678/1/Wahyu%20Anggraeni%2006202241034.pdf>
- Brown, H. M. 1978. *How to Write: A Practical Rhetoric*. Wichita Falls: Midwestern State University.
- Brown, D. 2000. *Teaching by Principles an Interactive*. San Fransisco: Longman
- Brown, D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc
- Cameron, L. 2001. *Teaching Languages to Young Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campillo, P. S. 2015. *EFL Students' Attitudes and Preferences towards Written Corrective Feedback*. Departament d'Estudis Anglesos: Universitat Jaume I
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. 1990. Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. Ed. B. Kroll, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 155-177.
- Cohen, R.F. & Miller, J.L. 2001. *Reason to Write: Strategies for Success in Academic Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diab, R. L. 2006. Error correction and feedback in the EFL writing classroom: Comparing instructor and student preferences. *English Teaching Forum*, 44(3), 2-13
- Dornyei, Z. 2001. *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Great Britain: (no city) St Edmundsbury Press. Ltd
- Ellis, R. 2009. *Analysing Learner Language*. New York: Oxford
- Enginarlar, H. 1993. Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System* 21,193-204.
- Ferris, D. R. 1995. Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly* 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. R. 1997. The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly* 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinki, S. 1997. Teacher commentary on student writing: descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6, 111-182.
- Ghandi, M. & Maghsoudi, M. 2014. The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Spelling Errors. *Journal of English Language Teaching*. Vol. 7: 53-61
- Hashemnezhad, H & Mohammadnejad, S. 2012. A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *Journal of English Language Teaching*. Vol.5: 230-239
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. 2006. Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101