

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of seven subchapters. They are: background of the research, statements of the problems, statements of the hypothesis, purposes of the research, significances of the research, scope and limitation, and definition of the key terms.

1.1 Background of the Research

Zhang, & Hyland (2018) stated that corrective feedback in second language writing has become a crucial issue to be researched (e.g. Tom, Morni, Metom, & Joe, 2013; Molloy, & Boud, 2013; Akter, 2016; Bo Wang, Timothy Teo & Shulin Yu, 2016). It included to a form of negative feedback that could be oral and written. Balachandran (2017) explained the differences between oral and written corrective feedback is that oral corrective feedback provides instruction in the classroom. While written corrective feedback (WCF) gives written responses after reviewing student writings task. A common reviewer to review student writing task is their own teacher, so it called teacher WCF. While giving teacher WCF, a teachers notice a number of errors that consisted of structure, content, overall argument, and lexical or grammatical mistakes by using different methods and strategies. By doing this, teachers help learners to be more capable writers by minimizing mistakes in and maximizing the intelligibility of their writing (Alhosani, 2008), it also develop the ability to self-edit among students (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). However, Iriarte, & Alastuey (2017) stated that most of teacher WCF consists of requirement sentences that burden student. Besides that, teacher need a lot of time to do teacher WCF. The time for learning process in the class is wasted only to do it. Furthermore, this teacher WCF still does not influence students' revisions in their writing.

By showing the weakness of teacher WCF, Ferris (1999) offered the practice of peer WCF to improve students writing ability. Peer WCF is one of corrective feedback type that give the opportunity to student to provides a proper

feedback for other student. Many researches show the efficiency of peer feedback (e.g. Jahin, 2012; Maarof, Yamat & Li, 2011). Those studies showed the success of peer feedback to increase students writing ability and reducing learners' anxiety. It also results students' positive attitude toward peer response and self-confidence (Tang, 1999). It because most of peer WCF consist of suggestion, not requirement such is found in teacher WCF. Besides that, Yang (2006) indicated that the effect of peer feedback could offer as a solution to lack of teacher WCF due to time constraints, so it would be helpful for teacher to give students corrective feedback in order to increase their writing ability. He added that it would encourage student autonomy and could be useful adjunct to teacher WCF. However, Sato and Lyster (2012) identified the weakness of peer feedback. First, learners often avoid the negotiation and only focus on the completion of task. Second, their feedback is usually made up of simple divisions of their partner's erroneous utterances. This is not a quality of feedback because it lacks of corrective force. Last, learner's perceptions of others learner may disturb the effectiveness of peers interaction.

Those weaknesses of both WCF can be reduced by considering the individual differences among students. Sheen (2011) mentioned individual differences in WCF included student anxiety and aptitude. The first is student anxiety. It is related to fear and anxiety of WCF content, whether consists of good comment or not. In this case, teacher word choice, method of delivery, and subjectivity in WCF influence student anxiety. Word choice is included the choice of verb, and words in WCF. A lot of requirement sentence that is chosen in WCF make student fell weighed down, it will get different result with the use of suggestion sentence.

Philip (2017) added that the error comment by reviewer whether coming from their teacher or peer in WCF will create bad practice. Next is method of delivery. It is included how the comment or erroneous and justification is delivered. Zhan (2016) explained that in the case of teacher WCF, teacher comment delivery does not clear enough for student. Students feel they need more specific, detailed and clear feedback than the teacher provides. While, subjectivity

point in WCF includes the use of first and third person. Ivanić *et al.* (2000) described that phrasing comments in the first person make evaluations more subjective, while comments that directly address the student writer using 'you' may leave them feeling judged.

The second is aptitude aspect. In the class, there are many types of student (e.g. a clever student, struggling student, and reluctant student). These various types of student need to be considered. They may have a different choice to decide what type of WCF in writing learning that proper for them. In some cases, students may choose same or various types of methods. But they want to be treated differently (Brookhart, 2008). Clever student will get an easy understanding to respond every comment from their teacher and peer, while struggling and reluctant student will confuse with unclear comment given by their teacher and peer. They need such clear method of delivery.

In the case of peer WCF, Tsui (2000) explained that different characteristic among students made different perception on peer WCF practice. The reluctant and struggling student might feel shy for getting a bad comment from their clever peer. Then the clever student would not believe on the correction result by their struggling and reluctant peer. While in the other side, student with strong influence and pressure that dominate on the peer group made other student also unpleasant to had peer WCF, it was added by the rebellion by several student that against teacher's rules that made other student uncomfortable and did not really believe on the effectiveness of peer WCF practice.

Regarding the explanation above, student has their own perception of both teacher and peer WCF. It is important to consider their perception of WCF since it has the impact to student psychology. Student anxiety coming from teacher or peer word choice, method of delivery, and subjectivity will make student get confuse, doubt or even afraid to write an essay. The inappropriate WCF also make difficult to know writing progress from each type of student (a clever, struggling, and reluctant student). So that, to know the students perception of both WCF, student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF need to be done.

Self-evaluative judgment is a key self-regulatory process that involves setting and using standards to judge the quality of one's performance (Ramdass & Zimmerman, 2008). In learning process, self-evaluative judgment has a big role to determine the appropriate method or strategy used for students. It would motivate them to get a better score in their lesson. Such study conducted by Gupta, and Woldemariam (2011), they explored the influence of affective factor which was attitude and motivation on the writing strategies or method used by undergraduate EFL students. It found that the student who had a high motivation used more writing strategies or method and had higher ability than students who were less motivated. The motivation of using more writing methods could be caused of the student self-evaluative judgment of those given method. Students felt appropriate and suitable with those given methods. Student self-evaluative judgment depended on the individual differences; learners who receive any method in writing learning might accept or ignore it. By knowing student self-evaluative judgment of both teacher and peer WCF, teacher will know the appropriate WCF for their student.

However, the study of student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF still limited. Tsao (2017) investigated the effect of the anxiety of writing and motivation on EFL collage student's self-evaluative judgment of corrective feedback. This research showed that intrinsic motivation and different types of writing anxiety (fear of writing test, anxiety about making mistakes, fear of negative evaluation, and low confidence in English writing) predicted English as foreign language learners' evaluative judgments of corrective feedback. Besides Tsao, Irwin (2017) also investigated about student preferences and teacher practices on written corrective feedback. His study showed that most of the student participants want to be given written comments in English on their writing, the teacher also should give error corrections and grades (scores) on it. The rest student only want to get written comments in English and grades (scores). Furthermore, the study results clearly indicate that the students in the class did not have the same belief as their teacher.

Based from the previous studies, it can be inferred that teacher and student has their own belief on WCF. The success of WCF cannot be inferred only from teacher side, but also need an evaluation from student. Therefore, this current study is important to be conducted. This study describes student self-evaluative judgment of both teacher and peer WCF, correlates student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF and students writing ability, and compares both student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF. By knowing student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF, the teacher can take into consideration what method will be applied in teaching writing. Correlating student self-evaluative judgment of teacher, peer WCF and students writing ability will give information about the relationship of both aspect, and make a prediction based on those relationships. Then, comparing both student self-evaluative judgment of teacher and peer WCF is to analyze similarity and difference of both aspect. Thus, it will give comprehension to both writing methods that has been done. In the other word, this current study is important to be conducted because it will help student to have the good opportunity to evaluate the use of WCF they've had, this evaluation will make student writing ability better.

1.2 Statements of the Problem

Five research questions are explored in this study:

1. How is a student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback?
2. How is a student self-evaluative judgment of peer written corrective feedback?
3. Is there any significant correlation between student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback and students writing ability?
4. Is there any significant correlation between student self-evaluative judgment of peer written corrective feedback and students writing ability?
5. Is there any significant difference between student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback and student self-evaluative judgment of peer written corrective feedback?

1.3 Statements of the Hypothesis

Ha1: There is significant correlation of student self-evaluative judgments of teacher written corrective feedback and students writing ability.

Ha2: There is significant correlation of student self-evaluative judgments of peer written corrective feedback and students writing ability.

Ha3: There is significant difference between student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback and peer self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback.

Ho1: There is no correlation between student self-evaluative judgments of teacher written corrective feedback and students writing ability.

Ho2: There is no correlation between student self-evaluative judgments of peer written corrective feedback and students writing ability.

Ho3: There is no significant difference between student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback and peer self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback.

1.4 Purposes of the Research

Based on the research problem, there are five purposes of the research which will be accomplished. The purpose of the research can be formulated as follows:

1. To explain student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback.
2. To explain student self-evaluative judgment of peer written corrective feedback.
3. To explain the correlation between student self-evaluative judgments of teacher written corrective feedback and students writing ability.
4. To explain the correlation between student self-evaluative judgments of peer written corrective feedback and students writing ability.
5. To explain the difference between student self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback and peer self-evaluative judgment of teacher written corrective feedback.

1.5 Significances of the Research

1. The result of this study is expected to be useful for the English teachers and L2 learners in giving solution of writing problems during learning process.
2. For teachers, the result of this study can be applied as proper method in teaching writing to improve student's writing ability.
3. For students, it can also be used to evaluate writing method they have had. So, they will understand what type of corrective feedback that suitable for them in order to improve their writing ability.

1.6 Scope and Limitation

This study focuses on investigating and comparing the student self-evaluative judgments of peer WCF and student self-evaluative judgments of teacher WCF and finding its correlation with students writing ability in MTs. Muhammadiyah 10 Gresik. Survey, correlation, and comparative design were used in this study. The data was collected by using 5-point likert-scale questionnaires. Then, the whole participant has learned English as foreign language for about 3 years and has been received teacher and peer WCF from their English teacher.

1.7 Definition of the Key Terms

1. SELF-EVALUATIVE JUDGMENTS: Ramdass & Zimmerman (2008) defined self-evaluative judgment is a key self-regulatory process that involves setting and using standards to judge the quality of one's performance.

2. TEACHER WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: The identification and correction given by teacher on student's erroneous of grammar, syntax, and lexis on student writing. Errors in L2 writing can be referred to the learner whose writing deviates from expectation, rules, and norms of the target language (TL) (Pearson, 2018)

3. PEER WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: The identification and correction given by learners to their peer about grammar, syntax, and lexis on their writing, and then learn and discuss their judgments with their peers to achieve an outcome from negotiated agreed (Topping, K.J. 2017)

