

## The effect of teacher written feedback towards students 'writing outcomes at first grade of SMA N 1 Natar

Khairun Nisa<sup>1</sup>, Feni Munifatullah<sup>2</sup>, Burhanuddin<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Sumantri Brojonegoro,

[nisahalin@gmail.com](mailto:nisahalin@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The current study investigated the effect of teacher written feedback towards students 'writing outcomes in recount text. The study was a quantitative research which utilized *one group pretest-posttest* design. 20 first-year students of SMA N 1 Natar were selected to be the experimental group of this research. The data was analyzed by using repeated measure t-test with the significance level  $p < 0.05$ . The findings revealed a growth in students 'writing outcomes after being given the treatment. The students 'mean score of the pre-test was 61.7 while the post-test pointed out at score 81.6. It showed that there was a significant difference between the students 'writing outcomes before and after the teacher written feedback was given with significant level 0.05. Moreover, grammar or language use was the aspect of writing that improves the most among the other aspects. In sum, it can be inferred that teacher written feedback can be used to help the students 'improve their writing outcomes.

**Keywords:** *Teacher written feedback, recount text, writing outcomes*

### I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of productive skills in language learning process. It is the process of conveying thoughts, ideas or any information in a written form. According to Nunan (2003) writing is the way of thinking to create (invent) some ideas, express the sentence into a good writing, and arrange those ideas into statements and paragraph clearly. Among the four language skills, writing is considered to be the most difficult skill to acquire (Javed et al., 2013). Bryne (2007) also states that writing is believed as the most difficult skills to be learnt since it is a productive skill in language learning. This is due to the process of writing that require several processes and adequate of linguistic knowledge to make it done. Whereas, the ultimate purpose in language education is to enable learners to understand and use the target language effectively both spoken and written language (Azman and Shin, 2012). Target language is a language that someone is learning, or a language into which a text has to be translated. Therefore, the students are expected to be able to apply target language as main goal of language learning.

In Indonesia, communicating ideas in a piece of writing seems to be very challenging for Senior High School students (Faroha et al., 2016). Recount text is one of text that Indonesian students

learn while in junior and senior high school. Even though students has become familiar with recount text, still they often get difficulty to produce they own story of recount text.

This happened because the process of teaching and learning of writing in recount text were not going appropriate in the class. Iswandari (2016) states that EFL students mostly learn English writing only in the classrooms, this can be indicated that students do not really give attention more of writing while outside of the classroom. Moreover, sometimes the teachers also do not quite aware of students 'mistakes in writing. This happen continuously in long-term process of teaching and learning writing. Another factor that restricts students in producing a better composition is the students 'knowledge of writing itself. Fareed et al., (2016) say that students face several issues during writing, and these issues generally arise from incompetence in syntax, coherence, idea expansion, content selection, topic sentence, rhetorical conventions, mechanics, organization, lack of vocabulary and inappropriate use of vocabulary and these several factors may be hampered the students to write a better composition. Furthermore, limited language knowledge and inadequate linguistic knowledge are often claimed to be the major reasons why writing in English is always problematic (Silva, 1993).

Since the teacher has responsibilities to make students success in achieving the learning goals particularly in writing, providing students with the right feedback could be a way to help it happen. Richards and Schmidt (2010) as cited in Hakimi (2020) defines feedback as "comments or other information that learners receive concerning their success on learning tasks or tests, either from the teacher or other persons". There are three types of feedback in writing; peer feedback, conferences and written comment (Keh, 1990). Written comment is the feedback provided by the teacher to communicate the error or mistake to the students in written form.

According to Hyland and Hyland (2001), written comment can be categorized into praise, criticism and suggestion. In a writing class in particular, the most frequently used form feedback is teacher written corrective feedback (Isnawati et al., 2019). Such feedback is also shown to significantly contribute to students 'writing development (Bitchener, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ellis et al., 2008 as cited in Isnawati et al., 2019) in which one of its advantages is improving the students 'accuracy in writing. Through feedback, the writer may learn the reader's confusion caused by the writer's insufficient information, illogical organization, poor development of ideas, or even inaccurate usage and choice of words and tense (Wen 2013). Those several issues may lead the students to make revision and produce a better writing text.

Referring to the previous study, Bijami et al., (2016) who attempted to investigate the impact of teacher's written feedback on student's writing performance of Iranian undergraduates in sociocultural perspective. Mixed methods research design was adopted on their study. The result showed a significant relationship between teacher's written feedback and students 'writing performance. They state that the finding is valuable because it shows that teacher can be a fundamental source in improving students 'writing. Thus, the following study attempts to observe the effect of teacher written feedback towards students 'students writing outcomes.

### 1.1 Formulation of the Problem

Relating to the background of the study above, the researcher formulates the problems as followed:

1. Is there any significant difference in students' outcomes on writing test before and after the teacher feedback is given?
2. What aspect of writing that improves the most after the treatment is given?

## II. METHODS

The study was a quantitative research which utilized one group pretest-posttest design. The population for this research was the students at the first grade of SMAN 1 Natar and the sample was 20 first-year students from class XIPS-3. The data were collected by using tests (pre-test and post-test), pre-test was administered directly in the class; while treatment and post-test was conducted by online through Whatsapp platform. The improvement of students' test results were analyzed by using repeated measured T-Test to find out whether there was any significant difference of students' writing outcomes after the implementation of teacher written feedback.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After conducting the research, the researcher gathers the result of the pre-test and post-test as follow:

### Result

**Table 1. The Students' Mean Score in Pre-test and Post-test**

	<b>N</b>	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>Pre-test Valid N (listwise)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>61,7</b>	<b>8.39235</b>
<b>Post-test Valid N (listwise)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>81,6</b>	<b>4.27231</b>

The table above shows the students' minimum score of pre-test is 47 and the maximum score is 75 with mean of the total score points out at 61,7. Likewise, students' minimum score of post-test is 75 and the maximum score of post-test is 92 with mean of the total score is 81,6. Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference on students' writing outcomes after the treatment is given.

**Table2. ResultofPairedSampleT-test**

	Paired Differences					t	d f	Sig. (2- tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Paired Sample T-Test 1	19.9000	4.56416	1.02058	17.76391	22.03609	19.499	19	.000

From the data above, the t-value of the test is 19.499 with *degree of freedom/df* is 19. Whereas, the data significant based on the t-table points out at 2093. Hence, it can be inferred that the t-value is higher than the t-table ( $19.499 > 2093$ ) with the significant level is 5% or 0.05.

Therefore, there is a significant difference on students 'writing outcomes before and after the treatment.

As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis ( $H_1$ : there is a significant difference on students 'writing outcomes after being given the teacher written feedback) is accepted. The table also reveals the increase of the outcomes is 19.90. Accordingly, there is an improvement on students 'writing outcomes after being given the teacher written feedback.

### 3.1 Aspect of Writing Improves the Most after the Treatment Is Given

The researcher also wants to reveal what aspect of writing that improves the most after being given the teacher written feedback. The researcher evolves the following table which will explain the result of students 'writing outcomes in each aspect.

**Table 3. Result of Students 'Writing Outcomes in Each Aspect**

<b>Aspect of Writing</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Mean of Pre-test</b>	<b>Mean of Post-test</b>	<b>Gain</b>	<b>The Increase</b>	<b>Sig (2 - tailed)</b>
Content	30%	15.67	20.32	4.65	23.36%	0.00
Organization	20%	14.57	19.17	4.60	23.11%	0.00
Vocabulary	20%	14.15	19	4.85	24.37%	0.00
Grammar	25%	14.67	19.55	4.87	24.47%	0.00
Mechanic	5%	2.62	3.55	0.9	4.52%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>61.70</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>19.90</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>

The table reveals the score of each aspect. That is mean of pre-test and post-test, the gain and the increase after the treatment and also the significant of this data and each will be explained as follows:

### **1. Content**

The first aspect is content. It is own 30% of the whole aspects. The total mean score of students ' pre-test is 15.67 and the post-test is 20.32 with the gain of 4.65 or 23.36% of the increase and significant level is 0.00.

### **2. Organization**

Organization has 20% of the aspect. 14.57 is the mean of total score pre-test and 19.17 for the post-test, with the gain of 4.60 and 23.11% of the increase and significant level is 0.00.

### **3. Vocabulary**

Likewise organization, vocabulary owns 20% of the aspect. The mean from the total score of the pre-test is 14.15 and the post-test is 19, its gain is 4.85 and 24.37% of the increase and significant level is 0.00.

### **4. Language Use**

Language use or grammar is the next aspect. It has 25% of the aspect. 14.67 is the mean of the total score of pre-test and the post-test is 19.55 with the gain of 4.87 and 24.47% of the increase and significant level is 0.00.

### **5. Mechanic**

The last aspect is mechanic, owns 5% of the aspect. The mean from the total score of pre-test is 2.62 and the post-test is 3.55 with the gain is approximately 0.9 and 4.52% of the increase and significant level is 0.00.

The total score of all aspect of the pre-pest is 61.70 and 81.60 for the post-test, the total of gain is 19.90 and the significant level of all aspect is 0.00 or significantly increased.

Ultimately, language use or grammar is regarded as the aspect that improves the most after the treatment is given.

## **Discussions**

Relating to the research questions of this research, the researcher would like to find out whether there is a significant difference on students' writing outcomes before and after being given the teacher written feedback and what aspect of writing that improves the most after the treatment is given.

How does teacher written feedback affect students' writing outcomes? As the researcher observed, in the first meeting or before the treatment was performed, the researcher found several problems on students' compositions. Many of them got difficulties when they tried to elaborate their ideas they want to write and evolve it as a piece of complete story. These things affected the result of they work. The story that they write had not good development in content and organization; even it was only a simple story they could not develop it clearly. Similarly, the words they put were very simply vocabulary and mostly used wrong language use or grammar; simple present tense appeared very often in their story. Also, the mechanic they used was mostly wrong; they did not use capital letter rightly, placed a confusing comma and so forth.

Before conducting the treatment, the researcher explained about recount text and gave a brief explanation of teacher written feedback. These instructions made students became more aware how to write recount text appropriately. Furthermore, the researcher provided them with teacher written feedback by giving comments; started with praising students' effort in writing their compositions, after that giving them some critics if their text seems unclear, then, providing them with suggestions that they have to evaluate later. Subsequently, the researcher also corrected their works by circling or marking the error or mistake of their writing. These feedbacks bring a positive impact on their revision. It because they felt more easily to find their mistakes since the researcher provided them with feedback and pinpointed their strengths and weaknesses. As a result, they learned the feedback and attempted to evaluate it later.

Subsequently, among five aspects of writing, language use appeared to be the most aspect that students revised. Before administering the treatment, students often used simple present tense and applied it repeatedly or sometimes they used Indonesian language. It became researcher's concern how to make students able to fix it also the others aspects though. Thus, the researcher mostly gave comments about their mistake in using the wrong tense. As a result, they became more aware to use the right tense while writing recount text. Meanwhile, mechanic became the aspect that most of students did not repair it. Although the researcher had explained clearly how to use and put the right punctuation and capital letter, still they placed wrong comma and full stop also put

the wrong capital letter in sentence. However several students used punctuation correctly on their text.

After analyzing and comparing students' score of pre-test and post-test, it was found that there is a significant difference on students' writing outcomes after being given the treatment. Ultimately, it can be assumed that teacher written feedback could be a technique for teacher to help students evolve their writing abilities. It may happen for several reasons, such as students presume that teacher can reveal their mistake and help them to make a revision. Nelson and Murphy (1993) stated that ESL students viewed teacher as the knowledge authority. Teachers were considered the only legitimate source of feedback (Babaii et al., 2019).

This study also approves with the previous study, Bijami et al., (2016), Ismail et al., (2008), Razali and Jupri (2014), Faroha et al., (2016) who purport that teacher written feedback encourages students' revision and helps students in improving their writings. According to Ismail et al., (2008) giving feedback is essential in order to help students improve their writing piece. Teacher written feedback on the students' writing indicates the problems and provides a good suggestion for improvement of future writing task, moreover, via feedback the teacher can help students to compare their writing with the ideal draft and recognize their own strength and weaknesses (Srichanyachon, 2012).

Chandler (2003) also provided the result of his study that demonstrated the accuracy of students writing improves significantly after given teacher's direct feedback. He also added that teacher's direct feedback is best for producing accurate revisions. In addition, Razali and Jupri (2014) said that teacher written feedback does lead to revision the final drafts on students' papers. Hyland (2003) said that many students see their teacher's feedback as crucial to the students' improvement as a writer. Students will easily reveal what they do not understand and become more legible to learn effectively (OCED, 2005 cited in Umar 2018). Through effective questioning and careful observation, the teacher can assess the students' understanding and can move them forward in their learning Umar (2018). He also added that students can only achieve a learning goal if they understand that goal and can assess what they need to do to achieve it.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

##### **Conclusions**

The results of data analysis presented currently lead to the following points of conclusion. There is a significant difference of students' writing outcomes after being given the treatment. It is found that the implementation of teacher written feedback can help students improve their writing result. Furthermore, language aspect appears to be the aspect that students improve the most after the treatment is given. Teacher written feedback helps students to analyze their mistake particularly in the use of grammar and it makes them to be more thorough to use the right grammar whenever they write they story. In sum, teaching writing by using teacher written feedback is helpful for both students and teacher. Teacher written feedback makes students able to evaluate their mistake

and error while writing and help them to revise it. For the teacher, teacher written feedback could assist them to make students achieve the learning goals. Since EFL students, particularly in Indonesian context still has low capability in developing their skill in writing, teacher written feedback can be a technique for the teachers to help students evolve their writing skill.

### **Suggestions**

In sum, the findings in the current study suggest some consideration for the future research in accordance with this topic of problem that the teacher written feedback is not appropriate to be used in the low level class of Indonesian EFL learners and applying teacher written feedback through online is not quite effective to gain the data since it takes much time to collect the data of this current study.

The researcher also suggests for the further research to search for more types of feedback to enrich the variety of feedback forms, and provide more time to teach and give the feedback to the students, so the students will more understand the problem of their writing and help them to make revision and produce a better composition.

### **REFERENCES**

- Azman, N., & Shin, L. K. (2012). Problem-based learning in English for a second language classroom: Students perspectives. *International Journal of Learning*, 18 (6), 110-126
- Babaii, E., & Adeh, A. (2019). One, two, ... , many: The outcomes of paired peer assessment, group peer assessment, and teacher assessment in EFL writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16 (1), 53-66
- Bijami, M., Pandian, A. & Singh, M. K. M. (2016). The relationship between teacher's written feedback and student's' writing performance: Sociocultural perspective. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 4 (1), 59-66
- Bryne, D. (2007). *Teaching Writing Skill*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- 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
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4 (2): 1, 81-92
- Faroha, D. N., Muslem, A., & Fajrina, D. (2016). Teacher's feedback on students' writing. *Research in English and Education (READ)*, 1 (1), 34-43
- Hakimi, M. (2020). Teacher written feedback in EFL classroom: Abu hayyan al-Tawhidi high school- Kenitra, Morocco- as a case study. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research*, 8 (7), 226-248
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10 (3), 185-212
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ismail, N., Maulan, S. & Hasan, N. H. (2008). The impact of teacher feedback on ESL students' writing performance. *Academic Journal of Social Studies*, 8 (1), 45-54



- Isnawati, I., Sulisty, G. H., Widiawati, U. & Suryati, N. (2019). Impacts of teacher-written corrective feedback with teacher-student conference on students' revision. *International Journal of Instruction*. 12 (1), 669-684
- Iswandari, Y. A. (2016). Written corrective feedback in writing class: Students' preferences and types of errors. *Jurnal Penelitian*. 1-9.
- Javed, M., Juan, W. X., & Nazli, S. (2013). A study of students' assessment in writing skills of the English language. *International Journal of Instruction*. 6 (2), 130-144
- Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*. 4 (44), 294-304
- Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response group: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*. 27 (1), 135-141. doi: 10.2307/3586965.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *No title practical English language teaching*. Singapore: Mc Graw Hill.
- Razali, R., & Jupri, R. (2014). Exploring teacher written feedback and student revisions on ESL students' writing. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*. 19 (5), 63-70
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*. 46 (2), 327-369
- Srichanyachon, N. (2012). Teacher written feedback for L2 learners' writing development. *Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts*. 12 (1), 7-17
- Umar, A. M. (2018). The impact of assessment for learning on students' achievement in English for specific purposes: A case study of pre-medical students at Khartoum University: Sudan . *English Language Teaching*. 11 (2), 15-25
- Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher written feedback on L2 student writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 4 (2), 427-431