CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter covers research background, identification of the problem, limitation of the problem, problem statement, research objective and the significances of the study.

1.1   Research Background

Writing is not an easy activity that can be simply done by the students (Shujairi, 2017). It is because writing is an activity that required the students to be able to express and share their ideas, knowledge, feeling and information into written form (Sepyanda, 2013, p. 96). Sahbaz and Duran (2011) states writing does not only use for expressing ideas, feeling, plans, views, opinion but also make us communicate with other. It means that besides the function of expressing idea, writing also has another function which is for communicating. Considering that thing, writer has to write a good writing in order to make reader easier to understand what the writer wants to say. Besides that, Phuket & Othman (2015, p. 100) states that a good writing requires a text with complexity of syntax and morphology, a wide range of vocabulary, and a good command over conventional forms and over the means of signaling the relation of the texts (Phuket & Othman, 2015). It causes the EFL learners often find that writing is a difficult task.

Writing is also known as a process. According to Trizia et al. (2016, p. 11) writing is a process to transform the ideas into words and it also pay attention about stucture and coherent of the ideas. The ideas are formed into sentences which are arranged in a good way and each sentence will be connected to each other so that the information can be easier to be understood (Novia, 2015). Meisuri and Wahyuni (2016) state that writing is a process where the writer have to share about what they think in their mind and write it on a paper by using the correct procedure. Based on Pangaribuan and Manik (2018, p. 165), writing is a process to get product in which during the process the writers have to follow some writing stages. Moreover, Oshima and Hogue (2007, p. 15) state that writing is not a one-step action, but it is an ongoing creative act. It means that when we first write something, we have already been thinking about what to say and how to say it. Then after we have finished writing, we read over what we have written and make changes and corrections. We write and revise and write and revise again until weare satisfied that our writing expresses exactly what we want to say (Oshima & Hogue, 2007, p. 15).

Regarding to the idea state by Oshima and Hogue (2007, p. 15), writing is not a one-step action, but it is an ongoing act or process. Oshima and Hogue (2007, p. 15) proposed five stages of writing that have to be followed by writers in order to be able to produce a good writing. Those are pre-writing, organizing (outlining), writing, revising and editing. First, pre-writing is a step where writers choose a topic. It also includes brainstorming, gathering information, and thinking, planning, and listing. The purpose of brainstorming is to explain and develop the topic. Second, organizing (outlining) is the step where the writers

organize idea into a simple outline. Third, writing is the step where the writers write rough draft using the outline as the guidance. Fourth, revising refers to the process of finding out and marking the errors or mistakes in our writing. Last, editing is a process of correcting our writing based on the comments, suggestion, or questions given in revising stage. Considering the revising and editing stages, students have to make sure that they know what is wrong and what is right in their writing. Teachers need to do their best to help students to achieve good results of their writing. One of the technique that can be use is by using feedback that is appropriate to help the students in writing.

Teacher feedback is the most common feedback given to the students (Guascha et al., 2013). Gielent et al. (2010) as cite in Guascha et al. (2013, p. 326) states that teacher feedback is more complex than peer feedback and interpreted as more reliable and effective feedback by students. It is because teacher feedback acquires special significance for the students considering teacher's expert status (Guascha et al., 2013). The use of teacher feedback is expected to assist students in producing written text which contains minimum errors and maximum clarity (Leng, 2014, p. 390). According to Leng et al. (2014, p. 390), the purpose of providing teacher feedback is to enable students to read and understand the problems or errors in their writing and use it to improve their future writing.

Furthermore, there are some types of teacher feedback that can be given to the students' writing. One of them is Written Corrective Feedback (WCF). WCF is defined as written implicit or explicit error correction, words of praise, comments, and advice that encourage students to make changes to the result of their writing (Irwin, 2017). Ellis (2009) proposed that there are five basic strategy

for providing written corrective feedback namely; 1) Direct Corrective Feedback, 2) Indirect Corrective Feedback, 3) Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback, 4) Focus versus unfocused Corrective Feedback, and 5) Electronic Feedback. Direct CF provides the correct form of students' errors while indirect CF provides students with indiction that they have made errors without giving th correct form. Underlining the words can be used as the way of giving indirect CF. Metalinguistic CF provides learners with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors they have made. Focused CF provides correction for specific error such as verbs or adjective. Meanwhile, unfocused CF happens when teacher choose variety of errors to be corrected such as preposition, verb, articles, and etc. Electronic Feedback provide a brief comment on each error andwith links to resources showing the correct form by using software program.

Regarding to the stages of writing, there is a stage where students have revise and edit their writing. In this case, teachers might help students to achieve good results of their writing. One of the strategies that can be used is by using feedback that is appropriate to help the students in writing. Guascha et al. (2013, p. 326) state that feedback is dialogic interaction. Feedback can also be defined extensive comments, question, praise, or suggestion on students' texts or speech to provide a reader or listener response to students' efforts and at the same time helping them improve and learn (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Regarding to those explanation, it can be conclude that feedback is a kind of interaction between writer and reader. In this case, the interaction can be in form of giving comments, questions, praise or suggestions to the recipient that is expected can make the recipient reflect on it, learn from it, and hopefully make change for the better.

The purpose of English subject in Junior High School is in functional level which means that the students are able to communicate using English in written and oral language. So, in this study the focus was on the writing itself. Students were taught how to write a good writing by giving different kinds of feedback. Based on pre-observation, it was found that SMP Negeri 2 Bangli used curriculum 2013. Based on Minister of Education and Culture Regulation number 37 year 2018 (*Permendikbud nomor 37 tahun 2018*), there are two basic competencies which are used in curriculum of SMP Negeri 2 Bangli, namely: 1) apply the generic structure and language features of the text to carry out the social function of descriptive texts by asking and giving information about descriptions of people, animals, and objects, short and simple, in accordance with the context of their use, 2) compose simple and short oral and written descriptive texts about person, animal, and things which should pay attention on the social functions, generic structure, and language features and based on the context. From the basic competencies, it can be said that Junior High School students in eighth grade of the first semester are expected to be able to compose a descriptive paragraph with an appropriate topic sentence and develop the ideas well based on the generic structure (identification and description) of descriptive paragraph with correct grammatical structure, appropriate vocabularies, and effective mechanic (spelling, punctuation, and capitalization).

Based on pre-observation that has been done in SMP Negeri 2 Bangli, the teacher used feedback named indirect corrective feedback in teaching writing after the students finish making their writing, but during its implementation the teacher usually just give indirect feedback to students after they finish their writing

without asking them to revise your work. Based on Ellis (2009) indirect feedback is a feedback that is given to the students writing by indicating the errors they made without providing the correct form. In this study, teacher will also give feedback on students' writing. Teachers can provide general clues regarding the location and nature or type of an error by providing an underline, a circle, a code, a mark, or a highlight on the error, and ask the students to correct the error themselves (Almasi & Tabrizi, 2016). For editing a paper with indirect feedback, the student is required both to identify the type of (Rahmawati, 2017). Almasi & Tabrizi (2016) state that through indirect feedback students are cognitively challenged to reflect upon the clues given by the teacher error and to self-correct the error, so it will be beneficial for long term learning improvement. On another hand, Lee (1997) as cite in Rahmawati (2017) distinguishes indirect feedback strategies with a code. Coded feedback requires the teacher to point out the locations of the errors and the types of errors by giving code, for example: Verb Tense–VT, Subject Verb Agreement–SV. The use of codes makes the students need to be trained to understand what the symbols mean and they are quite difficult to understand the meaning of symbols while revising their work, which may make it difficult to re-draft adequately (Rahmawati, 2017).

Regarding to those problem, in this present study it focuses on using Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on students' writing. Mojtaba & Mohammadi (2009, p. 230) states that metalinguistic corrective feedback contains either comments or information related to the students' writing, without explicitly providing the correct form. Meanwhile, Ellis (2009) states that metalinguistic corrective feedback involves providing learners with some forms of explicit

comment about the nature of the errors they have made. The common forms are using error codes (labels for different kind of error) and providing students with metalinguistic explanations of their errors on the bottom of their writing. The types of Metalinguistic CF that will be used in this study is metalinguistic explanations. It is because by using metalinguistic explanation teacher will write clear and accurate explanations for a variety of errors and it is expected can make the students easier to understand the error or mistakes they have made (Ellis, 2009).

Metalinguistic corrective feedback can give benefits for students. Hashemian & Farhang-Ju (2018, p. 143) state that metalinguistic corrective feedback can be seen as salient and noticeable to learners because it explicitly provides them with the opportunity to diagnose their ungrammatical sentences. In fact, metalinguistic feedback can also scaffold learners to notice the gap between their knowledge and the received metalinguistic feedback (Hashemian & Farhang-Ju, 2018, p. 144). Besides that, Ellis (2009, p. 100) state the use of error codes/clue can increase students curiosity to find out what the error codes/clue stand for and later on they have to work out the correction needed from the clue provided and then revise it into the correct one. Moreover, Metalinguistic feedback can increase awareness of the language rules and noticing of learners as an essential part of language learning (Khah & Farahian, 2016, p. 140). It gives students information about the errors they made, so that they are prompted to think about the structures they used and consequently take responsibility and react to feedback for their own learning during writing or task.

Metalinguistic corrective feedback will be given on students writing. As it is explained about the stages of writing based on Oshima & Hogue (2007) which are pre-writing, organizing (outlining), revising and editing, in this study metalinguistic corrective feedback will be given on revising stages. It will be given after all students finish making a rough draft of their writing. And then, the students have to revise their writing based on the feedback given by teacher. The reason why metalinguistic corrective feedback is given in revising stage is because based on Oshima and Hogue (2007), revising is the process of finding out and marking errors in our writing. So, it will be appropriate if feedback is given on revising stage. Besides that, Khah et al. (2016, p. 134) state that feedback gives advantages for the students. First, students can make sure their performance whether they have done well or not. Second, feedback can helps students to take corrective action about their writing in order to improve it. Third, students will be able to monitor their progress. Moreover, Gielent et al. (2010) as cite in Guascha (2013) states that teacher feedback is reliable and effective considering teacher's expert status. As it is explained, feedback will be appropriate if it is given on revising stage because students will be easier to identify the error on their writing. They also will be easier to correct it because metalinguistic corrective feedback gives clues or metalinguistic explanation of the errors or mistakes they made.

In this study, Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback would be given to Junior High School students' writing in students' first language (L1) or native language which was Bahasa. It had a purpose to make the students' easier to understand the feedback that had been given. Shoji (2008) state that the use of translation activities and calculated use of the L1 or native language in fact enhance the

acquisition process in learning English as Foreign Language. Shoji (2008) also state that 92% of students believe that translation helps learn the English as Foreign Language (EFL) more effectively because they easier to understand the comments or suggestion given by the teacher. Moreover, Leis et al. (2014, p. 201) believed that L1 or native language use helped improve teacher-student rapport through the creation of a positive, friendly classroom atmosphere necessary for successful learning.

Some researchers have conducted study about the use of metalinguistic corrective feedback on students' writing. Khah & Farahian (2016) have studied about Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. The sample of the study was 60 EFL learners who studied English at English language teaching institutes in Kermanshah. Two types of written corrective feedback which are metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction feedback were used as the treatment. The result of the paired t-tests showed that the writing performance of two groups improved; however, the independent t-test was performed between the posttests of the two groups indicated that the group with metalinguistic feedback had better improvement than the group which received the explicit correction feedback.

Azizi et al. (2014) had conducted a research about metalinguistic corrective feedback on writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. This study aimed at comparing the effectiveness of two types of metalinguistic feedback which are error codes feedback and description of feedback on students' writing improvement. The sample was 69 female (within 18-19 age span) students studying at Shahed high school, Eghlid, Iran. The results showed that the

metalinguistic corrective feedback, especially description mode, had a positive influence on students' writing improvement.

Hashemian & Farhang-Ju (2018) had studied about the use of metalinguistic corrective feedback grammatical accuracy of Iranian Field (In)dependent L2 Learners' Writing Ability. The study aimed at examining the possible effects of metalinguistic feedback on FI/FD intermediate L2 learners' writing accuracy. The study used experimental design. 52 Iranian intermediate L2 learners were devided into 2 experimental and 1 control groups. One experimental group for FI consists of 19 students, another experimental group for FD consists of 17 students, and one control group consists of 16. The experimental groups received metalinguistic corrective feedback and the control group received no feedback. Two sample IELTS tests (i.e., the Writing section) were used as the pretest and posttest to measure the participants' learning of English articles as a result of metalinguistic feedback. The results revealed that both the FI/FD learners benefited from metalinguistic feedback, but the FD participants outperformed the FI ones.

From the previous studies about the use of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback in teaching it was found that Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback had a positive influence on students' writing improvement. In this presents study, metalinguistic corrective feedback will be given on junior high school students' writing. It was different with the previous studies where on the previous studies Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback was given on students' writing of high school and university students. It means that there will be the difference in setting of the study. Moreover, Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback was found as more effective feedback compared to the Indirect Corrective Feedback (Hashemian & Farhang-

Ju, 2018). The reason was because by using Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback especially metalinguistic explanation the teacher can give clearer information or knowledge about the nature of errors that the students made in their writing. So, the students will be easier to understand and recognize their errors. Meanwhile, using Indirect Corrective Feedback the teacher only can use underline, circle, code, or highlight to the nature of errors that the students made. It was made the students difficult to recognize what is wrong in their writing because there was no clue given (Rahmawati, 2017).

1.2 Problem Identification

Many kinds of feedback are commonly given on students' writing. It is usually in the forms of written feedback. The aims of giving feedback is to give comments, suggestion, praise, or questions related to their writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006) and make the students aware about their writing performance whether they have done it well or not (Khah & Farahian, 2016). In writing, written feedback is usually given after the students finish their writing. Teacher will write down comments, suggestion, praise, or questions on students' writing in order to make them realize about their strengths or weaknesess of their writing. After that, the students need to revise it based on the comments, suggestion, or questions given. On the other hand, based on pre-observation at SMP Negeri 2 Bangli, English teachers of the eight grade students have given indirect corrective feedback on students' writing in form of circling the wrong parts, but after giving feedback, the teacher did not ask the students to revise it. In this case, the students did not really care about the feedback that was given because they were not asked

to revise their work and it made the students did not really understand about their mistake. In this study, metalinguistic corrective feedback especially metalinguistic explanation would be implemented in teaching writing. The aim is to find out whether there is an effect on students' writing after the feedback is changed.

1.3   Limitation of The Problem

The present study was focus on the implementation of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback in teaching writing on eight graders at SMP Negeri 2 Banglu. The type of metalinguistic corrective feedback that was used in this study was metalinguistic explanation. It was because by giving metalinguistic explanation, students would get clearer explanations for a variety of errors they made. So, they might be easier to understand it. Its implementation would be different with the indirect feedback used by teacher at SMP Negeri 2 Bangli. In this study, the researcher would ask students to revise their work after they were given feedback. This metalinguistic feedback would focus on correcting components of sentence (grammar), vocabulary, mechanic, organization and the content of students' writing. There would be one experimental group and one control group in the research. The experimental group would be taught by using metalinguistic corrective feedback and the control group would be taught by using indirect feedback.

1.4   Statements of the Problems

Based on the explanation of the background above, the research problem that could be formulated as:

1. Is there any significant effect of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on eight grade of junior high school students' writing performance?

1.5 Research Objectives

Based on the statements of the problem, the purpose of the study was to find out whether there was significant effect of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on eight grade of junior high school students' writing performance.

1.6 Research Significance

The significance of the present study is divided into two main significances. Those are theoretical significance and practical significance.

1.6.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, the result of the study was intended to have a meaningful contribution for teaching writing. This study was also expected to make better understanding about the use of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback in teaching writing.

1.6.2 Practically Significance

The result of the study was expected to bring some significances and contributions in teaching and learning English as follows.

1. The significance for the teacher

   The result of this study can be preference for teacher especially English teachers. The teachers can use "Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback" as the preference of their teaching technique in teaching writing.

2. The significance for the students

   Students are expected can improve their writing performance from the feedback they got on their writing continuously.

3. The significance for other researchers

   This study can be guidance in conducting the similar study and give a good reference or source of information to conduct further research.

1.7   Definition of Key Terms

1.7.1   Theoretical Definition

1.7.1.1 Writing Performance

Sonnentag et al. (2001) states that writing performance is defined as students' ability in sharing their ideas or thought into a written form which should based on the criteria of good writing such as content knowledge, linguistic knowledge (vocabulary, grammar and text structure), and strategic understanding (provision of relevant information).

1.7.1.2 Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

Ellis (2009) states that metalinguistic feedback is some forms of explicit comment or metalinguistic clues that are given to the students which related to the nature of the errors they have made.

1.7.2   Practical Definition

1.7.2.1 Writing Performance

Writing performance is the ability in the eighth grade students at SMP Negeri 2 Bangli in the academic year 2019/2020 to express their ideas, feelings, information and opinion by writing descriptive paragraph which should be based on the generic structure and language feature of descriptive paragraph. The paragraph also should consider about the writing dimensions namely content and development, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics.

1.7.2.3 Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback is a comments, suggestions, or questions which are given on the eighth grade students' writing at SMP Negeri 2 Bangli. The Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback is given in revising stage. It purposed to make the students easier to know the strengths or weaknesses of their writing.