Students' Revisions Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback in Their Compositions

Wahyun Bardianing Panggalih

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya
wahyunpanggalih@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Untuk membuat suatu komposisi yang terorganisir dengan baik, siswa membutuhkan bimbingan maupun umpan balik dari guru mereka. Umpan balik yang diberikan oleh guru dapat berupa umpan balik tertulis secara langsung. Ketika memberikan umpan balik tersebut, guru harus memperhatikan lima elemen dasar dalam menulis yaitu konten, organisasi, tata bahasa, pemilihan kata, dan mekanik. Beberapa penelitian terdahulu telah menunjukkan bagaimana cara guru memberikan umpan balik kepada siswa. Namun, bagaimana cara siswa merevisi komposisi mereka setelah mendapatkan umpan balik dari guru belum didiskusikan dengan baik. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mencari tahu cara siswa merevisi komposisi mereka berdasarkan umpan balik tertulis dari guru. Penelitian ini dirancang menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif. Subyek dari penelitian ini adalah tiga mahasiswa yang telah menerima umpan balik dari guru mereka dan diperintahkan untuk merevisi komposisi masing – masing. Data utama dalam penelitian ini adalah naskah komposisi siswa. Sedangkan, data pendukungnya yaitu ungkapan siswa dan guru yang didapatkan melalui wawancara semi terstruktur. Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukan bahwa siswa yang pintar merevisi kesalahannya dengan mempertimbangkan umpan balik dari guru, keterkaitan antar ide, dan struktur yang logis. Siswa yang cukup pintar juga merevisi kesalahannya dengan benar karena ia mengikuti apa yang ditulis oleh guru di bagian komentar. Sedangkan, siswa yang kurang pintar tidak merevisi kesalahannya dengan benar. Di beberapa kesempatan, ia justru mengabaikan umpan balik dari guru tersebut dan tetap membuat kesalahan yang sama.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik tertulis secara langsung, komposisi siswa.

Abstract

To produce a well-organized composition, students need proper guidance and feedback from their teacher. The teacher's feedback can be in the form of direct written corrective feedback. When giving the feedback, the teacher has to pay attention to the five writing elements which are content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanic. The previous studies showed how the teacher provided direct written corrective feedback in students' compositions. However, how the students revise their compositions after receiving the feedback are not discussed yet. Thus, this study was conducted to find out how the students revise their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. This study used qualitative as the research design. The subjects of this study were three university students (good student, moderate student, and poor student) who had received the teacher's feedback and were asked to revise their compositions afterward. The main data of this study were the students' drafts. Meanwhile, the supporting data were the students' and teacher's utterances which were collected through a semi-structured interview. The results of this study showed that the good student revised her errors by considering the teacher's feedback, the relevancy of her ideas, and the logical structure. The moderate student correctly revised her errors since she directly followed what the teacher wrote in the comment section. Meanwhile, the poor student did not revise her errors in the correct way. In some cases, she even ignored the teacher's feedback and produced the same errors.

Keywords: direct feedback, written feedback, student's composition

INTRODUCTION

Writing is the most complex skill since it needs abilities to organize, generate, and translate the ideas into readable and understandable text for the readers (Richards & Renandya, 2002:303). In order to do well in writing a composition, there are five writing elements that should be paid attention to. According to Jacob et al., (1981) the five writing elements are content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanic. Besides paying attention to the writing elements, Cantony and Harvey (1987:81) stated that sustainable practices and proper guidance are needed for the students (as cited in Rahayu, 2013, p. 2). The sustainable practices mean

that the students have to practice their writing skill regularly. Meanwhile, the proper guidance can be in the form of feedback.

Various definitions of feedback were presented by the experts and the researchers. Most of them shared a similar idea and concept related to feedback. Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) defined feedback as a mean of expressing opinion on other's works in order to produce better results. Meanwhile in an academic context, Hyland and Hyland (2006) mentioned it as a tool to develop the learning process and encourage the students to perform better in their performances. The students' performances can be writing or speaking performances in their native or foreign language.

To support the previous statement, Hattie and Timperley (2007) stated that in a learning context, it is used to bridge the gap between what the students understand and what they will understand in the future. According to them, feedback can be provided by the peer, teachers, parents, books, and even experiences to those who do the actions. In other words, it is possible for students to get feedback from the teachers, friends, or others. Due to its crucial role, it is needed for the students to receive proper teacher's feedback to find out their weaknesses or errors, strengths, and suggested goals for their next compositions. In line with this statement, Zhan (2016) pointed out that students see feedback as a crucial tool to avoid countless errors, inaccuracy, and uncertainty in their compositions.

There are some classifications of feedback according to some experts. Elashri and Elshirbini (2013:6) mentioned that feedback can be categorized into five classifications; first, feedback based on the providers which are self, peer, teacher, and Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). It means that feedback can be given by ourselves as the writers, peer or feedback from friends, teacher's feedback in an academic context, and Computer Assisted Language Learning which is an application offering a wide variety of educational programs, resources, and journals. Second, feedback based on the timing which is delayed and immediate. The delayed feedback can be given in written works. It is given after the students submit their compositions. Meanwhile, the immediate feedback can be given during spoken performances. Third, based on the methods of performances which are written and oral. It means that feedback can be given both in written form and orally to the students' performances. Fourth, feedback based on the forms which are direct and indirect. In direct feedback, the teacher shows both errors and the correct forms explicitly. Meanwhile, indirect feedback only indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. The last is feedback based on the

concentrations which are grammatical rules, vocabulary, mechanics, content, and organization.

Meanwhile, Hattie and Timperley (2007) classified feedback into two types; corrective and non-corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is used to find and give a correction to students' errors. It can be given orally or written to the students. On the other hand, non-corrective feedback is used to motivate the students to do better in their next tasks and help them to be more confident. In providing this type of feedback, the teacher is supposed to give them some motivational words such as *"Good", "Nice", "Excellent"*.

Based on the classification of corrective and non-corrective feedback, Ellis (2009) presented six strategies of providing written corrective feedback in students' works. The six strategies are Direct Corrective Feedback, Indirect Corrective Feedback, Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback, The Focus of the Feedback, Electronic Feedback, and Reformulation. The main focus of this study is the Direct Written Corrective Feedback. In applying this strategy, the teacher has to provide the correction of students' errors directly. This concept is in line with Ferris (2006) who stated that the characteristics of direct written corrective feedback are not only by pointing out students' errors, but also providing them the correct linguistic forms of the language they used. It can be given through various ways, such as writing the correct forms above the errors, omitting unnecessary words or phrases, inserting the missing words or morphemes, and so on (Ferris, 2006; Ellis, 2009).

There have been some studies which pointed out the effectiveness and benefit of direct written corrective feedback for students' writing skill. Chandler (2003:287) in his experimental study found that the students were able to produce accurate revisions after receiving the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. They also claimed that they enjoyed having this kind of feedback since it is the easiest and fastest way to revise the errors in their compositions. It is supported by Lee (2003) who stated that it is the most appropriate form of feedback for students, especially those with the low level of English proficiency, since it helps them to find out their mistakes and the corrections easily.

Bitchener (2008) revealed that the students significantly improved their vocabulary and language use after receiving the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. According to his study, the students were likely to be more focused on their grammatical features and word choice. Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2011) also found that students who got direct written corrective feedback were able to write their compositions effectively with more acceptable grammatical and structures. From the results of the past studies, direct written corrective

feedback shows positive effects on students' performances.

As stated in the previous studies, most of the students were able to revise and produce better compositions after receiving the teacher's feedback. According to Fitzgerald (1987:481), revision has a crucial role in the writing process. By revising the errors in students' compositions, they may improve the quality of their final works. It is supported by Kirszner and Mandell (2008:20) who defined revision as the process of rethinking, rewriting, and reevaluating a written work for better performances. Many experts believed that revising means making any changes, whether it is major or minor changes, during the writing process.

Some previous studies had presented the benefits of providing direct written corrective feedback in students' written works. However, none of them showed how the students revised their errors after receiving the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. Whether they revised their errors correctly based on the teacher's feedback or not. Moreover, in what writing elements they do the revision was also unclear. Thus, this present study was conducted to find how the students revise their errors on the five writing elements based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback.

After analyzing the previous studies and having some considerations, a research problem was finally proposed: "To what extent are the students able to revise their compositions based on teacher's direct written corrective feedback?".

Based on the research problem, five coherent research questions are developed. The research questions below are the broken down of the writing elements; content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. As a result, some measurable and observable questions are formulated as:

1. To what extent are the students able to revise the content of their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback?
2. To what extent are the students able to revise the organization of their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback?
3. To what extent are the students able to revise the language use of their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback?
4. To what extent are the students able to revise the vocabulary of their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback?
5. To what extent are the students able to revise the mechanic of their compositions based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback?

RESEARCH METHODS

Since the results of this study were presented in a long and detailed description, the most suitable design to be used is qualitative. According to Cohen et al., (2007), qualitative is used to describe, interpret, and summarize the existed phenomena. Therefore, this study involved an existed phenomenon in the writing class of a university and presented the results by describing, interpreting, and summarizing in a comprehensive description. Moreover, the data in this study are in the form of words rather than numbers or statistics. In line with this statement, Ary et al., (2010) mentioned that a qualitative study focuses on understanding the phenomena by providing rich verbal descriptions of the participants rather than numeric analysis. Besides, it involved a small number of participants which are only three students. Based on the reasons above, qualitative is the most appropriate and suitable design for investigating and describing the existed phenomenon in this study.

The subjects of this study were three English department students of a reputable university in South Surabaya. They were chosen as the subjects since they had received the teacher's direct written corrective feedback and were asked to revise their compositions afterward. These three students are the representatives of students' writing abilities (good student, moderate student, and poor student). According to Ary et al., (2010), a qualitative study uses a non-random or purposive selection of the subject to get more accurate data. Besides, Cohen et al., (2007:461) also stated that qualitative focus on a smaller number of participants than quantitative research.

The setting of this study took place in a writing class of the English Department of a university in South Surabaya. This writing class was chosen since the teacher had applied direct written corrective feedback for the students' revision. It consists of three male students and thirteen female students in their third semester. It is quite far from the main street. Thus, students' concentration is not distracted by the noise. It is equipped by some facilities such as two whiteboards, an LCD Projector, two air conditioners, and four electrical current outlets in each corner of the room. Due to the setting of the classroom, the teaching-learning process runs effectively and it may give positive effects to the results of this study.

In a qualitative study, the main instrument is the researcher him or herself. It is supported by Denzin & Lincoln (2003) that the researcher of a qualitative study is considered as the instrument. It means that the data are observed, analyzed, and interpreted through this human instrument. Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) also mentioned that as the main instrument, the researcher acts as an active respondent during the research process (as

cited in Pezalla & Pettigrew, 2012). As a result, the researcher here is the key instrument of this study.

There are two kinds of data in this study. First, the main data are the students' second drafts and final drafts. These drafts are in the form of electronic drafts since the teacher asked them to type their works in Microsoft Word. However, if the main data are not sufficient, the supporting data which are the teacher's and the students' oral statements are used for clarification. In line with the data, the source of the main data is the students' drafts (students' second drafts which contain the teacher's feedback and students' final drafts). Meanwhile, the source of the supporting data are the three students and the writing teacher.

The data in this study were collected in two different ways. The researcher copied the students' second and final drafts from the teacher. Then, they were collected through observation (studying, analyzing, and evaluating the compositions deeply). According to Mackenzie and Knipe (2006), data collection techniques in a qualitative study can be done by observing and reviewing the documents or texts. Meanwhile, the supporting data were obtained through the semi-structured interview with the three students and one writing teacher.

In analyzing the data, this study adopted a theory by Ary et al., (2010:481) which are familiarizing and organizing, coding and reducing, then interpreting and representing. Firstly, the main data were classified based on the five research questions. As a result, there were five classifications; content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanic. After that, the unimportant data such as students' revisions based on the teacher's indirect or non-corrective feedback were automatically reduced. Then, the third step was analyzing students' compositions. It was done by observing (studying, analyzing, and evaluating) their compositions deeply to see how they revised them. Whether their revision was based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback or not. During the analysis, when the main data were not enough to answer the research questions, the supporting data were also used. Finally, the last step was reporting the results of the analysis which were presented in chapter 4. The results and the discussions in chapter 4 are written descriptively to answer the five research questions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

RESULTS

Student's Revision in terms of the Content Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback

The student's revision in terms of the content based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback was only

found in the good student's composition. In her opening sentence, the good student wrote *"A house is a very important thing in our life. We need a house as a shelter and a place to do our daily activities"*. Then, it was commented by the teacher *"This opening sentence sounds too typical. Try to make it more appealing – Have you ever found a fascinating...house?"*. From the teacher's comment, it can be inferred that she asked the good student to change her opening sentence since it is too common for a descriptive text.

Picture 1. Good Student's First Paragraph in the

A house is a very important thing in our life. We need a house as a shelter and a place to do our daily activities. It is no wonder why we want to have a house that feels like home. It is even better if we can have not only a comfortable, but also a luxurious house that is located in a good location. The house in the picture above falls into those categories. The house is worth purchasing because of its strategic location, grand exterior, and appealing interior.

Second Draft

When revising her opening sentence, the good student did not change it based on the teacher's feedback. She preferred to use a quotation hook to grab the readers' attention. Thus, she chose one suitable quotation *"According to a French philosopher named Gaston Bachelard, 'The house shelters day-dreaming, the house protects the dreamer, the house allows one to dream in peace'"* for her opening sentence. As a result, she deleted her previous opening sentence and changed it by using the quotation above.

Besides using the quotation, the good student also changed the supporting sentences of her first paragraph and added an interrogative sentence. The changes in the supporting sentences were done to avoid irrelevant ideas. Meanwhile, the use of an interrogative sentence such as *"Does a house with those qualities exist in Bandung?"* was to be more interactive to the readers.

According to a French philosopher named Gaston Bachelard, "The house shelters day-dreaming, the house protects the dreamer, the house allows one to dream in peace". In addition, a house can also be more beneficial if its ambiance can enhance its occupant's enjoyment. *Does a house with those qualities exist in Bandung?* Yes, the house in the picture above does. Going to Jalan Basuki Rahmad, we will find a magnificent house that is located in a strategic location, has an exquisite exterior, and appealing interior.

Picture 2. Good Student's First Paragraph in Final Draft (Revised Draft)

From the good student's revision, it can be concluded that she had her own ways to revise her opening sentence and the whole first paragraph. First, she changed her

opening sentence to be more interesting. Second, she tried to make relevant ideas by restructuring the supporting sentences. Third, she also added an interrogative sentence in her revision to be more interactive with the readers.

Students' Revisions in terms of the Organization Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback

Unfortunately, this study was not able to show the students' revisions in terms of the organization. It is because none of the subjects in this study had the teacher's direct written corrective feedback related to organization. However, the teacher's summative comments related to the organization were found at the end of the students' compositions.

In the good student's second draft, the teacher wrote *"You have a very nice organization of ideas in your essay. Also, I see no serious problem in your development of content. Congratulation on a work well done!"*. The good student was able to show the adequate arrangement of ideas and her composition was based on the generic structure. Start from the identification (the introduction of the house), the description of the setting, the exterior, the interior, and the conclusion. Besides, her supporting sentences were logic and worked to support the topic sentence. She also bridged each paragraph well by using the appropriate transitions.

In the moderate student's second draft, the teacher wrote *"Organization – wise, this essay has no serious problem"*. The moderate student arranged her ideas based on the generic structure. It can be seen from the first paragraph, she talked about the identification (introduction) of the house. Then, she continued the next paragraph with the details descriptions (the location of the house, the exterior, and the interior design). She also wrote a conclusion in the last paragraph. However, her ideas were not as fluent as the good student. As a result, her organization was at a lower level than the good student.

In the poor student's second draft, the teacher wrote *"Make sure that your supporting sentences are actually doing their job – supporting the topic sentences. Make sure that your topic sentences are relevant with your supporting sentences (that they are in line and not out of topic)"*. From the teacher's summative comment, it can be inferred that the poor student had irrelevant ideas between the topic and the supporting sentences. In other words, her supporting sentences did not support the whole paragraph. Thus, the organization of the poor student was indeed poor because of the non-fluent and disconnected ideas, the irrelevant topic sentence with the supporting sentence, and lack of logical sequencing.

In conclusion, the students' revisions in terms of the organization were not found in this study since the teacher did not give direct written corrective feedback related to the organization. However, the teacher provided summative comments at the end of the students' compositions.

Students' Revisions in terms of the Language Use Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback

In the good student's composition, three teacher's direct written corrective feedback were found. First, the good student made an error in her sentence *"That is why we would not need to panic much if we or our relatives were not well."*. Then, the teacher commented *"SPOKEN LANGUAGE – In case of emergency, we will reach the hospital easily"*. Instead of revising it like what the teacher wrote, the good student chose to combine the teacher's feedback with her own words. As a result, she revised her first error into *"In case of emergency, we will not have to go far to reach the hospital"*.

Second, the good student wrote a sentence *"The white big house looks grand because of its lush landscaping and European style"*. However, it was commented by the teacher *"To make this essay sounds more specific, change the 'THE' into 'THIS' - This White Big House"*. Instead of revising the sentence based on the teacher's feedback, the good student restructured it into *"Besides its location, the exterior of this house is another thing that will make us proud to live there. The lush landscaping and European style make that house looks exquisite"* to have a better idea.

Third, the good student wrote an incorrect structure *"When pass it, we will be able to enjoy the view of the beautiful garden on our both left and right sides."*. It was commented directly by the teacher *"When passing it"*. However, instead of copying the teacher's explicit feedback, the good student tried to make a clear sentence based on the picture of the house. As a result, she revised it into *"When we walk through the paved pathway that separates the garden, we can enjoy the beautiful plants on our both left and right sides"*.

Three revisions in terms of language use were also found in the moderate student's composition. First, the moderate student had a problem in the parallel construction. She wrote a sentence *"Most people will say that their ideal should be big, luxury, and located in the good place"*. The teacher then commented *"Problem in Parallel Construction – Adj, Adj, and Adj. Big, luxurious, and located"*. After receiving the teacher's feedback, the moderate student correctly revised her error into *"Most people say that their ideal should be big, luxurious, and located in the good place"*.

Second, the moderate student used an incorrect article in her sentence "*Emerald house is defined as the good house because of its location, exterior design, and interior design*". Then, the teacher directly commented "*article – a*". However, the moderate student did not revise her second error. She kept on using the article *"the"* in the revision". She only restructured the sentence with similar ideas. According to the interview, she did not know that the use of the article is different. As a result, she incorrectly revised her second grammatical error.

Third, the moderate student produced incorrect sentence structure as in "*By looking how nice the interior is, people will feel comfort with the condition*". It was commented by the teacher "*Sentence Structure – By looking at*". After receiving the teacher's feedback, the moderate student revised her sentence into "*By looking at how nice the interior is, people agree that "Emerald House" is the real ideal house which they have been dreamed before*". From the revision, it can be seen that she followed the teacher's feedback and changed her sentence to get a better idea.

Unlike the others, the poor student had two revisions in terms of the language use based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. First, the poor student wrote a sentence "*Despite, if they have beautiful landscaping and architecture (exterior and interior) as like as in this dreaming house*". Then, the teacher commented, "*Just like the house in the picture*". After receiving the teacher's feedback, the poor student revised her sentence into "*Moreover, they must collect much money to build their ideal house just like the house in the picture*". From the revision, it can be seen that she followed the teacher's feedback and changed her transition as well as her sentence.

Second, the poor student wrote, "*There are full of plants, some of trees, and white flowers*". However, the teacher asked her to refer to the house by using "*it is*". Instead of following what the teacher asked, the poor student changed the whole second paragraph to have a better content. Based on the interview, she did not notice this teacher's feedback since she was too focused on the other feedback. As a result, she changed her sentence into "*We can take a walk around there and enjoy the freshness of air, because this house many greenery such as trees, flowers, and beautiful landscaping*".

To conclude this results, the good student did not revise her errors based on the teacher's feedback. However, she had her own ways and considerations to revise her errors correctly. Meanwhile, the moderate and poor students sometimes revised their errors based on the teacher's feedback when they noticed it. When they did not pay attention to the teacher's feedback, they revised their errors by using their own sentences.

Students' Revisions in terms of the Vocabulary Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback

The students' revisions in terms of the vocabulary were found in the moderate and poor students' compositions. The moderate student revised only one error in terms of the vocabulary. Meanwhile, the poor student had two revisions since she made two errors in the vocabulary.

The moderate student used informal conjunction *"so"* to show a result or consequence in the sentence "*So, it's obvious that Emerald House has the good location which is very strategic*". Then, the teacher commented, "*Word Choice – choose a more academic conjunction. Therefore, as a result, consequently, or other*". Even though the teacher had provided some examples of the more acceptable conjunction, the moderate student used *"Thus*" in her revision. It actually does not matter since its function is also to show a result or cause-effect. It means that the moderate student knew how to use the conjunction properly after receiving the teacher's feedback. Besides the conjunction, she also changed the sentence to be more effective. As a result, she revised her into "*Thus, it is clear that 'Emerald House' has the good location for being an ideal house*".

Unlike the moderate student, the poor student had two errors in her vocabulary. First, the poor student wrote *"waterpool"* to refer to a big pool which contains water. However, the teacher commented, "*Are you sure that this word even exist? Swimming pool?*". It can be inferred that the teacher doubted the word *"waterpool"* exists in English. After receiving the teacher's feedback, the poor student decided to change it into "*In the bottom of the stairs, we will find small pool that has many kinds of fish*".

Second, the poor student also used the informal conjunction *"so"* in her sentence "*So we can swim freely and enjoy it every time there*". The teacher also commented, "*Always prefer the more formal conjunction – As a result, therefore*". Even though the teacher had provided the examples of formal conjunction such as *"as a result"* or *"therefore",* the poor student did not revise it and kept on writing "*so*" in her revision. Based on the interview, the poor student was familiar with it. As a result, she always uses it during the speaking or writing task in the course. Because of this reason, she kept on using the informal conjunction in her revision "*So it doesn't matter if we feel hungry in the middle night*".

In terms of the vocabulary, the moderate student was able to revise her error correctly based on the teacher's feedback. On the other hand, the poor student was not able to revise her errors correctly and kept producing inappropriate vocabulary.

Students' Revisions in terms of the Mechanic Based on Teacher's Direct Written Corrective Feedback

The students' revisions in terms of the mechanic were found in the moderate and poor students' compositions. Each of them had one error in terms of the mechanic. The moderate student had a little problem with a contraction. Meanwhile, the poor student had a serious problem with spelling.

In the moderate student's second draft, she wrote *"It's obvious that Citraland is the place for the luxury houses"*. It can be seen that *"it's"* was in a contraction form. Then, the teacher directly commented *"it is"*. Since the moderate student got an oral explanation from the teacher, she was able to revise it correctly into "*It is obvious that Citraland is the place for the luxurious houses that make so many people want to live there"*. Besides revising the contraction, the moderate student also added a clause to support her previous idea.

Meanwhile, in the poor student's composition, she wrote the word *"can not"* separately such as in "*House is the most comfortable place, even most people can not be far away from their house because of it"*. Then, the teacher directly commented *"CANNOT"* without any explanation. However, the poor student did not revise it and kept on writing *"can not"* in her final draft. Based on the interview, she did not notice this teacher's feedback since she paid a lot of attention to the teacher's indirect feedback. Moreover, she always writes it separately as *"can not"* in the past. As a result, she kept on writing it separately in her revision "*We can not only do our activities and gather with our family"*. From the revision, it can be seen that she still had a problem in the sentence structure.

From these results, it can be concluded that the moderate student correctly revised her error based on the teacher's feedback. In contrast, the poor student did not revise her error and end up producing more errors in her sentence.

DISCUSSIONS

There are five discussions in this study. First, the discussion related to the student's revision in terms of the content and the teacher's reason in providing only one content feedback. Second, the discussion about the teacher's reasons for providing summative comments in students' compositions. The third and fourth are the discussions related to the students' revision in terms of language use and vocabulary. The last is the discussion about the students' revision in terms of the mechanic.

The first discussion is the good student's revision in terms of the content. From the result of this study, the good student did not use and copy the teacher's feedback directly since she had her own ways and ideas to revise her content. It means that she did not take the teacher's feedback for granted. Moreover, based on the interview, she wanted to use her own ideas in her composition. As a result, even though the teacher had provided the complete example of an opening sentence, the good student did not use it. This reason was supported by Leki (1990) who mentioned that students did not like it when the teacher interferes and controls their ideas (as cited in Zhan, 2016). In short, the good student in this study tried to have her own ideas for her composition.

Besides the good student's revision, the teacher's reason in only providing one content feedback was also discussed. In this study, the teacher claimed that content is not supposed to be given directly since it will ruin students' ideas in their compositions. Moreover, she tried not to spoon-feed them with the complete sentences. It is supported by Harper & Beasley (2010) that teachers should not give direct feedback in the content since it is usually given in complete and constructive forms. As a result, the teacher in this study only provided one direct content feedback in the good student's composition.

The second discussion is the teacher's reasons for not providing any direct written corrective feedback in terms of the organization in the students' compositions. According to the teacher, it was difficult and meaningless to give this kind of feedback in their organization since she will also give the correct and full sentences. In the end, she will be the one who composes the essay instead of the students. That is why she gave them summative comments instead of direct feedback. This result is in line with Keh (1990:31) that the teacher can give summative comments which are written at the end of the composition to show the weaknesses, strengths, and suggested goals for the subsequent writing. In short, the teacher decided to provide these comments instead of direct feedback to avoid spoon-feed in students' compositions.

The third discussion is about the students' revisions in terms of language use. Based on the results, the good student did not revise her errors like what the teacher suggested. However, she was able to make a good revision and development in her composition. Meanwhile, the moderate student tends to revise her errors based on the teacher's direct written corrective feedback. As a result, she correctly revised two of her grammatical errors. The problem came from the poor student since she did not notice the teacher's feedback and still produced some errors in her revision. The poor student's case is in line with Parwati (2017) that carelessness in learning happens when the students have no desire to learn another language and ignore the feedback from other people. In other words, the poor student in this study showed

carelessness in learning since she did not pay attention to the teacher's feedback in revising her errors.

The fourth discussion is related to moderate and poor students' revisions in terms of vocabulary. The moderate student had no problem in revising her error. Based on the result, she was able to change her informal conjunction *"so"* into *"Thus"* correctly like what the teacher suggested. On the other hand, the poor student did not revise her errors and end up producing the same errors in her revision. Based on the result, the poor student also used informal conjunction *"so"* in her composition. However, she did not revise it into the formal one like what the teacher asked her. Besides, she also showed negative transfer since she carried her native language to produce another language. It can be seen when the poor student used the awkward word *"waterpool"* to refer to a swimming pool or fishpond. It is in line with Zhan (2016) and Parwati (2017) that interlingual transfer occurs when the students are influenced by their native language to form the word in the target language. As a result, the poor student was not able to produce appropriate vocabulary in her composition.

The last discussion is related to the moderate and the poor students' revisions in terms of the mechanic. Based on the result, the moderate student correctly revised her contraction form *"it's"* into *"it is"* correctly since the teacher gave her written feedback and oral explanation. In contrast, the poor student showed carelessness in learning again since she did not pay attention to the teacher's feedback. It can be seen from the result that she kept on writing *"can not"* separately. Besides that, she also showed interlanguage fossilization which occurs when the student's error becomes permanent (a habit) and cannot be fixed anymore (Ellis, 1997:34). It is shown from her interview *"I always write it separately even though it is wrong"*. As a result, the poor student kept on using the incorrect form due to the interlanguage fossilization and carelessness in learning.

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTIONS
Conclusion
The conclusion can be drawn based on the results and discussions. The students revise their content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanic in different ways. The good student did not revise her errors based on the teacher's feedback. She had her own considerations such as the relevancy of the ideas and the logical structure to revise her composition. The moderate student correctly revised her errors since she directly followed what the teacher wrote in the comment section. Meanwhile, the poor student did not even notice the teacher's feedback in her composition. As a result, she produced more errors in her revision and had a poor composition.

Suggestions
Based on the results of the study, some suggestions were made for the teachers and future researchers. For the teachers, it will be better and more effective when the students are provided with the concrete feedback as well as the explanation. A clear explanation is needed so that the students will not take the teacher's feedback for granted. Besides, more content and organization feedback are needed since they are considered as difficult writing elements. By providing content and organization feedback, the students will be able to produce better and acceptable compositions.

For future researchers who want to a conduct similar study, it is suggested to focus on the content and organization aspect. They are rarely discussed since they have a higher level of difficulty than grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Moreover, this study cannot show the students' revisions in terms of the organization since the teacher's direct written corrective feedback was not found. Thus, it will be great progress if the future researchers find the result. Using the other types of feedback or different subjects are welcomed to make improvement in this study.

REFERENCES

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C, K. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Wadsworth, USA: Cengage Learning.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17,* 102-118. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

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. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). New York, USA: Routledge.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (3rd ed.). USA: Sage.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63,* 98-106. doi:10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elshirbini, I. I., & Elashri, A. F. (2013). The impact of the direct teacher feedback strategy on the EFL secondary stage students' writing performance. Retrieved February 23, 2018, from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED540631.pdf

Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2011). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(12), 1797-1803. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.12.1797-1803.

Fitzgerald, J. (1987). Research on revision in writing. *Review of Educational Research*, *57*(4), 481-506. doi: 10.3102/00346543057004481

Harper, B. E., & Beasley, W. (2010). Feedback techniques that improve students' writing. Retrieved April 1, 2018, from https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/feedback-techniques-that-improve-student-writing/

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112* doi:10.3102/003465430298487.

Jacobs, H. L. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 300-302. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/44.4.294

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2). doi:10.1017/S0261444806003399

Mackenzie, N., & Knipe, S. (2006). Research dilemmas: Paradigms, methods and methodology. *Issues in Educational Research, 16.* Retrieved from http://www.iier.org.au/iier16/mackenzie.html

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). *How do learners perceive interactional feedback?* USA: Cambridge University Press.

Kirszner, L. G., & Mandell, S. R. (2008). *Writing first with reading – Practice in context* (4th ed.). USA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Parwati, I. K. (2017). Error repeated after direct written corrective feedback in students' writing. Unpublished Thesis, English Education Department. Surabaya: State University of Surabaya.

Rahayu, D. (2013). Teacher's feedback in teaching writing of narrative texts to the tenth grade students of SMAN 3 Nganjuk. Unpublished Thesis, English Education Department. Surabaya: State University of Surabaya.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zhan, L. (2016). Written teacher feedback: Student perceptions, teacher perceptions, and actual teacher performance. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 76-77. doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n8p73