

Types of Peer Written Corrective Feedback on Recount Text in EFL Class

Nur Irma Lufita

English Department, Language and Arts Faculty, University Negeri Surabaya
nurlufita@mhs.unesa.ac.id

Abstrak

Setiap jenis umpan balik korektif tertulis yang dibuat oleh teman sejawat telah berkontribusi pada peningkatan keterampilan menulis siswa. Dengan demikian, peneliti menemukan jenis umpan balik korektif tertulis yang dibuat oleh rekan dan alasan memilih jenis tersebut. Penelitian ini adalah studi kasus. Subjek penelitian adalah 34 siswa kelas 10 SMA Negeri 1 Rejoso. Instrumen penelitian adalah umpan balik tertulis dan pedoman wawancara siswa. Peneliti mengambil data melalui umpan balik tertulis siswa, wawancara kelompok, dan wawancara mendalam. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan ada 2 jenis yang ditemukan dalam umpan balik tertulis siswa; umpan balik tidak langsung yang tidak dikodekan dan umpan balik reformulasi. Alasan siswa dikategorikan ke dalam dua kategori; kepraktisan memberi umpan balik dan peningkatan diri siswa. Para siswa mempertimbangkan kepraktisan dalam memberikan umpan balik dan visibilitas menggunakan tanda. Menjadi pembelajar mandiri dan meningkatkan kesadaran siswa adalah alasan siswa yang mengarah pada peningkatan diri siswa.

Kata kunci: *Jenis umpan balik korektif tertulis, umpan balik teman sejawat, hasil tulisan siswa EFL*

Abstract

Each types of written corrective feedback made by peer had contributed to students' improvement in writing skill. Thus, the researcher found out the types of written corrective feedback made by peer and the reason of choosing those types. This study is a case study. The subject were 34 students from 10th graders of SMA Negeri 1 Rejoso. The research instruments are students' written feedback and interview guideline. The researcher took the data through students' written feedback, group interview, and deep interview. The result of the study shows there are 2 types found in students' written feedback; uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback. The students' reasons are categorized into two categories; the practicality of giving feedback and student self improvement. The students are considering the practicality of giving feedback and the visibility of using sign. Being independent learner and increasing students' awareness are students' reason which led to student self improvement.

Keywords: *Types of written corrective feedback, peer feedback, EFL learners' writing*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is an indirect communication which needs an ability (Nunan, 2003). One of writing ability is constructing the ideas in written form. While constructing ideas, writing also delivers the writers' feeling. Thus, the purposes of writing are expressing someone's feeling, providing information, persuading readers, and creating a literary works (Nunan, 2003). To make sure that the purpose of writing had been delivered to the readers, the writer should consider the terms of writing. A good writing is proved by considering the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic (Oshima & Hogue, 2007).

According to Brown (2010), writing is an essential part in learning language with a long process. Students will have some stages in writing a text. Richard and Renandya (2002) claimed that there are 4 stages of writing; planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Students have to plan what they will write in their writing. In the process of planning, students can choose which type of writing, topic, and style that will be

consider to use. After choosing, students will make a draft of their writing. The writing draft consist some information related to the topic. Then, students start to write their writing. The next stage is revision. The revision can be done by students, teacher, and peer. After getting revision, students continue their writing into editing stage. The main important stage is revision because revision shows students' progression (Oshima and Hogue, 2007). She also stated that revision is also known as feedback.

Feedback is an information given by the teacher or peer to the students related to the students' output in order to create the improvement in learning process and students' output better than before (Brown & Harris, 2013). Besides making a better improvement in learning process, feedback also has purpose on making clear students' understanding. Yu and Hu (2017) stated that feedback can construct the students' learning and help students to reach the goal of learning. Concerning in how to give feedback, feedback can be given in oral (given during a task) or written form (given after a task). Gunady (2018) argued that written feedback performs

better than oral feedback since written feedback provide detail comments.

Both of oral and written feedback can be classified into non corrective feedback and corrective feedback (Hattie and Timperley, 2007). Non-corrective feedback is a feedback with the purpose to motivate the students. The teacher gives this kind of feedback by motivating their students personally with some motivate words such as “Good performance”, “You are smart”, “Amazing”, etc. While corrective feedback is a feedback with the purpose to correct students’ task. Teacher gives some direction and information about students’ task, whether it is correct or incorrect (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In giving written feedback, corrective feedback is favorable rather than non-corrective feedback (Gunady, 2018). Written corrective feedback could be classified into some types.

There are six types of written corrective feedback according to Ellis (2009). They are Direct written corrective feedback (give students the correct form of their errors directly), Indirect written corrective feedback (indicate students’ errors by circling or underlying the error but does not provide the correct form directly), Metalinguistic corrective feedback (provide some kinds of metalinguistic code), Focus of the feedback (give focused and unfocussed feedback), Electronic feedback (show an error by providing a hyperlink), and Reformulation (give native speaker’s reworking of the students’ text to make the language of the students’ text seem as native-like, reformulation differentiate into two types usable and unusable). Written corrective feedback can be done by the teacher or peer.

Peer feedback has been proved by many researcher as effective pedagogical activity in improving students’ draft of writing (Arif, 2014; Chang, 2015; Ruegg, 2015; Yu & Hu, 2017; Yu & Lee, 2016). Ruegg (2015) found that peer feedback provides students’ organization and academic style on writing. It showed that peer feedback could help students to develop their writing. Peer feedback also motivate students to write better than before (Yu and Lee, 2015). They argued peer feedback can increase students’ awareness in writing. Students will be more aware in creating mistake and error.

Other studies investigate written peer corrective feedback, in terms of the types, in EFL students’ writing given by students (Arif, 2014; Yusuf, et. al., 2016). Their study also revealed that written peer corrective feedback could influence students’ writing. Yet, those three studies were conducted in university level. A little attention was

addressed in revealing the types of written corrective feedback in Senior High School.

Thus, the researcher conducted a study to find out types of written peer corrective feedback made by students in Senior High School. The researcher chose students’ writing of recount text as the data because students learn recount text both in Junior High School and Senior High School. Because each student has a different way in accepting knowledge which may lead to different opinion about writing, students may create different types of written peer corrective feedback and have their own perception of choosing certain types of written peer corrective feedback. In addition, the researcher also likes to find out students’ reason of using certain type only on giving feedback in order to increase students’ awareness on choosing types of corrective feedback.

Recently, there was a teacher in Senior High School of Rejosso who has implemented written peer corrective feedback in his writing class on recount text for X-Mipa 1 graders only. Mipa is abbreviation of Math (*Matematika*) and Science (*Ilmu Alam*). Students were fresh graduate from Junior High School in which they have learnt recount text about past experiences. Meanwhile, in the Senior High School, students are given two types of recount text, Bibliography and Historical Recount Text. As the implementation of Basic Competence 3.7. and 4.7 on Curriculum 2013, the teacher asked the students to produce recount text about Historical Recount Text. To cope deep understanding of recount text, the teacher provided students to do peer feedback in written form. The teacher gave some information about types of written peer corrective feedback to the students. Students were given rubric to correct their friends’ work. Types of peer corrective feedback written by students may be various too because of differences in each students. Therefore, the researcher aimed to reveal types of written peer corrective feedback that had been made by X-Mipa 1 students and their reason of choosing certain types.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this research are to find out what types of written corrective feedback made by students and their reason in choosing certain types of feedback. In line with the objectives of the study, a case study is well appropriated to be conducted. This research focuses on learners’ types of feedback and their reason Since there is a teacher who conduct peer feedback in his writing class, the researcher seek more about that condition. Case study is study including comprehensive summarization of the

result (Ary, 2010). By using case study, the researcher could find out the types of written peer corrective feedback in EFL's recount text and students' reason in choosing those types on giving feedback. The result of this research will be presented in the form of words through description.

The study was conducted in EFL class in SMAN 1 Rejoso to get deep information about the written peer corrective feedback especially for recount text that is regularly applied by the teacher in that school. The subjects were 35 students from X-Mipa 1 class of Senior High School in Rejoso and the students' written feedback. The researcher conducted a research for about 3 weeks to gather students' written feedback of recount text from each student.

The researcher used three data on this study. The data are comprised from students' written feedback, group interview, and the result of interview. In order to answer the first research question that is about the types of written peer corrective feedback, the researcher used document that are students' paper which have been corrected by their peers. The researcher used 102 feedbacks that have been revised by each student in three meetings.

For answering second research question, the researcher got the data from students' statements in group interview and interview transcript to get the detail information about students' opinions, suggestions, and ideas in giving written peer corrective feedback.

Since the students have different capability on accepting knowledge and having argument, the researcher believed that the reason of using certain written peer corrective feedback could be various. The researcher used group interview to get all opinions from 34 students. The researcher divided 34 students into 4 group. Then, the researcher chose 4 students from each of group to be interviewed by considering their performances in group interview.

There are two instruments used by researcher; document and interview guideline. The first data were collected by researcher through document and the second data were collected by interviewing students.

The researcher is the one who collect, analyze, and interpret the data. The researcher collected some documents to get the data for the first research question. The documents were students' written feedback. The researcher used guideline from Ellis 2009 to help her collect, analyze, and interpret the data because it tells about types of written corrective feedback in detail.

Interview guideline is used by the researcher to answer second research question. The researcher conducted the study by interviewing all the students through group interview. Some important questions of group interview and deep interview are about the process

of peer feedback, types of peer feedback they used, the reason of choosing certain type only, and the impact of receiving and giving feedbacks. The researcher used those main questions to guide students naturally answer the questions.

The researcher collected data through documents analysis and interview (group interview and semi-structured interview). The documents were students' written feedbacks that had been made by students in three meetings.

The teacher asked the students to do peer feedback after getting first recount text from students. The students then revised their writing based on the first feedback given by their peer. After that, the revision should be submitted to the teacher in the next meeting. Then, the teacher conducted peer feedback again to get second feedback. The teacher asked students to revise their recount text again after getting second feedback. Since some students did not revise all the mistakes, the teacher asks the students to do peer feedback again.

The researcher got the second data from group interview and semi-structured interview that had been recorded. To ensure that all opinions and ideas were gathered by the researcher from all the subjects, 34 students were interviewed through group interview where leaner are encouraged to speak one by one in answering some questions in Indonesian language. The students were divided into 4 groups which consist of 8-9 members for each group. Then, the researcher took 4 students to be individually interviewed based on their participation during group interview.

In choosing those 4 students, the researcher considers the performances by paying attention to the students who have different ideas or opinions with the others. Then, semi-structured interview was conducted to get depth information on reason why choosing certain types only. The questions in semi-structured interview depend on the situation and condition during interview section was conducted in Indonesian language. In providing clear explanation about students' reason, researcher recorded the interview section both of group interview and semi-structured interview. Then, the data were analyzed by researcher.

The researcher analyzed the data by using qualitative analytic strategy to find out the types of written peer corrective feedback given by students and the reason in choosing those types of written peer corrective feedback. Based on Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, Walker, & Razavieh (2010), there are 3 stages in analyzing qualitative research; familiarizing and organizing, coding and reducing, and interpreting and representing.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the researcher describes the findings after finding out the types of peer written feedback made by students and their reason why choosing certain types only. The researcher describes some aspects relate to the findings. The researcher conducted the study in three meetings and became an observer. The researcher paid attention to the class activity and took note from the beginning until the end of activities.

Results

After writing recount text, students are asked to do peer feedback. Before doing peer feedback, students are given information about types of feedback to help them decide which types of feedback they will use. The teacher used rubric as a tool of correction (see appendix 3). The Rubric consists of evaluative criteria that should be noticed by students while correcting their friends' writing. Some of terms that should be corrected by students are generic structure of the text, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic (punctuation, spelling, capitalization, and paragraphing).

The teacher in X-Mipa 1 class used Ellis 2009 as his references in conducting peer feedback so the researcher also used Ellis 2009 as major guidelines in this research. Ellis (2009) stated that there are 6 types of written corrective feedback; direct, indirect, reformulation, focused vs unfocused, electronic, and metalinguistic feedback.

There were 34 students who collected their recount text. Students did peer feedback three times so each students received 3 feedbacks. First feedbacks were made by their peers after they have done their first recount text. The first feedbacks were submitted to the teacher to be given to the writers and revised by them. After the writers revised their writing, the first feedbacks were submitted to the researcher by the teacher. The teacher repeated those steps of peer feedback until he got the second and third feedbacks. Then, those feedbacks were analyzed by the researcher.

The result of this study shows students used circle and underline to mark the errors or mistakes. While correcting their friends' writing, 33 students tend to use circle and underline without giving the correct form above or near the erroneous. Those ways of giving feedback are called indirect feedback (Ellis, 2009). Also, those students were using circle or underline the error or mistake without using any linguistic codes such as art (article), prep (preposition), v (verb), n (noun), and etc. Ho in Gunady 2018 assumed that circling and underlining the wrong words or form without giving clue or codes is uncoded indirect feedback. So, there are 102 uncoded indirect feedback. In addition, one student used circle and gave the

correct form of errors on the recount text. This student used this kind of feedback three times so she repeated it on the next recount text. Circling and giving the correct forms belong to reformulation feedback (Ellis, 2009). Then, the result shows that the researcher found two types that were used by students; uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback.

While correcting their friends work, students had their own reason in choosing those types of feedback on their friends' work. The researcher found uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation on students' written feedback. To gather all students' opinion, the researcher had interview all students by conducting group interview. There were 4 groups which consist of 8-9 students. Then, the researcher had 5 students from each group to be interviewed in detail. The researcher chose those 5 students based on their activeness during group interview. The interview was semi structured interview. The students' answer could be classified into two categories; the practicality of giving feedback and student self improvement.

1. The Practicality of Giving Feedback

The researcher found that students tend to use circle and underline to mark the errors. The researcher also seeks students' reason why choosing circle and underline. In group interview, many students said that using circle is visible. These are the students' answer in group interviews:

- Group 1
"Karena melingkari yang paling menonjol" ("because circle is the most prominent sign").
- Group 2
"Karena kan lingkaran lebih kelihatan bu daripada garis" ("because using circle is clearer than using underline").
- Group 3
"Biar lebih jelas" ("it will be clearer").
- Group 4
"Biar kelihatan kalau yang salah itu" (allowing my friends to see that those words/sentence are wrong")

34 students were using circle and underline in giving feedback. According to group 1, their reason why using circle is the most prominent sign is circle. It means that using circle is the most visible sign to be used in giving feedback. They are very sure about it. Then, a statement from second group shows that the students also compare the using of circle with the other sign. Second group said that using circle is more visible than underline. Third group answers' is the simplest answer. Students in group 3 are using circle and underline. They said that using underline and circle could help their friends to see

the errors clearly. In line with group 3, group 4 also stated that using sign such as circle and underline could help their friends to know that it is wrong. Mostly, students' reason about why using uncoded indirect feedback are about prominent and clear which belong to the visibility of giving feedback.

Confirming those opinions, the researcher seeks more about those student's opinion through deep interview. The researcher interviewed 4 students from group 1, 2, 3 and 4 as representative of each group. Here, the students' answer during deep interview.

- Student number 34 (S34)

As the representative of group 1, student number 34 (S34) had delivered his opinion during deep interview. This student is active student during group interview from group 1. S34 also said that the reason of using circle is easiest "*Soalnya lebih mudah*" ("*because it is the easiest*"). He also say "*Kalau kita lingkari mereka udah tau jawaban yg benar pasti*" ("*If we use circle, they (his friend) who received feedback would definitely know the correct answer*"). He believed that his friend would know the correct answer directly by circling the errors only.

- Student number 23 (S23)

S23 is passive student from group 2 during group interview. The reason why she chose to use circle is "*Ya biar bisa tau kalau itu salah*" (*allowing my friend to see that the circle word is wrong*"). This statement could be concluded that she gives chance to her friend to find the correct answer by themselves and understand the errors.

- Student number 19 (S19)

The student number 19 (S19) had delivered her opinion during deep interview section. S19 is an active student from group 3 on group interview. She claimed that their friend could find the reason why the word in circle is wrong. It can be shown from this statement "*Biar tau bu, alasannya yang salah apa*" ("*Let them know, the reason why it is wrong*"). Her reason why using circle is she wants to make her friend know that the circle one is wrong.

- Student number 16 (S16)

In addition, a student number 16 (S16) is a representative of group 4. S16 is passive student from group 4 during group interview. He claimed that using circle is understandable. He stated "*Biar lebih mudah dimengerti*" ("*It's easy to be understand*"). He didn't give other statement that led to his reason why choosing uncoded indirect feedback only. It can

be known that S16 consider the difficulty of giving feedback so he prefer to use uncoded indirect feedback rather than the other types.

From those statements, it can be concluded that students consider the visibility of signing the error which refers to the practicality of giving feedback. However, there is one student who used circle and gave the correct form on her friends' recount text. Her reason why choosing reformulative feedback was because she wants her friend to know the correct form directly. On the interview transcript she said "*Ya biar tau kalau tulisannya itu salah terus saya benarkan tulisannya seperti itu*" (*i allow my friend to know that his writing is wrong then i correct it*). To sum up her opinion, it is clearly shown that she wants to ease her friend in correcting her friend's writing through giving correct form. This opinion also led into the practicality of giving feedback.

2. Student Self Improvement

Beside the practicality of giving feedback, students who gave uncoded indirect feedback stated that using uncoded indirect feedback could let their friend to be autonomous learner. Autonomous learner is a learner who provide his need by himself. Group 1 and 2 claimed that using circle could encourage their friend to be autonomous learner. These are first, second, third, and fourth groups' opinion related to the student self improvement :

- Group 1

Group 1 say "*Biar dibenarkan sendiri, mandiri*" ("*let them correct it by themselves, be independent*"). Then, group 2 also say "*Biar cari sendiri bu. Biar mandiri. Biar dia belajar*" ("*Allow them to find it, miss. Be independent learner. Let them learn it*"). All member of first group are assuming that using circle could help their friend to be autonomous learner since they have to correct the errors by themselves.

- Group 2

The other statement was also found in group 2 "*Biar dia cari gitu lho bu terus jadi bisa, biar dia juga pintar bu*" ("*Allow him/her to find the error by themselves then they become understand, let he/she also be smart*"). Group 2 believed that their friends (who received indirect feedback) could be smarter than before because they learn the error by themselves.

- Group 3

Group 3 stated that using indirect feedback gave a chance for their friends to do their best performance in writing. They say "*Biar bisa lebih baik lagi*" ("*Allow them to do their best*"). They assumed that

using uncoded indirect feedback could encourage their friends to do their best in the next writing.

- Group 4

Group 4 said that using uncoded indirect feedback could help students' improvement. They say "*Jadi bisa diperbaiki jadi benar, gitu bu*" ("*They can fix those error to be correct*"). Through their opinion, they are very sure about their friends improvement.

From those opinions, it seems that students tend to use circle and did not provide the correct form because they wanted to make their friend find the error and correct it by themselves. They thought that their friend could have more time in learning process about the error so they can be more understand than before. In line with this opinion, the researcher found the clear answers from 4 students in group 1, 2, 3, and 4 during deep interview.

- Student number 34 (S34)

The student number 34 (S34) is an active student from first group. He says "*Ya karena saya sudah melingkari kata yang salah, otomatis mereka akan mencari bentuk benarnya itu sendiri*" ("*because i have circled the errors, they will find the correct forms by themself automatically*"). S34 assumed that his friend who accept his feedback could fix the errors by his/herself automatically because he only give the sign to mark the errors. He believed that his friend could find the correct forms on the book or other sources.

- Student number 23 (S23)

The student number 23 (S23) had a chance to show her opinion in detail during deep interview. S23 is a passive student from group 2 during group interview. The reason why she chose to use circle is "*Ya biar temen bisa memperbaiki dan bisa faham*" ("*Let my friend fix it and understand it*").

This statement showed that she give chance to her friend to find the correct answer by themself and understand the errors. She believed that their friends could be more understand than before but she doesn't sure that their friend could have better improvement by saying "*Ya mungkin memperbaiki lagi*" ("*maybe they correct it again*"). This opinion reflects her hesitation of her friends' improvement.

- Student number 19 (S19)

A student number 19 (S19) is an active student from group 3 during group interview. S19 believed that their friend could improve their writing. The statement is shown when the researcher asked about what effect of those feedbacks after received it, she says "*Lebih bagus*" ("*allow them to be better*").

- Student number 16 (S16)

A student number 16 is a passive student from group 4 during group interview. He assumed that by using indirect feedback, his friend could correct the error by himself. Implicitly, his opinion led to autonomous students. He says "*Ya biar diperbaiki sendiri sama teman, diganti yang benar*" ("*Allow my friends to correct it by himself, then replace the error with the correct form*").

Beside uncoded indirect feedback, there is also reformulation feedback. Students who used reformulation feedback is a student number 24 (S24) from group 4. She assumed that using reformulation feedback could increase her friends' awareness in writing a text. This statement is proved by her opinion "*Ya, biar dia berhati-hati lagi nanti waktu ngerjain tugas*" ("*i want to make he to be more careful in writing a text*"). By providing correct forms of errors, she believed that she could help her friend to increase his/her awareness in making errors. Also, students' awareness is the one of student self improvement factors.

Discussions

After the data were collected and analyzed, the researcher discussed which type of written corrective feedback that had been used by students and the reason of using those types. Each types of corrective feedback that had been stated by Ellis (2009) has its' own advantages and disadvantages. Thus, the researcher will discuss the reason of using certain type of corrective feedback that belong to advantage and disadvantage of corrective feedback types.

Types of Written Corrective Feedback

The researcher found 2 types of written corrective feedback used by students, they are uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation. There were 33 students used uncoded indirect feedback and one student used reformulation feedback.

Based on the result, the researcher found students tend to use circle and underline the error without give correct form above or below the errors and use code. Those feedbacks are uncoded indirect feedback. Uncoded indirect feedback is one of written corrective feedback that use underline or circle in correcting the mistakes or error without giving any clues or linguistic codes (Gunady, 2018).

For reformulation, there is only one student who used circle and gave the correct form of the errors. This kind of correction belongs to reformulation type of written corrective feedback. Reformulation feedback is a combination of direct correction and revision. In reformulation feedback, corrector corrects the error or

mistakes directly by providing the revision of the errors or mistakes (Ellis, 2009).

This current study only identifies the types of feedback that found in students' written feedback given by peer. The results are 33 students used uncoded indirect feedback and 1 student who used reformulation. The finding of this current study is different with previous study by Arif (2014), and Yusuf, et. al. (2016). Arif (2014) found types of written corrective feedback that used by college students are direct metalinguistic, focused, unfocused, usable and usable feedback (Arif, 2014). Also, Yusuf, et. al. (2016) revealed that direct feedback, coded and uncoded, combination of coded and uncoded were the most used in peer feedback.

The teacher already informed to the students that there were 6 types of feedback but the students still tend to use uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback. The other types of written corrective feedback which were not used by students are direct, metalinguistic, the focus of feedback (focused and unfocused feedback), and electronic feedback. In relation with this finding, Budianto, et. al. (2017) revealed that direct and metalinguistic are not appropriated to be used in low proficiency level. This current study used ten graders as the subject. Since subject's proficiency level is beginner, using direct and metalinguistic feedback may not appropriate for them so they did not use direct and metalinguistic feedback. In addition, the students were not showing linguistic codes in giving feedback, so there are no focused and unfocused feedback found in this current study. Schmit in Frear (2015) claims that students who use focused and unfocused feedback must notice metalinguistic too. As the proficiency level of ten graders is still beginner, they were not using this kind of feedback. Since students' recount text is handwriting product, it is impossible to do electronic feedback so the teacher allows students to choose one of six types of written corrective feedback except electronic feedback. In contrast, Mohamadi (2018) found that using electronic as a tool in giving assessment or feedback could make learning more efficient than using formative assessment. However, the teacher considered the difficulty of doing electronic feedback because electronic feedback needs laptop and application. The teacher also thought that electronic feedback will have time-consuming rather than the other types of written corrective feedback. So, the teacher gave an exception in using electronic feedback.

Students' Reason Choosing Certain Type of Written Corrective Feedback

Therefore, the researcher seeks more about the students' reason of choosing certain types of feedbacks because feedback affects students' improvement (Hyland,

2006). The study by Chandler's in Hyland (2006) also proved that students' writing is improved when they corrected their writing after getting feedback. Thus, the researcher found out the students' reason to cope students' point of view about their friends (who received feedback) improvement in writing. The researcher categorized the reason of using indirect feedback and reformulation into 2 categories, they are practicality of giving feedback and student self improvement.

The Practicality of Giving Feedback

Based on those group interview and deep interview, students assumed that using circle and underline which refers to indirect feedback is the easiest way to correct friends' work since it is more prominent and visible than the other sign. Those opinions belong to the practicality of giving feedback.

Waller & Papi (2017) revealed that students like to received symbols or sign correction such as circle, underline, brackets, and etc in marking errors in their text. Students felt easy to find their mistakes or errors when the corrector use symbols or sign. This theory is in line with students' reason in choosing circle and underline. Students think that it is the easiest way to locate the errors. Hosseiny (2015) also revealed that people tend to use indirect feedback rather than the other types. Moreover, the visibility of using circle and underline is prominent than the other sign. This opinion is in line with the theory from Ferris and Robert in Ellis (2009), they claimed the location of error in indirect feedback is shown. By using indirect feedback, students would know the location of errors easily because the visibility of sign.

However, reformulation feedback is designed to require minimal processing (Ellis, 2009). The students' reason why choosing reformulation feedback is she want her friend to know the correct form directly. This opinion means that she tried to help her friend by facilitating the correct form. Also, she minimized her friends' process in correcting the error. Confirming this opinion, a study by Chandler in Budianto, Mukminatien, and Latief (2017) revealed that students prefer to receive direct feedback because it is the easiest and the fastest way in processing the feedback. Since reformulation feedback is a combination between direct and reformulate, reformulation feedback is chosen to be used by one student in this current study because it is the easiest way of giving feedback for her. Also, she didn't want to make her friend be confused in processing the error so she provides the correct form directly.

Student Self Improvement

Students assumed that using indirect feedback could help their friends to do better improvement by having long term learning process. Since in indirect feedback, students are encouraged to correct their errors by themselves so they need enough time to understand the errors. This opinion is in line with a study by Ruegg (2015). His study revealed that peer feedback could help students to have better communication of ideas (constructing the content). Before writing, students would be more aware in preparing the ideas, generic structure, and language features that will be used in writing. By receiving indirect feedback, learner could construct the ideas in writing broadly rather than before.

According to Ellis (2009), the advantages of using indirect feedback are providing deep learning process and encouraging students to reflect linguistic forms. Indirect feedback could guide students to find their error easily and find the correct forms based on their understanding. According to students' answer in group interview and interview, students said that the other students who received the feedback could encourage their self to find the correct form of the errors. In relation with this finding, Chiu and Frear (2015) stated that indirect feedback becomes a stimulus for students to encourage them in accuracy of writing.

Students would learn in depth because they try to understand it. From this condition, students became independent learner. In relation with students' opinion, study by Chaudron, Curtis, Cotterall & Cohen in Hyland (2006) proved that students' autonomy and self-confidence had been increased while implementing peer feedback especially in indirect feedback. Their study also revealed that peer feedback could reduce the writer hesitation so the writer could develop their ideas and knowledge into their writing freely. Students would not be worry anymore in writing but still aware in avoiding mistakes. Thus, indirect feedback is expected to help students to have better improvement in writing. Confirming this opinion, students who received indirect feedback improved better than students who received direct feedback (Jamalinesari & Azizifar, 2014; Eslami, 2014).

Reformulation feedback provides learners an explicit guidance to help students correct their errors or mistakes (Gunady, 2018). Since reformulation feedback provided the correct form directly, it may consist a guidance how to correct the error. So, the students (who received feedback) would know the correct form and how to correct it explicitly. This theory is related to the students' opinion that she provides the correct form directly because she wants her friend to know that the circle

words are wrong and the correct forms are above. Since reformulation is a combination of using direct and reformulate the erroneous, those opinions are relating with Chandler in Budianto, et. al. (2017). Chandler claimed that providing the correct form near or above the erroneous is the easiest and the fastest way in giving feedback. The other opinion is by using reformulation feedback, she wants to help her friend correcting the errors easily without processing it. This reason belongs to advantage of reformulation that is decrease time-consuming (Ellis, 2009). Using reformulation feedback could help students to correct the errors faster than uncoded indirect because they do not need to search the correct form by themselves and already given the correct forms of the error.

Students' awareness is improved when students received peer feedback (Chang, 2015). In line with this theory, students also said that using reformulation feedback affect to students' awareness in writing a text. Using reformulation feedback may not contribute to long-term learning but it can increase students' awareness. A study by Cohen in Williams (2008) stated that students need to enlarge their linguistic insights from their own writing. Thus, students need a guidance in assembling linguistic insights. From those statement, reformulation feedback is not effective to be used in correcting linguistic form for secondary level but it might be beneficial for people who mastered English very well.

CONCLUSION AND SUGESTION

Conclusion

Based on the result of the data and discussion that had been explained by the researcher in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that students tend to use circle and underline in giving feedback. 33 students used circle and underline in correcting their friends' writing and did not provide the correct form or linguistic codes near or above the erroneous. This kind of feedback belong to uncoded indirect feedback. Meanwhile, there is one student who used circle and gave the correct form or reformulate the error above the erroneous. This feedback belongs to reformulation feedback. In short, there were uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback that found by researcher in students' written feedback.

The students' reasons why choosing uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback are already revealed by the researcher through group interview and deep interview. Students' reasons are about the practicality of giving feedback and student self improvement. The visibility of using sign is the students' reason why using uncoded indirect feedback and reformulation feedback. This reason belongs to practicality of giving feedback. In addition, students also

stated that using indirect feedback could encourage their friend to be independent learner. Then, by using reformulation feedback, students' awareness is expected to be increased. Being independent learner and increasing students' awareness are led to student self improvement.

Suggestion

The researcher gives some suggestion for students, teacher, and further researcher who interested in feedback. These suggestions are expected to be beneficial for students, teacher, and further researcher or the readers.

1. The students are unfamiliar with types of written corrective feedback. They only knew the types of written corrective feedback by their teacher. Hopefully, students could use various types of written corrective feedback since every types of feedback could increase students' awareness in making error or mistakes.
2. The teacher may give broad information about types of written corrective feedback. The types of written corrective feedback may not only from Ellis but also from the other sources. The types of written corrective feedback that given by students are helpful in improving students' writing. The teacher is expected to make sure that students are understand about the types of written corrective feedback and its impact. As students' improvement in writing reflect the teaching learning process.
3. Further researcher who interested in this field may find out the types of written corrective feedback made by rural, sub urban, and urban students. Also, further researcher could compare the types of written corrective feedback made by native speaker and teacher.

REFERENCES

- Arif, M. D. (2014). *Students' Responses Toward Peer Review in Writing*. Surabaya: State University of Surabaya
- Boardman, C. (2008). *Writing to Communicate*. California: Pearson Longman.
- Brown, G. T., & Harris, L. R. (2013). Student Self-Assessment. *The SAGE Handbook of Research on Classroom Assessment*, 367-393.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy 4rd Ed*. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Activities*. New York: Longman Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices (2nd ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Budianto, S., Mukminatien, N., & Latief, M. A. (2017). The Superiority of Written Corrective Feedback Outcome on EFL Writing at Different Proficiency Levels. *International Journal of English and Education*, 40-53.
- Chang, C. Y.-h. (2015). Teacher Modelling on EFL Reviewers' Audiance-aware Feedback And Affectivity in L2 Peer Review. *Assessing Writing*, 1-20.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*, 97-107.
- Eslami, E. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing. *Procedia*, 445-452.
- Frear, D., & Chiu, Y.-H. (2015). The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Accuracy in New Pieces of Writing. *System*, 24-34.
- Gunady, F. (2018). *Written Corrective Feedback Given to Errors in Sentence Structure: A Case Study*. Surabaya: Petra Chistian University.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 81-112.
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 668-674.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Cambridge Journals*, 83-101.
- Jamalinesari, A., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116-123.
- Lee, M.-K. (2015). Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing: Investigating Junior Secondary Students' Perspective on Inter-Feedback and Intra-Feedback. *System*, 1-10.
- Mohamadi, Z. (2018). Comparative Effect of Online Summative And Formative Assessment on EFL Student Writing Ability. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 29-40.
- Nunan, D. (2003). *Practice English Language Teaching*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction in Academic Writing*. New York: Pearson Education.

- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2015). *Academic Writing*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The Use of Scoring Rubrics for Formative Assessment Purposes Revisited: A Review. *Educational Research Review*, 129-144.
- Pratiwi, Y. D., Maryaeni, M., & Suwignyo, H. (2016). Kreativitas Siswa Dalam Menulis Puisi. *Journal of Education*, 835-843.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruegg, R. (2015). The Relative Effects of Peer And Teacher Feedback on Improvement in EFL Students' Writing Ability. *Linguistics and Education*, 73-82.
- Waller, L., & Papi, M. (2017). Motivation And Feedback: How Implicit Theories of Intelligence Predict L2 Writers' Motivation And Feedback Orientation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54-65.
- Williams, N. (2008). *Reformulation as Feedback on Students' Writing*. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Yu, S., & Hu, G. (2017). Understanding University Students' Peer Feedback Practices in EFL Writing; Insights From A Case Study. *Assessing Writing*, 25-35.
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Exploring Chinese Students' Strategy Use in A Cooperative Peer Feedback Writing Group. *System*, 1-11.
- Yusuf, Y. Q., Silvianti, T. M., & Tauhidah, R. (2016). Looking Into EFL Students' Type of Feedbacks on Peer Correction Activities. *Celt*, 67-90.