

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a brief explanation of some theories that support the study. The theories relate to the definition of written corrective feedback and its types.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

2.1.1 Written Corrective Feedback

Whether one agrees or disagrees with WCF's efficacy in general, the form of WCF is thought to be critical to the endeavor's eventual success, and a wide range of WCF typologies are now available in the literature (Bitchener, 2008, 2012; Ferris, 1995, 2004; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Lalande, 1982; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; Sheen, 2007). Bitchener and Ferris (2012) define written corrective feedback as grammar and error correction and it is broadly defined as direct or indirect error correction, words of encouragement or praise, comments, advice, and suggestions instructing students to make changes to their written compositions. The type of error may have an impact on the effectiveness of WCF types.

The study and practice of written corrective feedback have long been contentious issues in composition and L2 studies. Researchers in both composition studies and L2 studies (including foreign language contexts) have investigated the phenomenon of written corrective feedback in various ways because there have been widely disparate philosophical stances and approaches to the related questions of if and how to correct language errors in L2 writing (Ferris, 2015). WCF decisions are about more than just improving (L2) accuracy (Brunton, 2009). They must be carefully considered within the context of the overall goals of writing instruction because a grammatically perfect thesis can still be considered an unsuccessful essay due to improper conceptual and organizational issues.

In terms of dimensions or types of written corrective feedback, Ellis (2008) conceptualized six types of written corrective feedback: direct,

indirect, metalinguistic, focused and unfocused feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation feedback.

2.1.1.1 Direct Written Corrective Feedback

Direct feedback, also known as overt WCF, entails identifying the error and supplying the correct form. Direct Written Corrective Feedback also can greatly benefit low-level English learners by improving their writing accuracy of some targeted language points. Direct feedback, according to Ferris (1999), maybe more effective with untreatable errors because it clearly marks the error and provides correction. A variety of factors, including error type (Ferris, 2006), learners' L2 aptitude (Sheen, 2007), learners' L2 proficiency (Sheen et al., 2009), and a variety of affective factors, such as learners' beliefs and prior educational experiences, may explain these inconclusive findings. Park et al., (2016) also stated if teachers can cross out unnecessary words, add missing words, and replace incorrect forms with correct forms, lower-proficiency L2 learners' ability to write accurately can improve. Diab (2015) discovered that direct WCF can help students improve their linguistic accuracy when using targeted syntactic structures. Without adequate guidance, students may incorrectly revise the text, wasting valuable time. Students spend less time identifying errors and looking up the dictionary after receiving direct WCF about the targeted English article system, which is more efficient.

2.1.1.2 Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

Indirect WCF involves identifying the error without providing the correct form, for example, by using an error code (e.g., 'art' to signal an error in the use of articles), underlining or circling the error (Ferris, 2003). Indirect feedback may have a greater impact with "treatable" errors. Sigot et al., (2019) found that indirect WCF improved students' accuracy not only at the sentence and word levels, but also at the paragraph and text levels, outperforming directive written corrective feedback (metalinguistic feedback). In addition to improving revision text accuracy, indirect WCF has a long-term impact on students' language acquisition. Niu and You (2020) validated the effect of

indirect WCF on accuracy improvement by running an experiment at various time intervals. Because the long-term effect is associated with more stable memory storage (i.e., working memory), they used working memory to assess students' temporary storage and manipulation of information in order to test the duration of the indirect WCF outcome. Students will be able to process and store information about indicated errors more effectively once they have mastered self-study. It can help them improve their working memory. As a result, student performance is more consistent.

2.1.1.3 Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback

Corrective Metalinguistics Feedback has been defined as providing brief grammatical descriptions for each error or using error codes as metalinguistic clues to inform students of the existence of errors. According to Lu (2023), metalinguistic WCF is a technique that can address the issue of information scarcity, which is a weakness of direct and indirect WCF. Metalinguistic WCF is more explicit and precise in terms of feedback explicitness than indirect WCF. The metalinguistic explanation explains why the correction was made, which assists students in "understanding the nature of the mistakes they make." Meanwhile, error codes can be used to indicate the type of grammatical error.

Aliakbari and Toni (2009) investigated the effects of direct WCF, indirect uncoded corrective feedback, and MCF. MCF outperformed the other two types of feedback in terms of improving grammatical accuracy, according to the data. Other studies have also demonstrated MCF's efficacy. It increases both the number and the depth of language-related episodes. However, there are some drawbacks to providing MCF. The use of an error code system has a drawback. According to Han et al., (2015), when students are unable to comprehend the codes, their confusion about the codes leads to feedback that is ineffective. Nonetheless, students may struggle to understand the code. As a result, they may need to ask their peers or teachers, which takes time and makes the feedback less effective.

Explanation in Metalinguistics Feedback improves students' understanding of grammar rules and assists them in gaining explicit knowledge. It entails providing a detailed explanation of grammatical errors in the written text. In contrast to direct WCF, which focuses too much on correct forms, MEF assists students in better understanding grammar rules, which is conducive to students gaining explicit knowledge about language. According to Sheen (2007), MEF is more effective when combined with direct WCF. Students can develop their understanding of the errors they have made to avoid them if teachers point them out directly and offer metalinguistic comments at the same time.

2.1.1.4 Reformation

Reformulation helps students write more naturally and process corrections more effectively. It can be interpreted as a provision for the correction of erroneous textual elements. To improve the overall accuracy of the text, teachers should address the linguistic error and then paraphrase the sentence. Reformulation, according to Sulistyono and Heriyawati (2017), improves students' writing performances. When direct WCF fails to engage learners in deep feedback processing, reformulation is a popular and less explicit alternative. The paraphrased sentence retains the original meaning of the draft while incorporating a native-like writing style. As a result, it provides "positive modeling of native-like writing" Students can correct errors by comparing reformulated versions to their original writing. Direct corrections do not prompt as much Depth of Processing as reformulation does. Depth of processing (DOP) is linked to cognitive ability. Students with higher DOP can perform better in writing. They can thoroughly analyze grammar rules in their heads. However, Kim and Bowles (2019) discovered little difference in most error types at high DOP between direct corrections and reformulations.

2.1.1.5 The Focus of The Feedback

WCF are classified into two types based on the number of errors that teachers focus on. They are Focus Written Corrective Feedback and Comprehensive Written Corrective Feedback also called Unfocused Written

Corrective Feedback. The FWCF has a significant impact on grammar accuracy. Rahimi's (2021) study found that FWCF was significantly more effective than CWCF in assisting students in reducing word and sentence errors. If teachers point out all of the errors in the text, students will have to spend a lot of time correcting them if they don't have a clear focus. As the correction may overload the mind and reduce their language learning efficiency, this may fail to provide effective assistance for them to improve grammar accuracy. Students can pay more attention to feedback when teachers select fewer grammar items for their attention.

However, some research indicates that there is no significant difference in the outcomes of CWCF and FWCF. The various outcomes may be related to the various outcome measurements. Nonetheless, for students, CWCF can be perplexing and ineffective. According to Frear and Chiu (2015), CWCF may reduce students' writing motivation by increasing their attentional load. Too many errors pointed out at once can be overwhelming and discouraging to students. The process of error correction can be a nightmare for their language acquisition. Later on, students may be afraid of writing in English, which reduces their motivation to learn the language. To summarize, CWCF may have a negative effect on students' writing performance.

2.1.1.6 Electronic Written Corrective Feedback

Electronic written corrective feedback is written corrective feedback that is delivered using tools like Google. Extensive bodies of written English (either carefully created or freely available via search engines like Google) can be used to help students write. This assistance can be accessed through a software program while students are writing or as feedback. Students can imitate the style of more experienced writers using electronic resources. Utilizing technological advancement in the ESL writing teaching process could be a potential solution.

2.1.2 Learner Engagement with WCF

Learner engagement with CF was defined by Ellis (2010) as the sum of the learners' cognitive, behavioral, and emotional responses to the feedback. Recent research has expanded on this approach, which now considers how learners process WCF intellectually, behaviorally, and emotionally (Han & Hyland, 2015; Zhang & Hyland, 2018; Zheng & Yu, 2018). Learner engagement with WCF has been discovered to be dynamic and variable across individuals (Zheng & Yu, 2018), and to be mediated by both learner variables and environmental factors (Ellis, 2010; Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum, & Wolfersberger, 2010; Murphy & Roca de Larios, 2010). To group contextual elements, various categories have been used. However, there is widespread agreement that WCF exists in a variety of contexts, ranging from the most immediate to the most general social and cultural environment. Ellis (2010) and Murphy and Roca de Larios (2010) classified ESL, EFL, immersion contexts, and learning-to-write or writing-to-learn settings as macro-level contextual variables. In contrast, micro-level contextual elements were anchored in smaller contexts (the classroom context). Evans et al. (2010) distinguished between methodological and situational variables (i.e., contextual factors inside and outside the classroom ranging from institutional justification to classroom climate) (i.e., how WCF is provided to students).

Engagement in behavior by teachers WCF refers to what students do with the WCF provided by the teacher. Several studies have been conducted to investigate how students handle feedback (Ellis, 2010), with a particular emphasis on how they incorporate WCF in revising their work (Ferris, 2006; F. Hyland, 2003) and how they use revision strategies (Ferris et al., 2013). Textual changes were discovered to be a predictor of behavioral engagement. Through interviews, Ferris et al. (2013) investigated students' editing strategies and strategies observed to apply previously learned linguistic rules in revision operations. Their focus was drawn to revision strategies that affected student behavior. Cognitive engagement is defined as cognitive

investment in WCF processing (Ellis, 2010), which manifests itself in the depth of WCF processing, cognitive and metacognitive operations in WCF processing, and revisions (Han & Hyland, 2015). Students' awareness of the WCF, in particular, indicates the depth to which the WCF is processed, which can be at the level of noticing or understanding the WCF (Qi & Lapkin, 2001; Sachs & Polio, 2007). Because students must expend mental effort in determining how and to what extent their texts should be revised, as well as how the revision operations should be carried out, cognitive operations are important indicators of students' cognitive engagement.

2.2 Study of the Relevant Research

Numerous studies have been conducted on students' engagement with Written Corrective Feedback. Shen and Chong (2022) discovered in their study about student engagement with written corrective feedback. Students' needs must be considered when providing written corrective feedback. To address learners' needs, English teachers may need to conduct a needs analysis or take a more dialogic approach so that students' development and language needs can be catered for. The previous studies (Ellis, 2010; Han & Hyland, 2015; Zhang, 2017; Zheng, 2018) on the other hand, focus on teachers' and students' perspectives on written corrective feedback, which is, of course, related to how students engage with written corrective feedback affectively, behaviourally, and cognitively. It is important to reflect on teachers' written corrective feedback (WCF) practices because feedback on writing is a staple of L2 instruction and has benefits for improving learners' accuracy and L2 knowledge (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Bitchener & Storch, 2016). Several researchers examined students' cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to corrective feedback and discovered that there is a positive impact between corrective feedback and writing skill improvement because most students were excited and successfully revised their work.

In their study, Mirza and Yunus (2020) discovered that students agreed that WCF from their teachers contributed the most to their improvement in writing skills and is beneficial to their learning. Bringing the student's attention to errors, as emphasized by Ellis et al. (2008), will help their language development because

errors allow them to notice the correct form and later internalize the rule. The form of the feedback given influences the response of students who receive it; if lecturers want students to respond positively, they must choose the appropriate type of feedback. Because a positive response will encourage them to improve their writing, resulting in more leverage. In her research, Susanti (2020) alluded to this, stating that direct grammatical feedback and other types of feedback, such as providing information and references, as well as appraisal, could motivate students. This finding corroborates previous research, which found that students responded more positively to explicit and specific suggestions. In L2 writing research, the (in)effectiveness of WCF on writing the accuracy or skill development has received the most attention. Suharyanti and Fauziati (2020) discuss the most important benefit of providing written corrective feedback to students, stating that the most important thing in providing written corrective feedback to students is to help them understand grammar and how to construct correct sentences.