CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a description of the study. It consists of the background, formulation of the problems, operational definitions, aims of the study, and significance of the study.

1.1   Background of the Study

Revision is incorporated into the writing process for a wide range of academic writing assignments, including thesis writing. Nonetheless, the revision process is also dependent on the quality of other components, such as the writing process, the writer, and the writing task. The process of writing a thesis by students undoubtedly necessitates revision, particularly from supervisors and examiners. We already know that feedback from supervisors and examiners is critical. Written corrective feedback is one of the many types of feedback provided by supervisors and examiners. In writing a thesis, providing written corrective includes everything from grammar correction to content correction. The role of feedback is becoming increasingly important in language learning. The importance of written corrective feedback (WCF) was recently highlighted in a discussion about writing practices. It refers to feedback written by the teacher as a review of students' tasks, and it helps to improve the following tasks (Wulandari 2022 & Yunus 2020) . Corrections from supervisors and examiners can, of course, improve the quality of a student's thesis, making the revision process easier.

This phenomenon of providing written corrective feedback was discovered among students working on their final project, a thesis. During the thesis writing process, each student is assigned a supervisor who will later provide feedback to help with the thesis writing process. Students are given feedback in the form of both oral and written corrective feedback. To strengthen the feedback given, oral corrective feedback is always accompanied by written corrective feedback. Written corrective feedback is always provided to students, both online and offline. This procedure is typically carried out on Google Docs, with the supervisor providing written comments on any errors in the writing. These comments include the location

of the student's errors as well as suggestions for more appropriate answers. However, it is not uncommon for lecturers to provide written corrective feedback by simply marking without explaining the errors, leaving students perplexed. If students are perplexed by the feedback they have received, they usually seek an answer for themselves by searching the internet and reading similar journals. Naturally, they will consult the supervisor again to be more confident in their answer and to avoid misinterpretation of the feedback that has been provided.

Students receive written corrective feedback not only during the guidance process, but also during the proposal seminar process, comprehensive studies, and thesis trials. In these three processes, the examiners not only provide oral corrective feedback during the exam, but they also provide written corrective feedback afterwards to clarify the feedback they provide. As we can see, students who write theses go through the process of providing written corrective feedback. The process of providing written correctives occurs continuously throughout the thesis writing process, so students will require it during the thesis revision process. The written corrective feedback provided simplifies and concentrates the revision process.

When written corrective feedback is provided, students will engage with the written corrective feedback. We can see students' experiences when receiving written corrective feedback from the engagement that occurs. Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback is broadly defined in second language writing research as students' affective, behavioral, and cognitive responses to the WCF received from the teacher (Zheng et al., 2018). Giving written feedback to students is an essential pedagogical practice for teachers who want to see their students' writing abilities and language accuracy improve (Mao, 2019). The effectiveness of corrective feedback has been confirmed and emphasized by additional research in the area of L2 writing pedagogy. Furthermore, teacher should take responsibility and pay attention to students' tasks, particularly the writing process. It may have an impact on the teaching and learning process, as well as assisting learners in creating better sentences and structures for writing. Several researchers examined students' cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to corrective feedback, assuming a symbiotic relationship between cognition and

emotion, and discovered that there is a positive impact between corrective feedback and writing skill improvement because most students were excited and had successfully revised their work.

The use of written corrective feedback (WCF) by teachers is crucial because it helps students' accuracy and L2 knowledge. Feedback on writing is a cornerstone of L2 instruction (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Bitchener & Storch, 2016). Because incorporating the WCF into students' written work is a common pedagogical practice, it is crucial for L2 writing teachers to understand how and to what extent students respond to the WCF. It helps them make the connection between the WCF provision and its effects on students' writing development. A thorough understanding of student engagement can guide teachers' pedagogical practices in providing WCF. The impact of written corrective feedback for teachers may reflect their beliefs based on prior knowledge or language learning in order to assist students in improving their writing skills. As a result, asking teachers to reflect on their WCF perspectives and actions can assist them in not only connecting theory to practice and making sound pedagogical decisions, and identifying gaps and potential barriers to WCF implementation in general and particular contexts.The affective perspective is concerned with how students react to emotional feedback. From a behavioral standpoint, the question of whether students edited their texts after receiving feedback is intriguing.

WCF studies in recent years have demonstrated its efficacy in improving student-written texts (Chen et al., 2016; Ferris, 2015; Jabulani, 2017; Lee, 2014). These studies were conducted in view of written corrective feedback in EFL academic writing in general. As revealed by Jabulani (2017) in his study, on the efficacy of WCF on university students' writing. He discovered that written corrective feedback has the potential to improve student writing. However, the efficacy of feedback depends on the extent to which students' academic potential benefits from it. Chen et al., (2016) also found the importance of WCF in classes with EFL students, despite the fact that they demonstrated a neutral attitude based on the quality of their writing. The study on written corrective feedback (Ferris, 2015) came to the conclusion that research on WCF in L2 writing must be ongoing

and cannot be done for a short period of time. Elwood and Bode (2014), on the other hand, report that undergraduate students in an EFL writing class respond to both feedback on content and feedback on technical writings. The student's reaction to feedback is contextually limited. According to Evans & Hartshorn (2010) it could be influenced by the learners, the situation, the instruction, and the students' cognitive and psychological maturity. The higher the level of education of the students, the more mature they are cognitively and psychologically.

Based on the previous studies mentioned above, most of the studies focus on academic writing in L2 in general and teacher's perspective. Meanwhile, this research focuses on how EFL students experience to written corrective feedback provided by the lecturer, especially in writing thesis context through their engagement.

1.2   Formulation of the Problem

Based on the background above, the writer can conclude the formulation of the problems with research questions as follows "What are the students' experiences to written corrective feedback provided by the lecturers?"

1.3 Operational Definitions

1.3.1	**Written Corrective Feedback**	Written feedback is given by supervisors/lecturers to students who are writing their thesis.
1.3.2	**Writing thesis**	Thesis writing is done by undergraduate students as their final project to get *Sarjana Pendidikan* degree.
1.3.3	**Students' Experiences**	Undergraduate students' experiences with receiving written corrective feedback on their thesis writing. Participant engagement and responses to the WCF provided will demonstrate the experience here.

1.4 Aim of the Research

The purpose of this study is to know what the students experience is when they receive written corrective feedback on their thesis writing.

1.5 Significance of the Study

In research, the researcher hopes that this research will be beneficial in the future, providing a benefit from this research and a positive side. There are:

1.5.1 Theoretical Contributions

This study contributes to existing theories on written corrective feedback (Zheng et al., 2020) and includes a brief discussion of students' engagement with corrective feedback (Ellis, 2010; Han & Hyland, 2015; Zhang, 2017; Zheng, 2018).

1.5.2 Practical Contributions

This study explains the experiences of students who receive written corrective feedback while writing their thesis, as evidenced by their engagement and responses. These students' responses can be used as a guide for determining which written corrective feedback can be used to provide feedback during the thesis writing process. Furthermore, this can be used as

a reference for providing written corrective feedback to students in order to improve their writing skills.

1.5.3 Empirical Contributions

This study examined previous research on the use of written corrective feedback with how students engage and its impact on writing skills especially in writing the thesis. However, these issues are frequently studied by a large number of researchers. As a result, the purpose of this study was to look into broader issues with a more significant field in Thesis writing.