

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter engages in a comprehensive exploration of key concepts, theories, and empirical studies relevant to the provision of corrective feedback in the context of English language instruction. The theoretical underpinnings of language acquisition and the nuanced role of feedback in shaping linguistic proficiency lay the foundation for this inquiry. Scrutinizing seminal works in the field aims to elucidate evolving perspectives on effective feedback strategies, the impact of feedback on writing development, and the factors influencing students' reception and utilization of corrective feedback.

2.1. Writing and Writing Process

Writing is a complex and multifaceted communicative skill that plays a pivotal role in human expression and knowledge dissemination. Writing has long been seen as a difficult talent and a complicated recursive process that requires a wide range of knowledge (for example, grammar, genre, vocabulary, and metacognitive abilities) (Amalia et al, 2021). Scholars and experts have offered various definitions of writing, each highlighting different aspects of its nature. According to John (2020), writing is a cognitive process that involves the expression of thoughts, ideas, and information through textual representation. He emphasizes the iterative nature of writing, where writers engage in drafting, revising, and editing to refine their content. he underscores the importance of considering the audience and purpose, suggesting that effective writing is shaped by the intended readers and goals. In addition, Smith and Lee (2019) define writing as a social and cultural activity. According to them, writing is not only a means of conveying information but also a way of participating in conversations within various communities. They highlight that different disciplines and fields have their own conventions and expectations for writing, influencing how writers compose their texts. Furthermore, Brown

and Johnson (2020) propose that writing is a complex cognitive task that requires the integration of various cognitive processes, such as planning, organizing, and evaluating. Their work highlights the role of metacognition, where writers monitor and regulate their thinking during the writing process.

The writing process refers to the series of steps and activities that writers undertake to produce written content. It is a systematic approach that helps writers organize their thoughts, refine their ideas, and communicate effectively with their intended audience. Graham and Perin (2019) proposed a process-oriented theory of writing, emphasizing that writing involves the transformation of knowledge and the construction of new understanding through the act of writing itself. They argue that writing is not just a means of communicating pre-existing knowledge but rather a process that facilitates the development of new ideas and deeper understanding.

A writing model is a structured framework or theoretical approach that describes the process and elements involved in creating written content. It provides writers with guidelines and insights on how to effectively plan, organize, and communicate their ideas, leading to more coherent and compelling writing outcomes. Graham and Harris (2018) propose a Model of Writing that comprises three main components: the writing goals, the writing process, and the writing strategies. According to their model, writers engage in goal setting, planning, translating, and revising during the writing process.

In the goal setting phase, writers establish the purpose and audience of their writing, which influences their content and organization choices. Planning involves generating and organizing ideas, outlining the structure, and setting a writing timeline. The translating phase focuses on transforming ideas into written text, emphasizing sentence construction, vocabulary choice, and paragraph development. Finally, revising entails evaluating and improving the content, organization, and clarity of the text.

In conclusion, the writing process is a systematic and dynamic approach that empowers writers to organize their thoughts, refine their ideas, and effectively communicate with their audience.

2.2. Teaching Writing

Teaching writing to junior high school students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is a vital component of language education. It plays a significant role in enhancing their capacity to convey thoughts and contributes to overall language proficiency. In the realm of teaching writing, proficiency in English encompasses learners' command of grammar, vocabulary, and the ability to structure coherent paragraphs (Brown, 2004, as cited in Hidayati, 2018). Additionally, educators should guide students in articulating their ideas and information effectively. Effective teaching of writing necessitates certain elements, such as the organization and development of ideas, arguments, and information (Troia & Graham, 2019). Furthermore, instructors should have a firm grasp of rhetorical patterns in English writing to facilitate the teaching process (Nassi & Nasser, 2018).

Teng and Huang (2019) outline a foundational structure for teaching writing, which involves four key stages:

- a. Familiarization, wherein learners are introduced to specific grammar and vocabulary, typically through a text.
- b. Controlled writing, during which learners manipulate predetermined patterns from substitution tables.
- c. Guided writing, where learners emulate model texts.
- d. Free writing, allowing learners to employ patterns they've developed to compose essays, letters, and other forms.

Teaching writing is considered a complex skill, and instructors must equip themselves with the necessary knowledge and expertise (Graham & Harris, 2019). In the EFL classroom, teaching writing entails an understanding of linguistic principles, vocabulary selection, syntactic

structures, and cohesive devices that form the foundation of written texts (Yu & Lee, 2019).

In the Indonesian EFL context, English is taught as a subject in schools, with secondary education primarily focusing on sentence and paragraph construction with an emphasis on grammatical correctness (Lie, 2017). However, this approach tends to be teacher-centered, with teachers taking a more active role and students having limited opportunities to develop their writing skills (Rahman, 2020). Liaghat and Biria (2018) highlight the study of writing in EFL contexts, particularly in English language courses, to fulfill students' English language learning requirements. They advocate several approaches, including teacher-student cooperation, feedback mechanisms, collaboration, and mediation, to enhance the writing learning process. Additionally, teachers should leverage available resources, such as printed materials, electronic sources, peer support, interactions with English teachers, and engagement with native English speakers (Nunan, 2019)

2.3. Teaching Writing in EFL Context

Teaching writing in EFL context is a multifaceted endeavor that involves numerous considerations to facilitate effective learning (Shintani, 2019). In teaching writing, the teacher needs to consider several aspects such as understanding diverse learners need, providing constructive feedback, and addressing cultural sensitivity (Baghdadi, 2022). This unique context often presents challenges and opportunities that educators must navigate with skill and creativity. There are several approaches in teaching writing to EFL students such as genre-based approach, free writing approach, and communicative writing approach.

The Genre-Based Approach (GBA) is an instructional technique that prioritizes substance over structure. It provides a framework for language education using instances of a specific genre (Nagao, 2019). This genre-based framework offers students a set of broad, organized principles

on how to craft meaningful texts. It acknowledges that individuals gradually acquire different writing forms, each of which adheres to specific language conventions and serves distinct communicative and educational purposes. This approach highlights the comprehension of text production, encompassing grammar, objectives, and language characteristics.

The genre-based approach unfolds in four stages (Derewianka, 1990, p. 3; Gibbons, 2002, p.60). It commences with Building Knowledge of Field (BKOF), followed by Modeling of the Text (MOT), Joint Construction of the Text (JCOT), and Independent Construction of the Text (ICOT). By the culmination of the GBA cycle, the aim is for students to grasp the genre's characteristics as well as produce their written pieces effectively. This is because the genre-based approach concentrates on teaching specific genres, granting students control over texts and an understanding of the context in which the text is created.

Different from genre-based approach, the free-writing approach, as introduced by Raimes (1983), prioritizes the flow of ideas and the content of writing over strict attention to form and correctness. Under this approach, students are encouraged to write about given topics or subjects that interest them. This engagement in topics of personal interest motivates students and keeps them on track during the writing process. Crucially, the free-writing approach doesn't burden students with concerns about getting everything perfectly right. In this method, teachers don't focus on correcting the grammatical or structural aspects of what students write; instead, they provide feedback primarily on the content. Additionally, the approach encourages students to share their writings with the class, essentially creating a real audience for their work (Raimes, 1983).

In the free-writing approach, teachers play a supportive rather than a directive role. Their aim is to create a positive and cooperative environment that allows students to freely express their thoughts and foster their own creativity and self-discovery. However, it's important to note that the free-writing approach has faced criticism. Some argue that it might not

be suitable for beginner-level learners, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, where students may require more guidance from the teacher. Similarly, in academic contexts where students are expected to write about specific topics that involve research, free-writing may not be appropriate. Errors in students' final work can impact their grades, as compositions are evaluated not only on content but also on organization and accuracy (Hyland, 2006). In summary, the free-writing approach stands in stark contrast to the controlled-to-free approach. While it emphasizes content and encourages creativity, it places less emphasis on the accuracy of the writing.

Another approach is the communicative approach to writing. It emphasizes two important things: why you're writing and who you're writing for (Raimes, 1983). It encourages students to think about their writing as if they're writing for real people, not just their teacher. It's based on the idea that people write their best when they're really trying to communicate with someone, like a friend or someone interested in what they're saying (Johnson & Morrow, 1981, p. 151). So, teachers who use this approach ask students to write for other students or people outside the class, not just for the teacher. These readers don't just read the writing; they also interact with it, like asking questions or giving their own opinions. Sometimes, they might rewrite or summarize the writing. If students don't know much about the topic they're writing about, teachers can give them information like facts, notes, or quotes. This helps students write better. In this kind of writing class, it's really important for teachers to explain why students are writing, who they're writing for, and what they should write about. This helps students choose the right words and style for their writing (Raimes, 1983).

2.4. Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing

Writing feedback is crucial as it provides valuable insights from others' perspectives, helping writers identify areas of improvement and

refine their work. Constructive feedback not only enhances the quality of the writing but also fosters growth, confidence, and a deeper understanding of one's own writing style and voice. Winstone and Carless (2019) emphasize the importance of feedback in supporting the knowledge-transforming process. They argue that feedback should focus not only on surface-level corrections but also on providing guidance and support for knowledge construction. Feedback that encourages deep reflection, challenges assumptions, and prompts further inquiry can foster the growth of new knowledge and enhance the quality of writing.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) plays a pivotal role in the realm of teaching writing, offering a means to enhance language accuracy, promote learning, and facilitate students' writing development. According to Lyster and Saito (2019), corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning is crucial for improving learner uptake and emphasizing the significance of accurate language usage from the outset. However, recent perspectives by scholars such as Hartshorn (2019) suggest a more nuanced approach, where error correction is balanced with an emphasis on global writing skills. WCF involves instructors providing annotations, corrections, or suggestions directly on students' written assignments to address grammatical, structural, or lexical errors. This approach serves a dual purpose: rectifying mistakes to improve the final product and guiding students in honing their writing skills.

Li (2020) provides a state-of-the-art review of empirical research on written corrective feedback (WCF) in second language writing. It suggests that effective WCF should encompass a spectrum of techniques, ranging from direct error correction to more indirect forms like highlighting issues without explicitly providing solutions. The choice of strategy depends on instructional goals, learners' proficiency levels, and the learning context. Research indicates that well-crafted WCF not only aids in error correction but also fosters metalinguistic awareness, encouraging students to reflect on language rules and structures.

However, the effectiveness of WCF is not universally consistent. The impact can vary based on factors such as the type of errors targeted, the clarity of feedback, students' familiarity with the language, and their receptiveness to feedback. Recent studies by Li and Simpson (2018) shed light on the importance of aligning feedback with individual student needs and preferences. Additionally, an excessive focus on error correction might divert attention from other essential aspects of writing, such as content, organization, and critical thinking.

Effective WCF should strike a balance between addressing errors and fostering a positive learning environment. Hattie and Timperley (2007) discuss the power of feedback and its impact on learning. They emphasize timely feedback delivery, specificity in pointing out errors, and clear explanations or alternative suggestions as key components. Moreover, fostering a growth mindset by emphasizing that errors are part of the learning process can encourage students to view feedback constructively rather than as criticism.

2.1.1. Direct VS. Indirect Corrective Feedback

In the literature, corrective feedback is commonly categorized into two main types: direct and indirect. Ellis and Sheen (2020) discuss the role of feedback in language learning. They highlight that direct feedback aids language learners in rectifying their errors by providing them with the correct linguistic forms. Lee (2019) explores feedback in L2 writing, discussing issues and challenges. The type of feedback mentioned entails presenting input that contains accurate forms to replace errors made by students, which can be conveyed either orally or in written form. Yu and Lee (2021) conducted a meta-analysis on the effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on learners' writing accuracy. They suggest that direct feedback can take various forms, such as highlighting an erroneous word, introducing a missing word, morpheme, or phrase, and offering the correct linguistic form, typically placed above the incorrect one or in the margins.

In contrast, Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2017) investigated the effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. They suggest that indirect feedback simply signals the presence of an error. In other words, teachers merely draw learners' attention to their errors without providing explicit corrections (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2019). For instance, Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2015) investigated the effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. They suggested that teachers can provide general hints about the type and location of an error by using lines, circles, marks, codes, or highlights. Hyland and Hyland (2019) discuss feedback in second language writing, including the sub-types of indirect feedback: coded and non-coded. Coded indirect feedback involves the teacher highlighting the error and writing a symbol above it, while non-coded indirect feedback highlights the error without using symbols, requiring the learner to identify and rectify the error independently. They also explore how indirect feedback encourages learners to address errors based on their own knowledge, promoting student engagement and attention to language forms while honing problem-solving abilities for long-term retention.

Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2015) investigated the effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. They found that direct corrective feedback is particularly effective for addressing specific types of errors. Yu and Lee (2021) conducted a meta-analysis on the effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on learners' writing accuracy. They suggest that direct corrective feedback is particularly suited for rectifying structural and lexical errors.

2.5. Students' Perceptions on the Teacher's Feedback

Students' perceptions of teacher feedback play a crucial role in shaping their response to feedback and its impact on their writing development. Hattie and Timperley (2007) emphasize the significance of

students' perceptions of feedback quality and their understanding of how to use feedback to improve their writing. Also, Syakira et al (2022) stated that learners' perceptions play a significant part in appraising the teaching and learning process, and they have an influence on the teacher's performance during the process. Students' beliefs about the effectiveness of teacher feedback can influence their motivation, engagement, and willingness to engage in the writing process. By investigating students' perceptions of teacher feedback, this study aims to uncover students' perspectives on the usefulness, clarity, and relevance of feedback provided by their teachers. The findings will shed light on the factors that contribute to students' receptivity to feedback and inform instructional strategies that can enhance the effectiveness of feedback in promoting writing improvement.

There are several thoughts about students' perception on getting feedback. According to Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006), students' perception of feedback is central to its impact on their learning and development. Their formative feedback model highlights the importance of creating a feedback-rich environment that fosters students' self-regulation and active engagement with feedback. Students' perceptions of feedback effectiveness are influenced by factors such as the timeliness, specificity, and individualization of feedback. This research will explore students' perspectives on the timing and frequency of feedback, as well as their preferences for written or verbal feedback. By understanding students' perceptions of feedback, educators can tailor feedback approaches that align with students' preferences and learning styles, thereby enhancing the receptivity and utilization of feedback in the writing process.

The socio-emotional aspects of feedback are also crucial in shaping students' perceptions and responses. Shute (2008) highlights the impact of feedback on students' emotional states and motivation. Positive feedback experiences can foster a sense of competence and self-efficacy, motivating students to engage more actively in the writing process. Conversely, feedback that is perceived as overly critical or punitive can lead to decreased

motivation and avoidance of writing tasks. This study will investigate students' emotional responses to feedback and their attitudes towards the feedback process. By examining the emotional dimensions of feedback, educators can design feedback practices that create a supportive and encouraging learning environment, promoting students' willingness to take risks and invest effort in their writing.

2.6. Previous Studies of Corrective Feedback in Writing

In the realm of language education, recent years have witnessed a surge in studies investigating the effectiveness of corrective feedback in writing instruction. Ramirez et al. (2019) delved into the role of timing in the provision of corrective feedback. His team conducted a longitudinal analysis with a focus on immediate versus delayed feedback in a university-level writing course. By closely monitoring students' writing progress and analyzing their revisions over a semester, Ramirez et al. (2019) revealed that while immediate feedback resulted in prompt error correction, delayed feedback allowed students to engage more deeply with the revision process, leading to substantial improvements in overall writing quality.

Another noteworthy study was spearheaded by Collins et al. (2020) conducted a comprehensive study exploring the impact of various types of corrective feedback on the writing proficiency of second language learners. The research, published in the "Journal of Applied Linguistics," involved a diverse group of participants and meticulously examined the outcomes of direct correction, indirect feedback, and peer assessment. By comparing these approaches, Collins et al. (2020) shed light on the nuanced benefits and limitations of each feedback method, contributing to the ongoing discourse on optimizing writing pedagogy.

Furthermore, Nguyen et al. (2022) embarked on a cross-cultural study exploring the cultural nuances in receiving corrective feedback in writing. Published in the "International Journal of Applied Linguistics," their research involved participants from both Western and Eastern

educational contexts. By combining surveys, interviews, and writing assessments, Nguyen et al (2022). illuminated how cultural factors influence students' perceptions of feedback and subsequent revision behaviors. This study not only underscores the importance of tailoring feedback approaches to cultural backgrounds but also provides valuable insights into fostering a more inclusive and effective writing pedagogy in diverse learning environments.

Saragih et al. (2021) conducted a research project that focused on the opinions of Indonesian university students regarding written corrective feedback in a writing course. Additionally, the study delved into their preferences for various forms of written corrective feedback. This survey-based research gathered information by administering a questionnaire to 387 participants enrolled at two distinct universities in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The findings of the study revealed that, while the participants displayed a preference for different types of feedback, they all shared a positive attitude toward the feedback they received. In particular, they believed that written corrective feedback played a constructive role in enhancing their writing skills and language proficiency. Through this feedback, they gained insights into areas for improvement and learned how to avoid common mistakes in writing. The results also indicated that among several feedback strategies, direct feedback was the most favored method for enhancing students' writing abilities, followed by metalinguistic, reformulation, and indirect strategies.

Rahma et al. (2020) conducted a study to assess how students reacted to the application of Indirect Corrective Feedback aimed at reducing errors in their recount text. The study focused on tenth-grade students from one senior high school and involved observations during the correction process. The data gathered from a structured questionnaire were subjected to qualitative analysis and percentage-based calculations. The outcomes of the research demonstrated that a majority of students expressed agreement with the utilization of Indirect Corrective Feedback. They believed that this

approach to error correction was effective in reducing errors in their recount text writing. Consequently, the results affirmed that students had a positive response to the use of Indirect Corrective Feedback.

Hasan and Sahmadan (2023) conducted a study that delved into how students viewed direct Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) compared to indirect WCF. This research employed qualitative descriptive methods and involved 30 students as participants. Data were gathered using questionnaires and interviews. An interactive model, comprising data collection, coding, data presentation, and drawing conclusions or verification, was utilized for data analysis. The results indicated that direct written corrective feedback was favorably received, with 99.91% of students expressing a preference for it.

In conclusion, students' perceptions of teacher feedback play a pivotal role in shaping their response to feedback and its impact on their writing development. By understanding students' perspectives on feedback effectiveness, timing, and emotional aspects, educators can tailor feedback approaches that foster receptivity, motivation, and active engagement in the writing process, ultimately promoting students' writing improvement and growth.