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The objective of the research was to find out whether or not the use of corrective feedback could improve the students’ writing ability to the fourth semester students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar. The researcher applied quasi-experimental method using non-equivalent control class design. The Population of this research was the fourth semester students of *Sekolah* *Tinggi* *Ilmu* *Keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar in academic year 2013/2014. The sample was class A and class B, which consists of 80 students. This research used cluster random sampling. The researcher chose two classes of the fourth semester students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar randomly, as the experimental class and the control class. The two classes were given treatment. The experimental class was treated by direct and indirect corrective feedback while the control class was taught with indirect corrective feedback. The data were collected through writing test. The result of the data analysis showed that there was significant difference between the students’ score who were taught by using direct and indirect feedback and only with indirect feedback. It is proved by the mean score of the experimental class is higher than control class in the posttest. Moreover, the result of test of significant analysis indicates that the use of corrective feedback significantly improve the students’ writing ability. Based on the result, it could be concluded that the use of corrective feedback improved the students’ writing ability of the fourth semester students of *Sekolah* *Tinggi* *Ilmu* *Keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar in academic year 2013/2014.
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**Introduction**

As English learners, students at school find that English language is different from their mother tongue. Indonesian, for example, does not introduce what is called tenses (past, present, and future) while English, the new foreign language which students are obligated to study at school, is formed by tenses. Another problem, which students fail to overcome, is the lack of writing ability. In nearly all English classes at school, the English teachers teach their students elements of language and other language knowledge. Consequently, students do not have opportunity to try practicing the language skills.

Harmer (1991) classified the language into four skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Furthermore he classified listening and reading as receptive skills while speaking and writing as productive skills. Both productive skills, writing and speaking are used to deliver or convey ideas, thought, experiences feeling and desires. As a productive skill, students should also prioritize their effort to improve their writing and speaking abilities.

Writing is also an essential part of communicating, thinking, and learning. It allows students to express their ideas, to negotiate relationships, to give definition to their thoughts, and to learn about language skills. Therefore, to utilize the language well, students should master all language elements, i.e.: vocabulary, pronunciation, structure, spelling, and the language skills: listening, speaking, writing, and reading. In relation to this matter, the researcher focuses this research on writing as one skill in English.

Writing includes many aspects of language that should be covered. The writing skills are complex and sometimes difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and theoretical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements. That’s why teaching writing is different from other aspects of language skills (Heaton, 1990: 135).

In writing class, the teacher should realize the students’ difficulties in writing. Sometimes the students have a lot of ideas in their minds but they worry to start writing and even they do not know how to develop the ideas The difficulties are due to weaknesses in grammar and vocabulary, they feel worry about making mistakes in writing. In this matter, the teacher has important role in correcting students’ writing by giving corrective feedback in order to help the students have better writing ability. This problem is faced by not only the students as beginner writer, but also an advance writer.

The problem is why having learned English for many years but most learners feel they have no ability to use the language as a medium of communication. They probably understand English when other people speak. They may also understand the English texts when the others read or write. This case is also faced by students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar. The students have low ability in writing. Mostly they are able to express their ideas in simple sentences but they still make grammatical errors.

Regarding the previous explanation, the researcher considers that corrective feedback is one of the teaching technique that can be used in improving students’ writing ability. It is an efficient way for writing class in which the students will have corrective feedback in their writing. As described in *Descriptive Feedback* (2010), corrective feedback gives information to students and teachers about learning. The corrective feedback given can reduce the gap between the student’s current level and expected goal.

It is obvious that improvement on the learning condition as previously described calls for attention especially from teachers, regarding how the writing class should be best designed to cater the students’ writing ability. For this purpose, types of corrective feedback are one of the possible answers to solve the problem. According to Bitchener & Ferris (2012), corrective feedback provides direct and indirect correction to students.

So types of corrective feedback are a way in which the students have some tasks of writing to develop their writing. Furthermore, Brookhart (2008) recognized that feedback can be very powerful to students if it is done well. She further explained that the power of feedback lies in its double-barreled approach, addressing both cognitive and motivational factors at the same time. If the feedback is good, students will get to know where they are in their learning and what to do next.

The most important aspect while giving feedback is adopting a positive attitude to students’ writing. While marking mechanically a teacher may not realize that they are showing the students only their mistakes – negative points (Gulcat & Ozagac, 2004). If the students receives only negative feedback, they may easily be discouraged from trying to form complex structures and using new vocabulary. According to Dullay, Burt & Krashen (1982:35), research has produced a rather discouraging view of the effect of correction has on learners’ errors. However, feedback sessions can be a beneficial experience for the students if the teacher shows the strong points as well.

The role of corrective feedback has a place in most theories of second language learning and language pedagogy. In both behaviorist and cognitive theorist of second language learning, feedback is seen as contributing to language learning and as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy (Ellis, 2009).

Corrective feedback is a strategy where students are given feedback in their writing. It is intended to complete an academic task and to achieve their accountability individually. Positive corrective feedback affirms that a learner response to an activity is correct. Gulcat & Ozagac (2004) described that the most important aspect while giving feedback is adopting a positive attitude to students writing.

**Research Methodology**

In this research, the researcher applied quasi experimental method by using direct and indirect corrective feedback. The experiment involved two classes, an experimental class and a control class. The experimental class received treatment by using direct and indirect corrective feedback while the control class received treatment by using indirect corrective feedback. Students were given some common topics or texts related to nursing and ask them to write based on the topics given. The control class was needed for comparison purposes to see whether direct and indirect corrective feedback was effective to improve students’ writing ability. Gay (2006:254) stated that the control group is needed for comparison purpose to prove if the new treatment is more effective than other.

The population of this research was the fourth semester students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar in 2013-2014 academic year. So the total number of population was 120 students. The sample of this research was selected through cluster random sampling, in which intact groups, not individuals, were randomly selected (Gay, 2006: 106. Cluster sampling was more convenient when the population was quite large and it had a much better chance of securing permission to work with all students in several classrooms than to work with a few students in many classrooms. Class A was taken as experimental class and class B was taken as control class. As a consideration, the students of both classes had the same ability. Besides, the students also had the same background knowledge in learning English.

This research used descriptive statistics in analyzing the data. Descriptive statistics that was used in this research consisted of the sum number, mean, standard deviation number, and frequencies table.

**Findings**

1. **Corrective feedback improved the students’ writing skill**
2. The results of writing test in experimental class

As stated previously that after scoring the students' writing skills, then the results were classified into four classification by referring to the scoring system introduced by Heaton (1991) namely excellent to very good, good to average, fair to poor, and very poor. The following table presented on the next page showed the frequency and the rate percentage of the students' pretest and posttest on writing skill in experimental class.

The results showed that in pretest, 36 students (90%) were classified as very poor, 4 students (10%) were fair to poor classification, and none of them were grouped in excellent to average classifications. On the other hand, in posttest, 7 students (17.5%) were successful to be classified in excellent to very good classification, 32 (80%) were good to average classification, only 1 student (2.5%) were grouped as fair to poor classification, and none of them were very poor classification.

Thus, the mean score in pretest was 45.27 which was categorized as very poor classification and in posttest, it was 79.20 which was categorized as good to average. This indicated that the mean score of students' writing skill in posttest was higher than that of the pretest.

The statistical summary showed that the total number of subjects was 40 students. The scores achieved by the students tended to get increased from pretest to posttest. The students did better in posttest. As the result, the mean scores in pretest was classified as very poor (45.47), while in posttest the mean scores increased to be good to average (79.20).

1. The results of data analysis of writing test in control class

In pretest, there were 38 students (95%) were grouped in very poor classification, 2 students (5%) were fair to poor classification, and none of them were scored in good to average classifications. In posttest, there were only 6 students (15%) were classified as good to average, 34 (85%) were fair to poor classification. None of the students was in excellent to very good.

Thus, the mean score in pretest was 44.50 categorized as very poor classification and in posttest it was 64.25 which was categorized as fair to poor classification. This indicated that the mean score in posttest was higher than the pretest.

The result showed the statistical summary of the students pretest and posttest in control class. It showed that the total number of subjects was 40 students. The scores achieved by the students increased from 44.50 in pretest to 64.25 in posttest. As the result, the mean scores in pretest had very poor score while in posttest the mean scores was still around fair to poor. The standard deviations of each component of both tests were also varied. In general, the pretest seemed to have smaller standard deviations (4.151) than the posttest (5.908).

1. The students' pretest of experimental and control class of writing test

The result pictured out the frequency and percentage of the students' scores of the pretest in control and experimental classes in writing. Based on the results, it showed that in experimental group, 4 students (10%) out of forty were in the fair to poor classification, and 36 students or 90% whose grade were in very poor classification.

While in control group, 2 students or 5 % got fair to poor and 38 students or 95 % got very poor. Both classes showed the similarity. None of the groups was categorized in excellent to very good and good to average.

1. The students' posttest of experimental and control classes of writing test

Based on the results, it showed that in the posttest of experimental class, 7 students or 17.5% were excellent to very good classification, 32 students or 80% were classified as good to average, 1 student or 2.5% was in fair to poor, and none of them had very poor classification. While in control class, 6 students or 15 % got good to average, 34 students or 85 % got fair to poor, and none of them were categorized as excellent to very good. Both class showed the similarity.

The results above gave information that students in experimental class achieved better progress than students in control class.

1. The comparison between the students’ score of pretest and posttest in control and experimental classes.

The result showed that the mean scores of experimental class was different with control class before treatment. The mean score of pretest of experimental class was 45.47 which were categorized as very poor and while means score of control class was 44.50. It was also categorized very poor. This indicated that scores of both classes were relatively the same. Gay (2006:124) stated that the difference between close score is essentially the same to the students mean score between experimental and control classes. It was relatively the same when the variables have equal intervals. Both experimental and control classes had the same or relatively the same baseline knowledge in writing before the treatment.

After the treatment, the students in both classes were given posttest to find out student’s writing ability. The results were analyzed by using t-test with SPSS 16 version. The result showed that the mean score of experimental class was different with control class after the treatment. The mean score of posttest of experimental class was 79.20 categorized as good to average while mean score of students posttest of control class was 64.25 categorized as fair to poor. These figures showed that after getting treatment, the result of experimental class in mean score was higher than control class. It proved that the treatment by using types of corrective feedback gave significant improvement to students’ writing skill.

To make sure that the pretest score of both groups are not significantly different. Table result indicated that the statistical hypothesis was based on statistical test in asymp. Sig (2-tailed), it could be concluded that the probability value was bigger than the level of significance .05 (.351 > .05). This assumed that the students’ score of both classes was not significantly different. It indicated that both classes had the same ability prior to treatment.

To know the students’ mean score of both tests was significantly different, it should be decided through the use of t-test by using SPSS 16 version.

The result presented in the previous page indicated that the statistical hypothesis was based on statistical test in asymp. Sig (2-tailed), it can be concluded that the probability value was lower than the level of significance .05 (0.00 < 0.05). This means that H1 was accepted and, of course, the statistical hypothesis of H0 was rejected. This showed that the students mean score of both classes was significantly different. It indicated that score of experimental class was higher than control class after the treatment. It can be concluded that the use of corrective feedback improved the students’ writing ability.

After comparing the students’ score of pretest and posttest of both classes, the following table showed the improvement of the students’ pretest and posttest in each class before and after giving treatment, the result of t-test was calculated by using inferential statistic through SPSS 16.

Based on the statistics, it could be interpreted that the probability value was smaller than the level of significance 0.05 (0.00 < .05). It means that H1 was accepted and H0 was rejected. It was concluded that there was a significant difference prior to treatment in pretest and after treatment in posttest both for control and experimental classes. In other words, there was an improvement on the students’ writing ability between pretest and posttest either in control or experimental classes after the treatment. This stressed that both types of corrective feedback and one type of corrective feedback were able to give significantly greater contribution to the students’ writing ability.

1. **Direct and indirect corrective feedback were more effective than indirect corrective feedback**

Direct feedback provided some form of correction or structure or the error made in writing and usually involved the crossing out of unnecessary word/ phrase. In direct feedback, the researcher omitted any wrong addition from students’ original texts. The researcher rewrote a word, phrase or a sentence, providing the correct spelling. Also added any missing items on students’ original texts (*e.g.* prefix, suffix, article, preposition, word, etc).

Indirect corrective feedback, the researcher only underlined, circled or highlighted errors on students' original texts, indicating the location of these errors without correcting them. So the students understood that there was a problem that should be 'fixed. In this case, the researcher asked the students to study their errors and correct them.

In this case, using indirect feedback for the students who did not know how to correct their writing or had low ability in grammar could not finish their writing well. Otherwise, for the students who were given direct feedback, they could correct their writing as the researcher helped them correct their writing.

Based on the students’ writing during treatment for six meetings, most of the students got high improvement when they were given two types of corrective feedback (direct and indirect feedback). The reason was that direct feedback provided form of correction whereas indirect feedback was a challenging task for them to fix it.

**Discussion**

In this discussion section, based on the findings, the researcher presented the interpretation of test result both pretest and posttest of experimental and control classes. The results showed that the use of types of corrective feedback improved students’ writing ability significantly. This means that there was a good applicable technique in teaching writing.

Most of the students did active participation in applying types of corrective feedback because it could develop their writing ability. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) found that after receiving written corrective feedback students could improve their writing development. As an example, the students’ mean score of experimental class was only 45.47 when they did pretest. This score increased to 79.20 in their posttest. This proved that the 6-meeting treatment by using corrective feedback was effective to improve students’ writing skill. As the result, the rate of score classification also increased from very poor (50-34) to good to average (83-68). According to Beuningen & Kuiken (2008), corrective feedback could be effective in improving accuracy.

After applying types of corrective feedback, the researcher had assumption that this strategy was one way to assist the students to practice and improve writing skill. As the researcher explained at the previous chapter that there were some advantages of this strategy, they are:

* + - 1. Facilitated the development of self-assessment (reflection) in learning.
      2. Encouraged teacher and peer dialogue around learning.
      3. Helped clarify what good performance is (goals, criteria, expected standards).
      4. Provided opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance.
      5. Delivered high quality information to students about their learning.
      6. Encouraged positive motivational beliefs and self-esteem.
      7. Provided information to teacher that can be used to help shape the teaching.

The implementation of teaching using types of corrective feedback in increasing the students’ writing ability could be seen from the significant difference the percentage of students’ writing ability in experimental and control classes.

The mean score of pretest of experimental class were 45.47 and mean score of control class were 44.50. This results showed that both classes had different score, but after analyzing by using t-test formula, the result showed that the difference were not significant. This indicated that both classes had the same ability in writing before the treatment was given.

The score of students’ posttest showed improvement. It could be seen from students’ mean score. The students’ mean score of control class in posttest was 64.25 while experimental class was 79.20. This showed that both classes had different score. It could be proved by using t-test to find out the significant difference and the result showed that the mean score of both classes was significantly different after conducting treatment. The students’ score of experimental was higher than score of control class. It means that the use of types of corrective feedback in teaching writing gave better effect than the use of one type of corrective feedback. This result was also supported by Liu. According to Liu (2008), direct corrective feedback reduced students errors in the immediate draft and indirect corrective feedback helped students reduce more morphological errors than semantic errors.

The mean scores of the experimental and the control classes increased after they were given treatments. The experimental class managed to improve writing ability by using types of corrective feedback while the control class also managed to improve writing ability by using one type corrective feedback. The improvement of students’ writing ability was marked by the results of the posttest occurring in both experimental and control classes. However, the improvement rate of the experimental class was higher than control class.

Based on the research findings, the students who were taught by using types of corrective feedback and one type of corrective feedback showed good progress. Most of the students in experimental class, 32 (80%) got good to average classification, 7 (17.5%) got excellent to very good, 1 (2.5%) got fair classification and none of them got poor and very poor classification either. Meanwhile, the result of control class in posttest showed that none got excellent to very good classification but the result was still same with pretest, there were 6 (15%) got good to average, 34 students (85 %) who got fair to poor, even though none of them got excellent, fortunately there was no students who were classified into very poor classification. The results indicated that the students’ writing ability in both control and experimental classes increased. However, the students’ writing in experimental class was still higher.

Based on the result of the students' writing skill either in control class or experimental class prior to and after treatment, the researcher found that from five writing components, some of the students still found difficulties in improving their writing especially in mechanics. It seemed that the students ignored the use of punctuation and capitalization.

Furthermore, both in control and experimental classes, some students still had serious problem in all writing components which increased only a few points in experimental class. However, based on the research, the students had already made a significant progress in all writing components after they were given treatment.

However, from five writing components, it seemed that students gained higher score in content both in control and experimental classes. They did much better in the content than in other components. In control class, for example, students’ mean score increased from 14.90 in the pretest to 18.02 in the posttest. Then, it was followed by vocabulary (9.02 to 14.0), organization (9.32 to 13.72), and language use (8.52 to 13.72). Mechanics, as one of the components, was the most difficult component for students in control class. The main score was only 3.87 in the posttest from 2.52 in the pretest.

Meanwhile, in experimental class, students also gained higher score in the content. They did much better in this component than other components. As an illustration that in the content, the mean score increased from 15.07 in the pretest to 21.55 in the posttest. Then, it was followed by vocabulary (9.02 to 18.38), organization (9.27 to 17.43), and language use (9.47 to 17.25). Mechanics, as one of the components, was also the most difficult component for students in experimental class. The main score was only 4.60 in the posttest from 2.62 in the pretest. From these results, it could be interpreted that students could improve their writing ability after treatment.

The results of this research concluded that after each meeting, by using corrective feedback (direct and indirect), the students were in fairly good category. It means that the corrective feedback was successful to improve the writing skill of the fourth semester students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu keperawatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar 2013/2014 academic year.

**Conclusion**

Based on the result of data analysis and finding in the previous chapter, the researcher puts forward the following conclusion:

1. The use of corrective feedback significantly improved the students’ writing ability to the fourth semester students of *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Kesehatan* (STIK) Stella Maris Makassar.

The score of students’ posttest showed improvement. It could be seen from students’ mean score. The mean score of control class in posttest increased to 64.25 from 44.50 in pretest while experimental class, the mean score was 79.20 from 45.47 in pretest.

1. Two types of corrective feedback (direct and indirect) were more effective than indirect corrective feedback. Students got better improvement when they were given direct and indirect corrective feedback compared with indirect corrective feedback only. This could be seen from the posttest of experiment class, the mean score was higher (79.20) than control class (64.25).
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