

Implementing Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback Technique in Teaching Writing Skill of Indonesian EFL Learner

Ammang Latifa

Graduate program of Muhammadiyah University of Parepare

Citation: Ammang Latifa (2022) Implementing Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback Technique in Teaching Writing Skill of Indonesian EFL Learner, *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, Vol.10, No.4, pp.64-73

ABSTRACT: *This research attempts to increase the writing skill of the fifth-semester students to write a narrative essay. The most problem faced by students, such as their writing was not comprehensible, and there were still many errors in vocabulary, grammar, and spelling. Since writing is a complex activity, it requires students' comprehensive abilities such as mastering grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation (Huy, 2015). This study applied mix-method design. The samples were Indonesian learner from State Islamic Institute of Religion, Parepare, Indonesia. The finding of this revealed that the students' writing skills improved significantly. It was showed by the mean score of the pre-test was 67.33, and the post-test was 86.30. It showed that the use of the Metalinguistic corrective feedback technique could increase the students' writing skill of Narrative essay.*

KEYWORDS: metalinguistic corrective feedback, writing skill, narrative essay

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a continuous activity. It means that when the writer first time writes something down, he or she has already been thinking about what it is going to say and how to say it (Cloutier, 2015; Chew & Tham, 2016). Then after we have finished writing, we read over what we have written and made changes and corrections. Therefore, writing is never one-step action; it as a process that has several steps (Saulnier, 2016; August et al., 2019). Writing also is often perceived as the most challenging language skill. It is a complicated task for students (Hammad, 2014; (Zumbrunn et al., 2015)).

Cuenca-carlino et al., (2016); Can & Ahi, (2017) stated Writing is the process of thinking to create the idea, express it through the sentences into a paragraph, organize the idea, and revise it to do good writing. In the same way, Patricia (2016); Kent & Wanzek (2016) affirmed that writing is a productive skill and, as such, the way we treat it in class has some similarities with the teaching and learning of speaking). It means that writing is a process in which the writer produces something that contains about writer's thoughts, feelings, or ideas (Arnett, 2018; Langhorne et al., 2017)

Nevertheless, doing a writing activity requires smart work. Before writing something, the learners have been thinking about what and how they are going to write (Blikstad

et al., 2018). They have to set and build prior knowledge or experience before producing writing composition (Norman, 2010); Wette, 2017). From this point of view, teaching writing skills should get much improvement. The smart teachers have to employ appropriate techniques, such as written corrective feedback in teaching writing skills (Banoğlu et al., 2018). The feedback that is used to improve work as an invaluable tool in teaching.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) is seen as the most common feedback form used nowadays in the English foreign language (EFL) classroom (Han & Xu, 2019; Zheng & Yu, 2018). It has included many researchers' attention and has become the core research as well as practices for teachers in writing (A. H. Lee & Lyster, 2015; Bao, 2019). Further, (Kılıçkaya, 2019); (Delante, 2017) observed that written corrective feedback is widely used to point students to the grammatical error in their written works and help reduce them. It can be considered a common practice in the ESL/EFL writing classroom where teachers are expected to use written corrective feedback to help their students correct their grammatical errors and generally improve writing performance (Chen, 2014; Engeness & Engeness, 2018). Regarding this effect (Bulusan et al, 2019; Han & Xu, 2019) investigated the studies dealing with error treatment and corrective feedback, there have been interests regarding the existence of corrective feedback in language classrooms, especially among learners except those a teacher.

The importance of writing ability has made many teachers and researchers explore and expose the language teaching process by the implementation of various techniques (Ostovar et al., 2017; Bauer, 2017; I. Lee et al., 2015). Some researchers have researched by using corrective feedback in teaching writing skills. They are as follow: (Park et al., 2015) in her study To what extent do students benefit from indirect corrective written feedback? This research examines students' ability in language and status of inherited language; the conclusion of this study showed that students were able to find and correct one third, while non-inherited students showed a significantly better understanding of fatigue in orthography and particles. The results of this study also show that learners who are more capable and skilled and non-inheritance of languages appear to be better able to revise their own mistakes on particles. This research also reinforces the errors found and asks students to revise them specifically of course mistakes, which can still be more comfortable to correct, including those involving orthography and particles. This study also underlines the importance of individual characters in learning foreign languages (L2) beforehand.

Meanwhile, (Benson & Dekeyser, 2018) in the project of "Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy." This study showed that All respondents completed two writing assignments given to see the effects of corrective feedback treatments that show results that have far better accuracy than without feedback treatments.

Types of written corrective feedback, including direct, indirect, focused, unfocused, metalinguistic, electronic, and reformulation (Ellis, 1985). All of them offer different benefits. In that, the metalinguistic corrective feedback refers to providing feedback by

the provision of notification, which indicates the writer's errors. In the feedback, a linguistic clue or explicit statement on the targeted error(s) is provided by using the error codes (e.g., art.) means article or explanation of grammatical rules (Paris et al., 2017).

Traditionally, teachers are only one who has immense knowledge to provide feedback to students' writing skills. Moreover, based on the writers' result of observation study that conducted to the fourth Semester of Indonesian learner of State Islamic Institute of Religion, Parepare, The results showed that most students have sufficient writing skills (fair level achievement). Students wrote a more descriptive and narrative paragraph so that researchers only take Vocabulary, Language Use, and Mechanics as a reference to determine the writing category. Based on the Department of National Education, Republic of Indonesia (2008), the test showed that students who received the Fair category were 16 (53%) out of 30 students and 14 (47%) students who received the Good category. The questionnaire also revealed that 22 of 30 students (73.3%) chose techniques/methods that were lacking, five students (16.7%) pointed at the learning media, and the remaining three students (10%) pointed to the content of the material that was less interesting.

They were dealing with the difficulties above. Learning a writing skill can be carried out by implementing a technique in teaching writing. The technique should make the students be able to develop their writing skills. Moreover, the techniques need to have the ability to motivate the students to write and allow them to have enough practice in writing so that the difficulties can be minimized. On the other hand, a writing technique should be suitable for the students' background knowledge to make them easier to show up their opinion in writing activities.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used mixed methods. According to Creswell (2010), mixed methods is a research method that combines Quantitative and Qualitative. In this research, the writer used a quantitative descriptive model where quantitative data more heavily weighted than qualitative data. The Quantitative data of this research was the writing test, and the qualitative data was the questionnaire.

In this research, the researcher used the pre-test post-test nonequivalent design. This design is often used in classroom experiments when experimental and control groups are such naturally assembled groups as intact classes. One class received treatment through Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), which was a metalinguistic corrective feedback technique, and the other class received a listing lecturer's technique. The population of this research was the fifth semester of writing course students of State Islamic Institute of Religion in the academic year 2018 that consisted of 5 classes. The instruments that have used in this research were the writing test. Writing test was one of research instrument which consists of some interesting topics, and students required to write about 200-300 words at least in three paragraphs for 90 minutes. The test has applied in the pre-test, and the post-test, both of them consisted of two meetings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

After conducting pre-test and post-test and both experimental and control classes, the researcher found some findings. Firstly, the result of students' pre-test of experimental class and control class was tabulated as follows;

Table 1. The Percentage of the Score of Experimental and Control Class in Pre-Test

No	Classification	Score	Experimental Class		Control Class	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	86-100	-	-	-	-
2	Good	71-85	9	30%	7	28%
3	Fair	56-70	21	70%	18	72%
4	Poor	41-55	-	-	-	-
5	Very Poor	<40	-	-	-	-
Total			30		25	100%

The table of percentage score above shows the students of experimental and control class' score percentage of the Pre Test. On the classification table, the first classification that Very Good is empty with the score. In the Pre Test, none students, both from experimental or control class able to reach the score. In the second classification, there are 9 (30%) of 30 students in the experimental class, and 7 (28%) of 25 students in the control class were categorized good achievement while the third classification contains 21 (70%) of 30 students in experimental class and 18 (72%) of 25 students in control class who got fair. None students, both experimental and control class who got the lowest classifications, or very poor and poor achievement.

Table 2. The Percentage of the Score of Experimental and Control Class in Post-Test

No	Classification	Score	Experimental Class		Control Class	
			F	%	F	%
1	Very Good	86-100	14	46,67%	8	32%
2	Good	71-85	16	53,33%	17	68%
3	Fair	56-70	-	-	-	-
4	Poor	41-55	-	-	-	-
5	Very Poor	<40	-	-	-	-
Total			30	100%	25	100%

The table of percentage score above pointed out that None students, both experimental and control class who got the three lowest classifications that very poor level, as well

as fair. Most students placed the second classification, that is good. Here is the data analysis: first, the classification of very good was addressed to 14 (46,67%) of 30 students in experimental class and 8 (32%) of 25 students in control class. Second, there are 15 (53,33%) of 30 students of the experimental class, and 17 (78%) of 25 students of the control class classified as an excellent achievement.

Based on both tables above, the data can conclude that in the Pre-test, none students of both experimental and control classes were able to get the classification of very good. Moreover, most students place the third classification that fair before the treatment given to the class. Moreover, the Post Test table showed that none students, both experimental and control class, classified as very poor. Most of them place the second classification that is good after the treatment used in the classroom.

The mean scores and the standard deviation of both classes after calculating the result of the student's pre-test are presented in the following table.

Table 3. The mean score and standard deviation in pre-est

Classes	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental class	67.33	-2.14
Control Class	67.92	4.24

Link to the table above, the experimental class obtained 67.33 for mean score and control class obtained 67.92, whereas the standard deviation of the experimental class was -2.14, and the control class was 4.24. The score was derived from the students' Pre Test result before given the treatment.

Table 4. The Students' Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Post Test

	Mean Score	Standard deviation
Experimental Class	86.30	3.69
Control Class	81.68	4.79

After conducting the treatment, the data of mean score and standard deviation discovered shows in table 4.4. Link to the table, the experimental class scored 81.30 for the mean score, and the control class scored 81.68. Whereas the standard deviation of the experimental class was 3.69, and the control class was 4.79.

Based on those both tables above, it can clarify that there was an increase in the student's score from the Pre Test score and the pot test score. Both classes experience an increase from the mean score and standard deviation. The data indicated that in the data of the mean score and standard deviation in the Pre-test was higher than the data of mean score

and standard deviation in the Post Test. So, it was able to conclude that there was an improvement in the students' scores after giving treatment. For the detail to find out the technique that was able to improve the students' writing skill will talk more in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

The discussion section will discuss the improvement of the students writing skill and their interest in the use of metalinguistic corrective feedback techniques based on the data discussed in the finding section and the theory explained in the second chapter. For further information, there are two objects will be discussed in this section. They are:

The teacher may use the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique as one of the ways to encourage the students to improve their writing; as (Park et al., 2015) and (Benson & Dekeyser, 2018) confirmed that the corrected feedback become the beneficial property of writing activity to motivate the students to drill on writing more and more.

The metalinguistic corrective feedback technique is suggested to be a great way of writing class; in order that it can help to improve the students' competence and ability. Secondly, It is about the skill; this research centralizes the writing skill as the most skill that needs to be investigated more. Based on the result of the observation research, students were errors of word idiom form and meaning confused to write a narrative essay. They also frequently make errors of tense, word function, articles, pronouns as well as prepositions. Most of the students frequent error of poor handwriting, punctuation as well as confused as well as the method or technique used by the English teacher was still no varieties. Therefore, this research applied a metalinguistic corrective feedback technique used to improve the students' writing skill of State Islamic Institute of Religion, Parepare, Indonesia.

Applying a metalinguistic corrective feedback technique is one of the choices to use to improve the students writing skills (Khaled Karim). It was chosen by considering how to lack the students' writing skill and how low their interest in learning writing. In the classroom, they usually write their task by listing teacher's technique, on the contrary, this technique was design to give new experience, new activity in writing task to increase the students' progress in exercising their writing skill. Oshima, A., Hogue, A. (1997:2) stated that writing is a continuous activity. It means that when we first time writes something down, we have already been thinking about what we are going to say and how we are going to say it. Then after we have finished writing, we read over what we have written and made changes and corrections. Therefore, writing is never one-step action; it as a process that has several steps.

In collecting the data, this research was designed by using quasi-experimental research, where the respondent took from two different classes. One class was as the experimental group (E), and another one was the control group (C). The experimental group is the class was treated by using the Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback Technique (X1),

whereas the control class was treated by listing the teacher's technique (X2). Additionally, the data of the test would be analyzed using a quantitative method.

The result in the pre-test showed that the students were still less in writing skills. The data of the percentage score was manifesting that most of the students were placed in the third category that fair. This category included in under a standard. Related to the Indonesian learner from State Islamic Institute of Religion, syllabus, the standard of the English was 70. In the observation data, the teacher influences their writing score used the strategy or technique causes the students' low score.

Regarding the low score data of students' writing skills, it is the best decision to apply the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique during the treatment. In this process, the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique was compared with the listing teacher's technique to know which technique may give a more considerable improvement to the students writing ability. In addition, the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique was designed to organize the students' writing. In which the teacher checks the error Grammar and gives a clue in error by giving a number. Students continued to quickly check error and underlying the clue for editing the narrative essay. Moreover, the control class did the activity by listing the teacher's technique. After the treatment activity ended, the students tested again to find out their writing improvement.

In the finding section, the Post-Test result showed that the experimental group showed a lower score than the control class before giving the treatment. However, after the treatment was given, the experimental group showed a higher score than the control class. It depicts that the students who were treated by using the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique get more improvement than the students who were treated by listing the teacher's technique.

The other data analyzed was the students' mean score and standard deviation of both groups during the pre-test and the post-test. In the pre-test, the mean score of the experimental group was 67.33, and the control class was 67.29 in While the mean score of both classes in the post-test is 86.30 in the experimental group and 81.68 for the control group. This data shows that the score of the control group higher than the experimental group in the pre-test, but the treatment conducted the experimental class got higher score the control class, so it signifies that the students writing skills experience the alteration before and after giving the different treatment. So, based on the data of the mean score and standard deviation above, it can conclude that there was an improvement to the students' score in the experimental group that treated by using metalinguistic corrective feedback technique than the students in the control group who treated by using listing teacher's technique.

Related to the discussion above, the researcher link the theory form Abdollahzadeh (2016), in his study with the title "The Effect of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback on ELF Learners' Grammatical Accuracy." In his study, he found out that the effect of metalinguistic feedback on the accuracy of tense is more considerable than the pronoun.

Implication

The finding his study can be helpful for language teachers and teacher trainers—the research finding related to the result of teaching writing skills with metalinguistic corrective feedback in this research. The data showed that there is improvement significant after students treated by using a metalinguistic corrective feedback technique. The result of this study can be helpful for students to self-correction their writing by underlying the metalinguistic clue.

CONCLUSION

The researcher decided to use the metalinguistic corrective feedback technique used for experimental class and listing teacher's technique as contrary to improve the students' writing skills. To conclude this research, The researcher showed that the score of the students Pre Test and Post Test got an improvement based on the data Pre Test of experimental class (2011), Pre Test of control class (2589) and Post Test of experimental class (1698), Post Test of control class (2042). The students' mean score also got an improvement based on the data Pre Test of experimental class (67.33), Pre Test of control class (67.92), and Post Test of experimental class (86.30), Post Test of control class (81.68). The students' scores of standard deviation showed the data Pre Test of experimental class (-2.14), Pre Test of control class (4.24), and Post Test of experimental class (3.69), Post Test of control class (4.79). The students' test significance defines that the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected, and the Alternative Hypothesis (H1) was accepted by the data Pre Test of T-Test (-0.842), T-Table (1.671) and Post Test of T-Test (3.928), T-Table (1.671).

The Author

Ammang Latifa is a lecturer of English Department of Teacher and Training Faculty at Muhammadiyah university of Parepare. Now, he is teaching English language Teaching and Evaluation and Language acquisition course.

Reference

- Arnett, J. (2018). *What 's Left of Feelings ? The Affective Labor of Politics in Doris Lessing 's The Golden Notebook*. 41(2), 77–95.
<https://doi.org/10.2979/jmodelite.41.2.05>
- August, E., Burke, K., Fleischer, C., & Trostle, J. A. (2019). *Writing Assignments in Epidemiology Courses : How Many and How Good ?* 134(4), 441–446.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354919849942>
- banoğlu, Badem, Nebahat, R. A. (2018). *Explicit and implicit written corrective feedback in higher EFL education: Evidence from Turkey*. Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330022950_Explicit_and_implicit_written_corrective_feedback_in_higher_EFL_education_Evidence_from_Turkey
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes : Teachers ' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140–150.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Bauer, E. B. (2017). *Writing Through Partnership : Fostering Translanguaging in Children Who Are Emergent Bilinguals*. 10–37.

- <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16683417>
- Benson, S., & Dekeyser, R. (2018). *Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770921>
- Blikstad-balas, M., Roe, A., & Klette, K. (2018). *Opportunities to Write : An Exploration of Student Writing During Language Arts Lessons in Norwegian Lower Secondary Classrooms*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088317751123>
- Bulusan, F. , Romar, B. Antonio, and Sherill, G.-D. (2019). *Effect of Medical English on Students' General English Proficiency*. 15(2). Retrieved from <https://www.elejournals.com/tag/asian-esp-journal-volume-15-issue-2-october-2019>
- Can, R., & Ahi. (2017). *Analysis of written expression revision skills of the students in faculty of education*. 12(5), 267–271. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.3120>
- Chen, T. (2014). *Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL / EFL writing classes : a research synthesis*. (December), 37–41.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.960942>
- Chew, J., & Tham, K. (2016). *Wearable Writing : Enriching Student Peer Review With Point-of-View Video Feedback Using Google Glass*. 1–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616641923>
- Cloutier, C. (2015). *How I Write : An Inquiry Into the Writing Practices of Academics*. *Journal of Management, Inquiry 1 –16 Reprints and Permissions: Sagepub.Com/JournalsPermissions.Nav,*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492615585875>
- Cuenca-carlino, Y., Mustian, A. L., Allen, R. D., & Gilbert, J. (2016). *I Have a Voice and Can Speak Up for Myself Through Writing !* 51(4), 220–228.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451215589180>
- Delante, N. L. (2017). *International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives Perceived impact of online written feedback on students ' writing and learning : a reflection*. *Reflective Practice*, 3943(September), 1–33.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351351>
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Principles of Instructed Learning*. *Asian EFL Journal*.
- Engeness, I., & Engeness, I. (2018). *What teachers do : facilitating the writing process with feedback from EssayCritic and collaborating peers from EssayCritic and collaborating peers*. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 5139, 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2017.1421259>
- Hammad, E. A. (2014). *Problems with EFL Essay Writing in an Instructional Setting*. 99–124. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46726-3>
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2019). *Teaching in Higher Education Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback : a case study of Chinese undergraduate students*. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 0(0), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410>
- Huy, N. T. (2015). *Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11 at thong linh high school*. 3(2), 53–69.
- Kent, S. C., & Wanzek, J. (2016). *The Relationship Between Component Skills and Writing Quality and Production Across Developmental Levels : A Meta-Analysis of the Last 25 Years*. 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315619491>

-
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2019). *Pre-service language teachers' online written corrective feedback preferences and timing of feedback in computer-supported L2 grammar instruction* *Ferit*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1668811>
Pre-service
- Langhorne, P., Coupar, F., Pollock, A., Tech, H., Su Nwe, M., De Silva, V., ... Bleyenheuft, Y. (2017). *Academic-Writing-Handbook-International-Students-3Rd-Ed (2)*. In *Society* (Vol. 45). <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijssn.20170504.11>
- Lee, A. H., & Lyster, R. (2015). *THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON INSTRUCTED L2 SPEECH PERCEPTION*. 1–30.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263115000194>
- Lee, I., Mak, P., & Burns, A. (2015). *EFL teachers' attempts at feedback innovation in the writing classroom*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815581007>
- Norman, D. A. (2010). THE WAY I SEE IT Looking back, looking forward. *Interactions*, 17(6), 61. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1865245.1865259>
- Ostovar-namaghi, S. A., & Safaei, S. E. (2017). *Exploring Techniques of Developing Writing Skill in IELTS Preparatory Courses : A Data-Driven Study*. 10(3), 74–81. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p74>
- Paris, N., Ngonkum, S., & Nazaruddin, R. (2017). Types of Written Corrective Feedback : Overview of Teachers' Implementation in Indonesia. *The 5th AASIC 2017*, 5, 255–262. Retrieved from
https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/be9b/c3694badb635cbe11831e8ec7cd3d21cb02c.pdf?_ga=2.48830118.1257399318.1583152720-773875922.1561758504
- Park, E. S., Song, S., & Shin, Y. K. (2015). *To what extent do learners benefit from indirect written corrective feedback? A study targeting learners of different proficiency and heritage language status Eun Sung Park*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815609617>
- Patricia, P. W. (2016). [PDF] *Becoming An Academic Writer : 50 Exercises For Paced , Productive , And Powerful Writing Patricia Goodson - download pdf book free*.
- Saulnier, B. (2016). *The Application of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Techniques in a Systems Analysis & Design Flipped Classroom*. 14(4). Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135329.pdf>
- Wette, R. (2017). Journal of Second Language Writing Using mind maps to reveal and develop genre knowledge in a graduate writing course. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 38(June), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.09.005>
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing : A case study of Chinese lower-pro fi ciency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37(January), 13–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.03.001>
- Zumbrunn, S., Marrs, S., & Mewborn, C. (2015). Toward a better understanding of student perceptions of writing feedback : a mixed methods study. *Reading and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-015-9599-3>