

ผลกระทบของการเขียนข้อแนะนำเพื่อแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมี วิจารณญาณเกี่ยวกับความถูกต้องตามหลักไวยากรณ์ ของนักเรียนที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ

Nirma Paris¹ และ สุริศา โจนคำ²

^{1,2} สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ

^{1,2} คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์

^{1,2} มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยนี้มีจุดประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาผลของการเขียนข้อแนะนำเพื่อแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมีวิจารณญาณเกี่ยวกับความถูกต้องของหลักไวยากรณ์ของนักศึกษาชาวอินโดนีเซียที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ ผู้วิจัยส่งเสริมความรู้การเขียนที่ถูกต้องให้นักเรียนด้วยการผสมผสานกันของการเขียนข้อแนะนำและการเน้นย้ำเพื่อแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมีวิจารณญาณ งานวิจัยนี้ใช้กลุ่มทดลองหนึ่งกลุ่ม โดยกลุ่มทดลองจะได้รับการทดสอบก่อนเรียนและแบบทดสอบหลังเรียนทันที และจะได้รับแบบทดสอบหลังเรียนอีกครั้งหลังจากทั้งช่วงการเรียน กลุ่มทดลองของงานวิจัยนี้ประกอบไปด้วยนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 1 สาขาการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ คณะสังคมศาสตร์และรัฐศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัย West Sulawesi ประเทศอินโดนีเซีย เพียงชั้นเดียวเป็นจำนวน 43 คน ซึ่งผู้เข้าร่วมทั้งหมดได้เข้าเรียนในวิชาการเขียน ผู้เข้าร่วมวิจัยในครั้งนี้ได้รับการแนะนำเพื่อแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมีวิจารณญาณของการเขียนเรียงความของแต่ละคนโดยเน้นที่ความถูกต้องของหลักไวยากรณ์รวมถึงบทความภาษาอังกฤษ การใช้รูปกริยาในอดีต ความเขินอาย คำนามเอกพจน์-พหูพจน์ ผลที่ได้รับจากงานวิจัยนี้คือการแนะนำเพื่อแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมีวิจารณญาณปรากฏผลที่มีนัยยะในการพัฒนาความสามารถเรื่องความถูกต้องของหลักไวยากรณ์ของกลุ่มทดลองทั้งในระยะสั้นและระยะยาว

คำสำคัญ ; การแก้ไขโดยตรงอย่างมีวิจารณญาณ ความแม่นยำของหลักไวยากรณ์ วิชาการเขียนของนักศึกษาที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สอง การเขียนของนักศึกษาที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สอง การให้ข้อแนะนำเพื่อความถูกต้อง

The Effect of Direct Focused Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback on the EFL Students' Grammatical Accuracy

Nirma Paris¹ and Sutida Ngonkum²

^{1,2}Department of English

^{1,2}Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

^{1,2}Khon Kaen University

Abstract

The present study aimed to investigate the effect of direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback on the Indonesian EFL students' grammatical accuracy. The combination of direct, focused, and metalinguistic written corrective feedback was employed to enhance the students' writing accuracy. This investigation employed one-group with pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest design, and the participants of the current study were one-intact class consisting of forty-three (43) freshman university students who enrolled in a writing course, majoring in English Language Teaching, Faculty of Social and Political Science, West Sulawesi University, Indonesia. The direct focused metalinguistic feedback was provided on the participants' writing essay focusing on the grammatical errors including the English articles, simple past tense, be auxiliary, and singular-plural noun. The results of the study revealed that direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback has a significant effect on the improvement of the participants' grammatical accuracy both in the short and long term.

Keywords; Direct focused metalinguistic, Grammatical accuracy, L2 writing class, L2 writing, Corrective feedback

Introduction

Writing is the process of thinking that creates the ideas, and expresses through the sentences paragraph, or essay form (Harmer, 2004; Nunan, 2003). Writing is regarded as an important skill contributing to learners' language learning (Cumming, 1995; Hyland, 2003); thus, it is one of basic components to English communication as it is used to interact in the written world.

Writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) context is challenging and has a complex process as it is considered as the most complicated skill to acquire for EFL learners. It is necessary that writers' mastery of various knowledge concerning the idea organization, grammar and vocabulary (Coffin, 2001; Zachariahs, 2007; Hyland, 2003). In order to complete a piece of writing; moreover, learners must be able to have ability to convert thoughts into text. In terms of linguistics, it is impossible for EFL learners to write in EFL properly without linguistic competence of grammar and vocabulary (Weigle, 2002); therefore, some EFL learners may find English writing a difficult task.

In EFL settings, grammatical problem seems to be a major obstacle of students' successful writing (Lee, 2005). For Indonesian students, the most frequently problem encountered is the grammatical errors (Basri&Ampa, 2013; Mardijono, 2003), ranging from the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, to singular-plural noun (Basri&Ampa, 2013; Hambali, 2011; Siminto, 2009; Mardijono, 2003). One way to help the students solve such grammatical problems is to inform them about their own grammatical errors (Paris, Ngonkum, &Deerajviset, 2016). Hence, giving corrective feedback is claimed an effective way as it allows the teacher point out student grammatical errors (Ebadi, 2014; Sheen, 2007).

It has been claimed that corrective feedback offers various advantages to the students' EFL writing; for instance, corrective feedback helps increase grammatical accuracy. Furthermore, some scholars (Nagode, Pižorn, and Juriševič, 2014; Ellis,

Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima, 2008; Sheen, 2007) postulated that written corrective feedback (WCF) is an effective tool in increasing greater grammatical accuracy. To be more specific, article is an obvious example of grammatical errors found in the EFL learners' compositions. This is in line with a study of Sheen, Wright, and Moldawa (2009) which revealed that corrective feedback significantly improved the students' accuracy of English articles in writing. Another grammatical point that could be improved by WCF is simple past tense (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005). The previous statement was in accordance to the study of Lam (2016) which investigated the effect of WCF on students' simple past tense improvement. The results revealed that WCF facilitated the students to correctly use the simple past tense significantly in new pieces of writing.

Another advantage of the corrective feedback is that it could enhance the students' awareness on their errors. There has been a claim that providing corrective feedback allows the students to become aware of their error (Sheen, 2007). One example of study was conducted by Ebadi (2014) which investigated the effect of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' essay writing ability. The result of this study revealed that written corrective feedback helped the students to be aware of their own errors as they could monitor themselves. It also indicated that when the students were aware of their error, it led to fewer errors in writing. This awareness will eventually help them to reach a successful writing correction.

There are many types of written corrective feedback including: direct, indirect, focused, unfocused, metalinguistic, electronic, and reformulation (Ellis, 2007). All of them offer different benefits. In that, direct written corrective feedback is an effective tool that helps the low English proficiency learners in revising their essays (Rustipa, 2014). Besides, it has been also claimed that focused written corrective feedback is an effective tool to promote the students' grammatical accuracy (Sheen, et al., 2009; Sheen, 2007). Further, metalinguistic written corrective feedback helps

the students to become aware of their errors (Sheen, 2007). Although there has been a claim that each of these feedbacks are effective tools for writing class, there has also been suggestion that the combination of certain types could help the students to enhance their writing accuracy (Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Ebadi, 2014).

The combination of corrective feedback also become interesting research topic as there are large number of studies investigating the combination of two types of corrective feedback (Diab, 2015; Ebadi, 2014; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Sheen, 2007). All of them offer the benefits beyond a single type of WCF. According to the claims, the combination of direct focused corrective feedback helps students to acquire targeted linguistic feature errors in writing particularly for the low level of English proficiency students (Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012). In regard to the combination of direct metalinguistic, it is stated that it helps the students become aware of the grammatical rules and improves the grammatical accuracy in writing (Diab, 2015; Sheen, 2007). Another combination of WCF is focused metalinguistic, a study of Ebadi (2014) revealed that having focused metalinguistic corrective feedback helps the students become aware of their error through the teachers' comment and acquire English grammatical rules from their errors.

In the context of grammatical errors of Indonesian, it is found that Indonesian students made many grammatical errors in their EFL writing. Specifically, the high frequent grammatical errors are ranging from the English articles, simple past tense, be auxiliary, and to singular-plural noun. In terms of the English article, a study of Siminto (2009) and Mardijono (2003) indicated that the Indonesian students have problem in using definite and indefinite articles. In line with the previous statement, Mardijono (2003) revealed that the errors are mostly the omission of indefinite article before a noun and the omission of the definite article where it is required. Regarding the simple past tense, Siminto (2009) and Mardijono (2003) reported that the students encountered grammatical problem in using the simple past tense. Particularly, the

students made error due to the omission of past tense inflection { *-ed1* } (Mardijono, 2003). Move on to the be auxiliary, Basri and Ampa (2013) indicated that Indonesian learners made grammatical errors in the use be auxiliary when composing a written product. The study indicated that the students' errors are misused and omission of be auxiliary (Basri&Ampa, 2013). Another grammatical error of Indonesian student is singular-plural noun. Basri and Ampa (2013) indicated that Indonesian students made grammatical error namely misuse of singular-noun. It is also indicated that the students making mistake in using plural nouns. This is in accordance with Siminto (2009) and Mardijono (2003), they agreed that most common error that the Indonesian students made in their writing is the use of singular-plural noun. The students' grammatical problem could be improved by using corrective feedback.

Thus, it is believed that the combination of direct, focused, metalinguistic written corrective feedback is applicable for Indonesian students as Indonesian students seem to have grammatical problems on the English articles, simple past tense, be auxiliary, and singular-plural noun. Providing focused WCF would help them to overcome these grammatical problems. Another reason is that the participants of the study were the low English proficiency learner. Direct WCF would be appropriate in helping them to revise their errors. Besides, metalinguistic WCF would help the students to be aware of their errors and they could learn grammatical rules from this feedback. Therefore, it would be appropriate for Indonesian students to improve their grammatical accuracy from this model.

This present study attempted to examine the effectiveness of combination of direct, focused, metalinguistic written corrective feedback on the students' writing accuracy improvement. In particular, it aimed to investigate how direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback could help the students overcome grammatical problem of freshman university students in Indonesia. The research question of this study was:

What are the effects of direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback on the EFL students' grammatical accuracy of Indonesian university students?

Literature Review

Written Corrective Feedback

Bitchener and Ferris (2012) defined written corrective feedback as a grammatical error correction. Such errors allow students to improve their performance (Loewen, 2012; Ur, 1996). Refers to definition mentioned, written corrective feedback is viewed as information provided to the students about a grammatical error that they have produced. This kind of feedback is used as indication of the language correction.

Written corrective feedback (WCF) is seen as the most common feedback form used nowadays in the English foreign language (EFL) classroom (Beuningen, de Jong, & Kuiken, 2012). It has included many researchers' attention and has become the core research as well as practices for teachers in writing (Beuningen, 2010). In Indonesian setting, written corrective feedback is the scholars' interest nowadays, and a number of scholars have conducted studies on written corrective feedback.

There are numerous types of written corrective feedback; these have been differently grouped by different scholars. However, the group which has been widely mentioned is Ellis (2007) in which six types of WCF are discussed. They are direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic, the focus of the feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation.

Starting off with the direct corrective feedback, it refers to providing feedback on the writer's text directly with provision of the correct form on a place of the errors. In providing the feedback, the errors might be cross out and inserting a missing word might also be performed.

Move on to indirect corrective feedback which is known as a frequent tool in correcting students' composition. Indirect corrective feedback refers to providing feedback indirectly on the writer's text. The feedback might be given in the form of notification with circling or underlining the errors. The errors might also be indicated by the provision of a note in the margin near the specific line without showing the exact place of an error.

Next, the metalinguistic corrective feedback refers to providing feedback by 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.

Another type of corrective feedback is focused and unfocused corrective feedback. Focused corrective feedback refers to providing feedback on the writer's text focusing on the targeted errors (e.g. the article errors); in the meantime, unfocused corrective feedback refers to providing feedback on variety or all of the students' grammatical errors.

Moreover, the electronic feedback is also used, it refers to providing feedback through an electronic assistance (e.g. computer). Last but not least, and the sixth type of corrective feedback is reformulation. It refers to providing feedback through reconstruction of the written text. It is estimated that the writer's text retains the idea. Such feedback provision is mostly conducted by a native speaker.

According to the written corrective feedback (WCF) types mentioned earlier, the present study highlights three types of WCF that work very well. They are direct, focused and metalinguistic corrective feedback. These types of WCF offer different benefits to EFL students. It is evident that direct written corrective feedback is an effective tool that helps the low English proficiency learners in revising their essays (Rustipa, 2014). One example of study related to direct WCF was conducted by Beuningan, de Jong, and Kuiken (2008) to investigate the effect of direct WCF on

the student' written accuracy. The results revealed that after receiving direct corrective feedback, the students made less error in their revisions. Another WCF type that benefits the EFL students is focused corrective feedback. The previous research concluded that focused written corrective feedback is effectively promote the students' grammatical accuracy (Sheen, et.al, 2009). Moreover, Lam (2016) investigated the effect of focused written corrective feedback and the results revealed that focused written corrective feedback indicated a higher effectiveness to increase the grammatical accuracy. Meanwhile, it has been stated that metalinguistic written corrective feedback helps the students become aware of their errors when it comes to metalinguistic (Sheen, 2007). Furthermore, a study of Ebadi (2014) investigated the effect of metalinguistic written corrective feedback on EFL learners' essay writing ability. The results of this study showed that metalinguistic written corrective feedback help the students be aware of their own errors as they could monitor themselves and this awareness leads them to make fewer error in writing.

All of these studies mentioned investigated the effect of written corrective feedback on the students' writing accuracy. Each of provided feedback on these studies was effective tools for writing class. However, there has been suggestion that the combination of certain types could help the students to enhance their writing accuracy (Diab, 2015; Farrokhi and Sattarpour, 2012; Ebadi, 2014; and Sheen, 2007). The present study investigated the effect of WCF on the students writing accuracy and combined three types (direct, focused, and metalinguistic) of WCF together. It was expected that the combination of three types of WCF would help the students overcome the grammatical problem in Indonesian context.

Direct Focused Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback

In the literature of WCF, it is found that there are numerous studies of a single type of written corrective feedback (i.e. Lam, 2016; Rustipa, 2015; Sheen

et al, 2009). Of all studies on WCF, the comparative studies on the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback were most highlighted (i.e. Tursina& Chuang, 2016; Kisananto, 2016; Rustipa, 2015; Wijayatiningsih, 2015; Rahimi&Asadi, 2014; Rustipa, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad, 2012; Beuningan, et.al, 2008; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005). The results of those studies confirm the effectiveness of the direct and indirect corrective feedback are effective tool that enhance students' L2 writing. In this case, it is noticed that direct corrective feedback benefits the low level of English proficiency students as it helps them revise their essay.

Another topic of investigation comes to the focused corrective feedback. Most research study's interest is on how it promotes student grammatical accuracy. For example, Lam (2016), Lertcheva (2014), Sheen et al. (2009), Ellis, et al. (2008) conducted the studies in order to compare the effectiveness of focused and unfocused corrective feedback. The results revealed that focused and unfocused corrective feedback were significantly effective method in providing written corrective feedback to the learners in promoting grammatical accuracy. In this respect, it is indicated that focused written corrective feedback has higher effectiveness compared to the unfocused one in EFL learners' context. Focused WCF proved to be more effective as the students could notice their errors in the written task. The students also might engage with multiple corrections of the targeted error(s). Besides, they could monitor their accuracy using their grammatical knowledge.

Metalinguistic corrective feedback is also an important research topic. It is seen helping the students become aware of their errors. There are numbers of scholars (i.e. Khah, 2016; Diab, 2015; Ebadi, 2014; Shintani and Ellis, 2013; and Sheen, 2007) who investigated the effectiveness of metalinguistic WCF comparing with any types (i.e. direct, direct metalinguistic) of WCF on the students' writing. The results of those studies revealed the effectiveness of metalinguistic feedback in enhancing

the students' awareness of the grammatical rules which in turn helped them correct their error.

Currently, not only the single type of corrective feedback, the combination of corrective feedback also become interesting research topic. There are many studies investigating the combination of two types of corrective feedback. The first pair of the corrective feedback was direct focused corrective feedback. Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2012) revealed that direct focused corrective feedback helps the students acquire the targeted linguistic feature errors in writing particularly for the low level of English proficiency students. The second pair of corrective feedback was direct metalinguistic corrective feedback. Diab (2015), Sheen (2007) revealed that direct metalinguistic corrective feedback helped the students become aware of the grammatical rules and improve the grammatical accuracy in writing. The third pair of corrective feedback was focused metalinguistic corrective feedback. Ebadi (2014) revealed that having focused metalinguistic corrective feedback helped the students become aware of their error through the teachers' comment and acquire English grammatical rules from their errors.

Based on the previous studies mentioned above, it proved that the combination of a pair of WCF is more effective than the provision of a single type of WCF. The present study combined three types of written corrective feedback: direct focused metalinguistic. The reasons were that these (three types of written corrective feedback) could work together as an indication of the errors' location targeting the particular linguistic errors as well as provision of brief grammatical explanation. It was hoped that this combination would enable the English language learners to improve their writing.

Methodology

The present study investigated the effectiveness of direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback on the EFL students' grammatical accuracy.

process of writing and outlining paragraph. The third section was types of paragraph. The narrative paragraph, the descriptive paragraph, and the expository paragraph were introduced. The fourth section was personal letters. The layout of personal letter, and punctuation were explained. The fifth section was types of personal letter. It included a letter to a friend, a letter of invitation, and a letter of application. The current study employed personal letter and chose a type of letter to a friend. The topic of the personal letters was telling a friend/parents about his/her experience. It was chosen as it allowed the students to use the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, and singular-plural noun when composing a personal letter.

4. Instrument

The research instruments in this study involved a writing prompt. The writing prompt was used to guide the participants in composing a writing task. The topic of the writing tasks (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest) was to express the student's experience being a university student to his/her best friend and or parents. The same topic was used in all writing test in order to compare the students' writing. The participants were expected to write 200–250 words in each test within 60 minutes of time period. (See appendix 1).

5. Data Collection

The current study took place in writing I course (ENG0412) at West Sulawesi University, Indonesia from August to December 2017 of academic year 2017/2018. To conduct the current study, the researcher collaborated with the teacher of writing I course (ENG0412). In doing so, the researcher and the teacher had a meeting to discuss any possibilities of conducting this current research, discussing the writing I course (ENG0412) curriculum, setting the writing task, clarifying the researcher and the teacher's responsibility and job, and specifying the procedure of collecting the data.

In the first stage, the writing course teacher was recruited as she was responsible in teaching writing courses at English Language Teaching Program. She also provided feedback for the students in her writing classes. In this current study, the writing course teacher was served to teach the students by using the curriculum of Writing I course (ENG0412) as she had the access to the class. This justification based on the study of Ferris, Liu, Sinha, and Senna (2013) which assigned only one teacher to teach the students. Another responsibility was assigning the writing tasks to the students. She was also in charged to assist the students in revising their grammatical errors in the classroom as she had already been trained by the researcher on how to provide as well as revise the grammatical errors. Apart from teaching, she was responsible for distributing the questionnaires.

In the meantime, the researcher was responsible for providing written corrective feedback to the students in this second stage. To do so, the students sent the writing task as well as the revision to the researcher via email as they lived in a different place after each writing task assigned by the teacher. In addition, the researcher played a role of the rater of the students' task due to logistical and methodological reasons. This justification was based on the study of Sheen et al. (2009); Mohammadi (2009), Sheen (2007) that used only the main researcher as the rater.

6. Direct Focused Metalinguistic Model

The corrective feedback provided for the participants was in the form of direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback. It indicated the location of the error which targeted linguistic feature errors and it also provided a brief grammatical explanation. In that, focused WCF was provided through the provision of correction on the targeted linguistic error including the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, and singular-plural noun. Direct WCF indicated through the provision of error's location which pointed out directly; while, metalinguistic WCF was shown through the provision of correction that used grammatical explanation on the bottom of the students' writing in which numbered and explained based on the kinds of errors.

7. Research Procedure

Table 1 presents the research procedure.

Table 1 Research Procedure

Week	Session	DFM	Writing Topic
1	Pretest	Writing task #1	Experience being a university student
2		Writing task #2	Last holiday
3		Feedback and revision for task #2/writing task #3	Last IdulFitri or IdulAdha/Christmas
4		Feedback and revision for task #3/writing task #4	Unforgettable experience
5	Immediate posttest	Feedback and revision for task #4/writing task #5	Experience being a university student
10	Delayed posttest	Writing task #6	Experience being a university student

All the participants wrote six writing tasks. They were expected to write 200–250 words. They were also given an hour (60 minutes) to complete each. Writing task #1 was assigned as a pre-test and no feedback provided. For writing task #2 to writing task #4, the participants then received correction on their grammatical errors including the English articles, simple past tense, be auxiliary, and singular–plural noun. They were given 30 minutes to revise the previous written task before completing the new one. Writing task #5 was assigned as an immediate posttest and the feedback was no longer provided. Finally, writing task #6 was conducted four weeks after the immediate posttest. This task was assigned as a delayed posttest, no feedback provided.

8. Data Analysis

The grammatical accuracy scores were counted from the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest. To score the participants' grammatical accuracy in the compositions, the rater first totaled the number of grammatical errors, then divided the errors by the total number of words in the task and times ten (number of errors/ number of words $\times 10$). This scoring system was previously used by some researchers (e.g. Sheen, et al., 2009;Pariyanto, 2017) in order to measure overall accuracy of the writing task. Nonetheless, for easy identification and easy interpretation, the following formula (10 – the generated scores = accuracy scores) was used. In other words, the higher the scores, the more accurate the students' writing is interpreted (Pariyanto, 2017).After that, the scores obtained by the participants were put onto the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) software. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in analyzing the data of the current research. Additionally, descriptive statistics provides information on the mean and standard deviation of each score on the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest.

Results

There were forty-three (43) freshman university students enrolled in Writing I course (ENG0412). They are majoring in English Language Teaching, Faculty of Social and Political Science at West Sulawesi University, Indonesia. However, some of the data from the participants were excluded as they missed either pretest, immediate posttest, delayed posttest, or writing tasks. There were thirty-six (36) students who completed all the three tests and writing tasks. The students' grammatical accuracy scores on the accurate use of the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, and singular-plural noun were obtained from the students' writing.

Table 2 shows the students' grammatical accuracy in the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest.

Table 2 The students' grammatical accuracy

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	36	9.31	.31
Immediate posttest	36	9.61	.18
Delayed posttest	36	9.68	.15

Table 2 shows the comparison of the students' grammatical accuracy on the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest. One-way ANOVA was performed with the students' grammatical accuracy scores as a dependent variable within three times (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest).

Based on the study results, both the posttests (immediate and delayed posttests) were outperformed the pretest. As you can see from the results, the students' grammatical accuracy scores increased after receiving direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback. Furthermore, it was evident that the delayed posttest was superior to immediate posttest as they could write better in the delayed posttest.

Table 3 shows the percentage of the students' grammatical errors in the pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest. It presents the average number of the words produced by the students, the number of the errors as well as the percentage of each the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, and singular-plural noun. The percentage of the errors was obtained from the total number of grammatical errors divided by the total number of the words multiplied by one hundred (number of errors/ total number of words x 100).

	N	Average of words	Number of Errors (%)				
			Articles	Past	Noun	Aux	Total
Pretest	36	160	95 (1.65%)	164 (2.85%)	17 (0.30%)	131 (2.28%)	407 (7.07%)
Immediate posttest	36	253	67 (0.73%)	143 (1.57%)	33 (0.36%)	104 (1.14%)	347 (3.80%)
Delayed posttest	36	257	64 (0.67%)	119 (1.24%)	14 (0.15%)	105 (1.09%)	302 (3.15%)

In addition, the data showed the frequency of the students' grammatical errors on each type: the English articles, be auxiliary, past tense, and singular-plural noun. The most frequent errors produced by the participants were simple past tense. They made 2.85% grammatical errors of simple past tense on the pretest. It then decreased to 1.57% on the immediate posttest. Finally, it reduced to 1.24% on the delayed posttest. Move on to the second frequent errors which was be auxiliary, the students made 2.28% grammatical errors of be auxiliary on the pretest. It then decreased to 1.14% on the immediate posttest. Finally, it reduced to 1.09% on the delayed

posttest. Next, the third frequent errors was the English articles: the students made 1.65% grammatical errors of the English articles on the pretest. It then decreased to 0.73% on the immediate posttest. Finally, it reduced to 0.67% on the delayed posttest. Last, the least frequent errors were singular-plural noun. The students made 0.30% grammatical errors of singular-plural noun on the pretest. It then increased slightly to 0.36%. Finally, it reduced to 0.15% on the delayed posttest.

Discussion

The research investigated the effect of direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback on the EFL students' grammatical accuracy. The data presented above indicated that Indonesian university students performed better in grammatical accuracy after receiving direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback. Besides, there was significant difference in the students' score on grammatical accuracy across the three tests (pretest, immediate posttest, and delayed posttest). The mean (9.31) on the pretest increased to (9.61) on the immediate posttest, while the immediate posttest increased to (9.68) on the delayed posttest. Based on the study results, the students gained more accuracy in the immediate posttest. In other words, the students could improve their grammatical accuracy score and they could write better after being given feedback. It is also worth mentioning that students did better in the delayed posttest when being compared with their performance in the immediate posttest. This might be because the students have learnt the grammar from the feedback. They could even be able to retain their grammatical knowledge and could still use it in the delayed posttest. This phenomenon demonstrated that the students' grammatical accuracy improved as they produced fewer errors in writing. Once the grammatical accuracy score improved, the students produced fewer grammatical errors. This is in line with Ebadi (2014) which revealed that written corrective feedback leads the students to have fewer errors in writing. The results of this current study were also

As you can see in the results that the students' grammatical accuracy improved as they could decrease their grammatical errors. Overall, the data showed the students' grammatical errors decreased from 7.07% to 3.15%. It proved that there was a decreasing of the students' grammatical errors as the students had fewer grammatical errors in writing. This result was in line with a study of Ebadi (2014) that written corrective feedback leads the students to have fewer errors in writing as they can learn English grammar rules from their own errors by applying their grammatical knowledge in writing.

The data particularly indicated that there was an improvement of the students' grammatical accuracy in the use of the English articles, be auxiliary, simple past tense, and singular-plural noun. In terms of the English article, the students' grammatical errors decreased from (1.65%) to (0.67%). The results were in accordance with several scholars: Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2012), Sheen, et al. (2009), and Sheen (2007) who postulated that providing written corrective feedback helps the students improve the grammatical accuracy of the English articles in a piece of writing. In respect with be auxiliary, there was a decreasing of grammatical error in the use this grammatical point. It reduced from (2.28%) to (1.09%). Moreover, the results were in line with Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2012), Sheen, et al. (2009) who revealed that written corrective feedback enhances the students to mastery in the accurate use of be auxiliary. When it comes to the simple past tense, it could be seen

from the obtained data that the reduction of the simple past tense was from (2.85%) to (1.24%). The results above were supported by a number of studies; for instance, Lam (2016), Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad, (2012), Bitchener et al. (2005) claimed that written corrective feedback facilitate the students to use the simple past tense with significantly greater accuracy in new pieces of writing or drafts. Turn to the underlying the singular-plural noun, the data showed the reduction of this grammatical error from (0.30%) to (0.15%). This results were in line with Bitchener, East, and Cartner (2010) which claimed that written corrective feedback is effective in helping the students improve the accuracy of singular-plural noun in a new pieces of writing.

The data from the delayed posttest offers a clear picture of how students could still write with accurate grammar (the mean of the immediate posttest (9.61) and (9.68) on the delayed posttest). This phenomenon exhibits that the students' ability to conduct a written text with accurate grammar even when no more feedback provided for few weeks. This is in line with a report from study of Sheen, et al. (2009) which revealed that focused written corrective feedback enhanced the grammatical accuracy in both short and long term. From this, it could be stated that the students could retain their grammatical knowledge after classes had already finished. Drawing the data, the students could perform better writing until the delayed posttest. In summary, it could be strongly stated that direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback had a significant effect on the improvement of Indonesian university students' grammatical accuracy. This phenomenon displays that the students' grammatical accuracy improvement is resulted from their acquisition of the grammatical rules.

Conclusions

It could be concluded from data analysis that direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback offered the grammatical accuracy of the students. The results revealed that the students' grammatical accuracy increased after receiving

feedbacks. This phenomenon could offer a picture that once students acquire grammar points, they will perform better in their writing accuracy. They are less likely to produce grammatical errors. In regard to the effect of the feedback, it is also evident that the students retained their grammatical accuracy even no more feedback provided.

Overall, it could be further stated that direct focused metalinguistic written corrective feedback is one of the most effective writing tools for the Indonesian university students for the improvement of the students' grammatical accuracy. The results of the study could be beneficial for writing teachers. They might consider to combine the types of written corrective feedback especially the combination of direct focused metalinguistic in their L2 writing instruction.

References

- Basri, D. M., & Ampa, A. T. (2013). Syntactic errors in descriptive paragraphs by native Indonesian speaking students of English. **International Journal of Linguistics**, 5 (5), 125–137.
- Beuningen, C. V., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. **Language Learning**, 62 (1), 1–41.
- Beuningen, C. V. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. **International Journal of English Studies**, 10(2), 1–27.
- Beuningen, C. V., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. **ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics**, 156, 279–296.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). **Written Corrective Feedback in Second language Acquisition and Writing**. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

- Bitchener, J., East, M., & Cartner, H. (2010). **The effectiveness of providing second language (L2) writers with online written corrective feedback.** New Zealand: An AkoAotearoa publication, 1–12.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 14, 191–205.
- Coffin, C. (2001). Theoretical approaches to written language—A TESOL perspective. In A.
- Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), **Analysing English in a global context**, 93–122. London: Routledge.
- Cumming, A. (1995). Fostering writing expertise in ESL composition instruction: Modeling and evaluation. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), **Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research & pedagogy**. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Diab, N. M. (2015). Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: does type of error and type of correction matter? **Assessing Writing**, 24, 16–34.
- Ebadi, E. (2014). The effect of focused meta-linguistic written corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' essay writing ability. **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**, 5 (4), 878–883.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. **System**, 36, 353–371.
- Ellis, R. (2007). A typology of written corrective feedback types. **ELT Journal**, 62 (2), 97–107.
- Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2012). The effects of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high- proficient L2 learners. **World Journal of Education**, 2 (2), 49–57.

- Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 22, 307–329.
- Hambali, M. (2011). Investigating grammatical errors in translation. **Proceeding: The 1st International ELT Conference Pains and Gains: New Trends in ELT**, 11–21.
- Harmer, J. 2004. **How to Teach Writing**. Malaysia: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hashemnezhad, H., & Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A case for direct and indirect feedback: the other side of coin. **English Language Teaching**, 5 (3), 230– 239.
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. **Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science**, 98, 668–674.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. **Language Teaching**, 39, 83–101.
- Hyland, K. (2003). **Second language writing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Khah, Y. A. (2016). A comparative study of the impact of metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction on the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. **Journal of Studies in Education**, 6 (2), 132–114.
- Kisnanto, Y. P. (2016). The effect of written corrective feedback on higher education students' writing accuracy. **Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra**, 16 (2), 121–131.
- Lam, L. T. (2016). **The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on the accurate use of tenses in Hong Kong primary ESL context**. [Unpublished]. Hongkong: The Education University of Hongkong Library.

- Lee, S. (2005). Facilitating and inhibiting factors in English as a foreign language writing performance: A model testing with structural equation. **Journal of Language Learning**, 52 (2), 335–374.
- Lertcheva, N. (2014). **Focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on tenses and other types of errors**. [Master Thesis in English Language and Literature]. Singapore: National University of Singapore.
- Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.). **The Routledge Handbook of Second Language Acquisition**, 24–40. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.
- Mardijono, J. J. (2003). Indonesian EFL Advanced Learners' Grammatical Errors. **K@ta**, 5(1), 67–90.
- Mohammadi, M. (2009). Recast and metalinguistic feedback in teaching and learning L2 writing: a comparative study. **The Journal of Asia TEFL**, 6 (3), 227–244.
- Nagode, G. P., Pižorn, K., & Juriševič, M. (2014). The role of written corrective feedback in developing writing in L2. **English Language and Literature Teaching**, 11 (2), 89–98.
- Nunan, D. (2003). **Practical English Language Teaching**. Singapore: McGraw Hill.
- Paris, N., Ngonkum, S., & Deerajviset, P. (2016). Teacher's feedback in Indonesian's English writing. **Proceedings: The 63rd TEFLIN International Conference**, 683–691.
- Pariyanto. (2017). The effect of corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy in the writing of EFL university students. [Doctoral Dissertation in English Language Teaching]. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Rahimi, M. & Asadi, E. (2014). Effect of different types of written corrective feedback on accuracy and overall quality of L2 learners' writing. **European Journal of Academic Essays**, 1 (6), 1–7.

- Rustipa, K. (2015). The Benefit of Indirect Comprehensive Error Corrections in Improving Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. **Proceedings: The 2nd International Language and Language Teaching Conference**, 551-557.
- Rustipa, K. (2014). The effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving EFL learners' hortatory exposition writing. **Proceedings: The 61st TEFLIN International Conference**, 625-628.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. **System**, 37, 556-569.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. **Tesol Quarterly**, 41 (2), 255-283.
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, E. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 22: 286-306.
- Siminto (2009). Grammatical errors in the students' thesis abstract (a study on the students' enhancement in English grammar). **Jurnal Studi Agama dan Masyarakat**. 3(2), 100-125.
- Tursina, P., & Chuang, M. (2016). Direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students' writing performance. **Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC) in conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU)**, 209-214.

- Ur, P. (1996). **A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weigle, S.C. (2002). **Assessing Writing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wijayatiningsih, T. D. (2015). Direct corrective feedback on students' writing performance. 4th *ELTLT International Conference Proceedings*, 873–880.
- Zacharias, N.T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. **RELJ Journal**, 38 (1), 38–52.

THE AUTHOR(S)

Nirma Paris is a Master of Arts (M.A.) in English student of KhonKaen University, Thailand. She received a bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching from SekolahTinggi Agama Islam Negeri (STAIN) Parepare. She is interested in teaching and learning strategies, corrective feedback, collaborative learning, and second language (L2) writing.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

SutidaNgonkum is an assistant professor in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, KhonKaen University, Thailand. She is currently a senior lecturer in the English Program. Her main interests are teaching and learning strategies & techniques, autonomous learning, collaborative learning, and pragmatics.

Appendix 1: A sample of the essay writing prompt

Essay 1 Writing Prompt

Direction

Please write a personal letter in English of approximately 200–250 words on the following topic:

“Telling your best friend/parents your experience being a university student”.

Your essay must be typed and saved in Microsoft Office Word. Use the standard, 12 pt Times New Roman font size, double-spaced format. To complete the essay, you are given 60 minutes. When you have finished writing, please save it using your name and type of test (for example, AMINAH_essay 1).

Your essay will be read and graded by the researcher. However, you do not need to worry as the accuracy of your writing will not influence your score of writing I course. The most important thing is that you do your best on your writing essay.

Thank you for your participation.