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Abstract
The effect of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing is a strategy that effectively facilities in learning English. The students can be more aware with the errors that they made in their writing product and will not write the errors repeatedly. The method used in this study was pre-experimental design and it was conducted in one of Islamic High School in Garut class X IPA 1. Written test was given to every students of the class to find out students’ writing achievement before and after have been given treatments. Beside that the interview was conducted to gather more information about students’ responses toward the strategy. Based on the findings that the value of $t_{observed}$ ($17.372$) > $t_{critical}$ ($2.045$) it can be define that $t_{observed}$ was out of Ho area and it meant that Ha was accepted. Therefore, it was concluded that using teacher’s corrective feedback significantly affected students’ achievement in writing text.
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INTRODUCTION
Writing provides a vehicle for communication; therefore, writing is considered to be an essential skill for people, especially for the language learner. According to Meyers (2005) writing is a way to produce language naturally. Writing is speaking to other on paper – or on a computer screen. Writing is also an action – a process of discovering and organizing your ideas, putting them on a piece of paper and reshaping and revising them. Thus, mastery of writing becomes a great need for all of people to convey their thoughts, ideas, and facts when communicating in written form.

Nevertheless, many students have difficulty in writing. Sometimes they may understand what the teacher means but they are not able to deliver it well in the written form. It is in line with Browns’ (2001) statement that written products are often the result of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skills, skills that not every speaker develops naturally. Students fail to share and develop their opinion and their knowledge when writing a text. In addition, many students either think or say that they cannot, or do not want to write because they lack confidence, they think it is boring or believe they have ‘nothing to say’ (Harmer, 2007). This facts indicate that the necessity of developing students writing skill is challenging.

As a consequence, teachers need to offer guidance in helping students write better; the guidance is then called feedback. Feedback is information that is provided to students about whether or not their production and interpretation of language is appropriate (Cameron, 2001).

However, as Lewis (2000) stated teacher knows that the effective aspects of feedback can be as important as the factual aspects. They also know that students sometimes misunderstand the teacher’s feedback. Feedback can be like conversation.
between learner and teacher, and in the case of conversation, things can sometimes go wrong. To this point, teachers needs to ensure that the students get the appropriate feedback from the teacher so that they will understand and can be enthusiastic in writing the text. One of the appropriate feedbacks is corrective feedback, information about what is ungrammatical or unacceptable; a response from an addressee to a speaker and writer with an intention to correct their erroneous (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006 in Leiter 2010). By using corrective feedback, students are expected can improve their writing products because they will know the mistakes in their writing.

Regarding the background above, this study investigates the effectiveness of teacher’s corrective feedback in improving students’ writing skill.

Speaking
The Nature of Writing
Verbal communication activity is a process of producing texts both spoken and written. In the context of language learning, it is commonly believed that to communicate in a written form (writing) is more difficult than orally (speaking). Brown (2001) suggested the process of writing requires an entirely different set of competencies and fundamentally different from speaking. In writing process, writers employ graphic symbols when they write such as letters or combination of letters that connect with the sounds they produce when they communicate (Byrne, 1988 in Emilia, 2014). In other words, writing is more than producing sound productions into written forms of symbols. The symbols should be arranged in accordance with certain form to build sentences.

The nature of writing can also be defined as both physical and mental activity that is aimed to express and impress (Nunan, 2003). It is categorized as the physical activity because a writer is required to be able to do the act of committing words and ideas. As a mental work, the activities of writing focus more on the act of inventing ideas, thinking about how to express and organize them into clear statements and paragraphs that enable a reader to understand the ideas of the written work. Therefore, writing is an activity to improve our understanding of any subject. Writing is the ability not only to put ideas from mind to paper but also to produce more meaning and make the ideas clear.

Writing Process
Writing in all of its dimensions has gained considerable position in human’s life. As Patel and Jain (2008) stated “Writing is essential feature of learning a language because it provides a very good means of foxing the vocabulary, spelling, and sentences pattern” (p.125). However, it is possible to get barriers in writing process. People have to do several steps of revision in producing a final product. According to Brown (2001), “Writing allow the very process of putting ideas down on paper to transform thoughts into words, to sharpen your main ideas, to give them structure and coherent organization”.

Furthermore, Harmer (2007) in the process of writing, it involves planning what we are going to write, drafting it, reviewing and editing what we have written and then producing a final (and satisfactory) version. Writing process as a classroom activity that incorporates those four basic stages is seen as a recursive process. It has cycle which integrates among stages.

Teaching Writing
Teaching encompasses what teachers do in helping their students learn and perform the task. It means teaching as the imparting of knowledge or skill; the giving instruction. According to Nunan (1989) a process approach in writing sees the act of composing from
a different perspective, or focusing as much on itself. Nevertheless, the process approach also focuses on the steps involving drafting and redrafting a piece of work. In other words, on this process approach, the important one is not only in the product, but also in the writing process. Thus, the process approach can be developed through writing practices routinely with effective activities also a better input to improve the students’ writing skill.

Therefore, this study is emphasizes the implementation of teacher’s corrective feedback in teaching writing skill. This implementation is expected to create an effective activities also be a meaningful input through students’ writing skill as a routine practices.

Definition of Feedback
Feedback is information that is provided to students about whether or not their production and interpretation of language is appropriate (Cameron, 2001). Feedback encompasses not only correcting students, but also offering them an assessment of how well they have done, whether during a drill or after a longer language production exercise (Harmer, 2007). In other words, feedback appears to help improve, revise, and edit his or her writing contents, organizational pattern, grammatical structures, and appropriate words choices.

The importance of feedback in writing
Feedback is an activity in which there is interactions between learners and their peers or their teacher, where the purpose is to encourage positive changes in subsequent writing (Ravand & Rasekh, 2011). To the extent that feedback becomes as an important part of teaching and learning process. It means that we need to regard feedback (whether it is in written, oral or any other form) as two-way (and sometimes multi-way) process. In sum, the feedback is very crucial in improving students’ ability whether in the written or oral form. It is line with Purnawarman (2011) that feedback can improve students’ attention on the subject they are writing because students who receive feedback will pay more attention to what they have written which exceed their ability or knowledge and or their written does not meet certain standard.

Types of corrective feedback
This following is a typology of options for correcting linguistic errors (Ellis, 2008). Those are:

1. **Direct CF**
The teacher provides the student with the correct form. This can take a number of different forms – crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form.

2. **Indirect CF**
The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. Two types of indirect CF, namely:
   a). Indicating + locating the error. This takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show omissions in the student’s text.
   b). Indication only. This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.

3. **Metalinguistic CF**
The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error. There are types of metalinguistic CF:
   a). Use of error code. Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. WW ¼ wrong word; art ¼ article).
b). Brief grammatical descriptions. Teacher numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.

4. **The focus of the feedback**

This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students’ errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options. There are types of focus of the feedback:

a). Unfocused CF: Unfocused CF is extensive. Teachers can elect to correct all of the students’ errors, in which case the CF is unfocused. Processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the learner is required to attend to a variety of errors and thus is unlikely to be able to reflect much on each error.

b). Focused CF: Focused CF is intensive. Alternatively they can select specific error types for correction. For example, in the above examples the teacher could have chosen to correct just article errors. Focused CF may prove more effective as the learner is able to examine multiple corrections of a single error and thus obtain the rich evidence they need to both understand why what they wrote was erroneous and to acquire the correct form.

5. **Electronic feedback**

The teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of correct usage.

6. **Reformulation**

This consists of a native speaker’s reworking of the students’ entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study applied a quantitative research method for some considerations. First of all, this study has characteristics of quantitative research as stated by Creswell (2009) quantitative research is a means of testing objective theories by examining the relationship among variables. These variables, in turn, can be measured on instruments, so that numbered data can be analyzed by using statistical procedures. This study were conducted to find out whether one variable influence another variable.

Regarding the use of quantitative method, this study conducted a pre-experimental with pre-test-post-test as the research design. This design was chosen because this study involved a group of students to be given treatment and used pre-test-post-test to analyze the result of its treatment. Cohen, Maninon, and Marrison (2007) said that pre-experimental with group pre-test-post-test design involved one group of students to measure by treatment with a pre-test and post-test for a single group. In this study, the pre-test was used to measure students’ writing skill before using teacher’s corrective feedback and the post-test was used to measure the students’ writing skill after using teacher’s corrective feedback.

**FINDINGS**

This study discovered some findings that related to the main objectives of this research there were to investigate whether or not significant effect of using teacher’s corrective feedback in teaching writing, to discover how far teacher’s corrective feedback can improve students in their writing skill and to find out students’ responses toward the use of teacher’s corrective feedback in teaching writing.

From the analyzing the data, it was found that the average score of pre-test, the test
before the students had been given teacher’s corrective feedback, was 55.26 and the average score of post-test, the test after the students had been given teacher’s corrective feedback, was 63.14. It indicated that students’ score in post-test have significant improvement on their writing product. Furthermore, after comparing the result of the test between pre-test and post-test, it obtained $t_{observed} = 9.0898$. By applying significant level 5%, it was found that $t_{critical} = 2.0452$. The result showed that $t_{observed} > t_{critical} = 9.0898 > 2.0452$. The $t_{observed}$ lied in the rejection area of $H_0$. It summary, teacher’s corrective feedback have significant effect to improve students writing skill.

**DISCUSSION**

This research also was to find out the students’ responses toward the use of teacher’s corrective feedback in teaching writing. The result of interview showed that most of the interviewees felt enjoy, happy, enthusiasm and also motivated using this technique to improve their writing ability. They told that teacher’s corrective feedback is very advantageous as it made them know what errors that they made. Furthermore, they became aware that errors existed in their writing product. When they could understand what their mistakes are, they would able to revise it. Then, through teacher’s corrective feedback, closeness between teacher and students happened. There were no distance from the students to ask the teacher. Additionally, by giving corrective feedback, they would not repeat the same errors in next writing product. Consequently, they got motivation to write better. Furthermore, this point was likely to lead the students to enrich their knowledge that they did not know before. By giving teacher’s corrective feedback, it also could encourage the students to immediately look for the meanings in the dictionary. If the students do this more often, their vocabulary mastery and their knowledge will gradually be increased.

**CONCLUSION**

This study was conducted to the tenth-graders in one of Islamic high school in Garut. Having analyzed the whole data which were obtained, it can be concluded then that the null hypothesis in this study was rejected; this means that teacher’s corrective feedback is proven to be effective in elevating students’ score in writing, especially in descriptive text. Additionally, to elaborate the two major findings above, variety of students’ responses about the technique were also unveiled from the interview. First, Teacher’s corrective feedback is considered very effective since it provides the place for the students to know the errors they made. This also draws another advantages for them; teacher’s corrective feedback made the students can store new key words or vocabularies which may be used for correcting students’ mistake. Second, the technique makes the students more enthusiastic in learning English; they felt happy because the teacher appreciated their work and they can learn their previous mistakes as the learning process. It meant that they will not write the same mistake in future writing product.
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