



Proceedings

The 2nd International Language and Language Teaching Conference

Friday-Saturday, 25-26 September 2015
at Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**English Language Education
Sanata Dharma University**

Jl. Affandi, Mrican, Caturtunggal
Depok, Sleman
Yogyakarta 55281
(+62)274-513301



LLT JOURNAL
A JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE, LINGUISTICS, AND TEACHING



PROCEEDINGS

The 2nd International Language and Language Teaching Conference

25-26 September 2015

**English Language Education
Sanata Dharma University**

Jl. Affandi, Mrican, Caturtunggal
Depok, Sleman
Yogyakarta 55281
(+62)274-513301



LLT JOURNAL

LLTC

PROCEEDINGS

The 2nd International Language and Language Teaching Conference

Editors

Christina Kristiyani, S.Pd., M.Pd.

C. Tutyandari, S.Pd., M.Pd.

Barli Barm, Ph.D.

Yuseva Ariyani Iswandari, S.Pd., M.Ed.

Laurentia Sumarni, S.Pd., M.Trans.St.

Truly Almendo Pasaribu, S.S., M.A.

Published by

English Language Education Study Program

Sanata Dharma University

Jl. Affandi, Mrican Catur Tunggal Depok Sleman Yogyakarta 55281

Telp: (0274) 513301, 515352 ext. 1131

ISBN 978-602-18681-9-5

Preface

The Organizing Committee are delighted to present the proceedings of the Second International Language and Language Teaching Conference (2nd LLTC), whose main theme is English as a Second Language (ESL) Teaching in the 21st Century: Research and Trends. There are 87 full papers in the compilation, covering various topics in language learning-teaching, linguistics and literature, mostly related to the English language. As an academic forum, LLTC is organized by the English Language Education Study Programme of Sanata Dharma University or *Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (Prodi PBI) Universitas Sanata Dharma (USD) Yogyakarta*. It is expected that all complete papers in the proceedings will enrich our knowledge and broaden our insights into language learning-teaching, linguistics and literature.

Editors

Table of Contents

Preface	i
Learners' Intercultural Competence as Communicative Competence in Teaching English for Young Learners	1
Agnes Widyaningrum	
Developing Reading Strategy Training guidebook for Senior High School Level	11
Alfan Zuhairi and Nurul Afidah	
Teaching and Learning Method in Inclusive Classroom: A Case Study in EAP Class at Sampoerna University	17
Anddy Steven, Athifah Utami, Rangga Akbar Sahidin, and Victor HutomoDesetyadi	
Language Problems with Special Reference to Bodo Language in North-East India	29
Araiswrag Basumatary	
Culture Immersion in Molding the Novice EFL Teachers' Identity	35
ArcciTusita, Nurul Laili Nadhifah, and Ive Emaliana	
Assisted Final Project of Developing Tutorial Video: Strategy to Improve the Non-English Department Students' Language Skills through Meaningful Activities	43
Arum Puspitasari	
A Study of Experiential Learning in the Teaching of Drama	49
Ayu Liskinasih	
Designing English Material for Psychology: A Case Study	55
Azhar Aziz Lubis, Fitria Muji Pratawati, and Ardhian Suseno	
Headwords and Hyponymy Consistencies of Vegetable Definitions	59
Barli Bram and Hernita Ratna Aulia	
Developing Language Assessment Literacy: Its Importance and Implication	71
Dang Arif Hartono	
Meaning Negotiation in Conversational Interactions: A Method to Create Language Environment in the Classroom	75
Denok Sari Saputri and Yulia Isnanini	
A Study of Students' Attribution for Success and Failure in Speaking English	91
Dian Puisi	
The Implementation of Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI) in Order to Improve Students' Reading Comprehension	97
DitaSurwanti	
Correlating Communicative Language Teaching with Character Education in English Teaching ..	105
Dodi Siraj Muamar Zain	
English Contents or Contents in English to Help ESP Students Improve English Communicative Ability	113
Dominique Savio Nsengiyumva	
A Comparative Account of Communicative Dynamism among Three Versions of <i>The Lord</i>	123

<i>Prayer: English, Indonesian, and Javanese</i>	
Emanuel Sunarto	
Politeness Strategies of <i>CekGu Jasmine</i> on “ <i>UpindanIpin (English Version)</i> ” Cartoon Movie in Episode “ <i>When I Grow Up</i> ”	133
Eka Anggia Rini	
Integrating Internet-based Technology in a Foreign Language Teaching: Fostering Students’ Outcome	141
EkaWahjuningsih	
Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Teaching English Writing and Its Challenges in the Indonesian Context	149
Faisal	
English Code-Mixing in Four Age-Based Indonesian Magazines	163
Nabila Muliawati	
Assessment in EAP English Literature Courses	171
Neil Conway	
Code Switching of Cross Caste’s Marriage in Balinese Family	177
Ni Putu Isha Aprinica	
Acquiring A Second Language: Siblings’ Influence and Parental Help	183
Novi Rahayu Restuningrum	
A Semantic Study of English:Verb–Noun Functional Shift	193
Nurvita Wijayanti and Gatri Asti PutriIndarti	
Undergraduate Students’ Problems in Writing a Research Paper: An Analysis of the Causes	201
Nuur InsanTangkalangi and Widyasari	
Relevance to the Detriment of Accuracy: The Future of the Writing Skill	207
Oscar Ndayizeye	
Teachers’ Beliefs about the Curriculum 2013 Implementation in their Classrooms	215
Veronica Triprihatmini and Agustinus Hardi Prasetyo	
The Use of Ice Breakers in English Learning and Teaching	227
Ramea Agus Purnama	
Cultural Analysis on Attitudes toward MALL in Higher Education: a Case Study	233
Risa Rumentha Simanjuntak	
Traditional Media Still Exist in Digital Era: Maximizing Pictures In TEFL	241
Rizky Amelia	
Exploring Language Learning Strategy Use and Its Relation to Academic Self-Concept: The Case of Indonesian EFL Students	249
Rosyi Amrina	
The Beliefs and Practices of ESL Teachers about Teaching High-Order Thinking Skills	259
Sanmuganathan Nagayar, Azianbt.Abd, and Mangala Nayahi Kanniah	
The Impacts of Immersion For Learning English: A Comparative Study of Private Junior-High School Students in Surabaya, Indonesia	271

Singgih Widodo Limantoro

Improving Students' Speaking Achievement in Expressing Offering by Using Role Play Technique	279
Siti Nurhayati, Sri Utari, Syarah Aisha, Saidatul Hanim, Enda C. Nora Ginting, and Arief Muadz	
Using Lectora Inspire to Develop and Arrange Students' Comprehend in Reading Narrative Text	285
Sofa Sofiatun Nufus	
Improving Students Writing Ability Through Jigsaw: A Classroom Action Research at The English Education Department, Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta	291
Soviyah	
Using of Explicit Instruction Method in Improving Students' Grammar Ability in Simple Present Tense at Class X ³ of SMA Negeri 4 Leihitu	297
Stella R. Que and Ayu Aprilya S. Abdullah	
Evaluative Analysis of the Implementation of Mobile-Web Application System to Improve Academic English Writing Skills	303
Sugeng Purwanto	
Exploring Communication Strategies Used by English and Non-English Major Students.....	311
Tanvir Hossain and Zhang Suting	
Nonverbal Communications Done By The Native Speakers in the Interview of Cross Cultural Understanding (CCU) Project at the Sixth Semester Students of English Education Program of Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo in the Academic Year 2014/2015	319
Titi Rokhayati	
Cognitive Linguistic Analysis of Polysemy Lexeme CUT	329
Truly Almendo Pasaribu	
Inquiry Based English Learning to Foster Metacognitive Skill	339
Tusino	
English Teachers' Strategies in Assessing The Students' Learning Performance Based on 2013 Curriculum	345
Ummu Syahidah	
Using Arts in English Classes to Promote Writing to First Year College Students	355
Sri Rejeki Murtiningsih	
Scaffolding: Teacher-students Interaction in the Initial Lesson of ESL Classroom	363
Valentina Siwi Nugroho Widhi	
Senior Support Programmeamong Lower Levels of English Proficiency Students in an English Improvement Programme	369
Vikineswaran A. Maniam, Phang Siew Sia, Marshall Kennedy, and Natalie Canham	
Students' Perceptions of the Importance of Integrating the Target Culture using ELT Authentic Materials	379
Widyasari, Nur Insan Takelang, and Diah Safithri Armin	
Using Facebook with Process Writing Strategy to Enhance the Teaching of Recount Text	391
Wihda Nadia Silcha and Francisca Maria Ivone	

Using Edmodo as Modern Technology to enhance the Students' English Language Skills	
Yusawinur Barella	
The Effects of Literature Discussion in EFL Book Report Class	407
Yuseva Ariyani Iswandari	
Empowering New Writers with Revising Technique	415
Mega Wati	
Needs Analysis to Develop an ESP Syllabus for Biology Students: A Task-Based Approach	421
Meti Rahmawati and Rosyida Asmaul Husna	
Teaching Character and Point of View to Enhance Students' Understanding: A Study in Prose Class	429
Mia Fitria Agustina	
Using E-Learning of Jenderal Soedirman University (El-Diru®) to Teach Grammar: Students' Perspective	437
Mia Fitria Agustina, Ririn KurniaTrisnawati, and Agus Spto Nugroho	
Teaching Critical Writing by Using Peer-Editing Technique	449
Miftahul Janah	
English Language Education Study Program Students' Self-Perceived Listening Comprehension Strategies: Identifying the Problems	457
Christina Lhaksmita Anandari	
Communicative Competence (Cc) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)	465
Muh Kuntoaji	
Affective Factors Influencing the Involvement of EFL Instructors in e-Learning in Saudi Universities	475
Mohammed A. Zaid	
The Application of Jigsaw Technique in Improving the Students' Achievement in Speaking	491
Muhammad Yusuf, Ridwan Hanafiah, Aprilza Aswani, Nazliza Ramadhani	
Top Down Strategy to Provide Background Knowledge of Contextual Material in Vocational High School	499
Fitriya Dessi Wulandari	
Learners' Use of Learning Strategies in a Web-Based Listening Environment	505
Francisca Maria Ivone	
Collocation: Theoretical Considerations, Methods and Techniques for Teaching It	515
H. Saudin	
Promoting Speaking-Strategies Based Training for Junior High School Students' Autonomy	523
Alfan Zuhairi, Hanifah	

The Influence of Introducing Semantic Knowledge to Improve Students' Paraphrasing Skills	529
Intan Pradita	
Strategies-Based Instruction of Writing Skill to Senior High School EFL Learners in Indonesia	537
Junaidi Mistar and Nurul Abidah	
An Analysis of Speech Acts Produced by Teacher in Conducting Teaching Learning of English	545
Juni Hartiwi	
The Benefit of Indirect Comprehensive Error Corrections in Improving Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy	551
Katharina Rustipa	
Introducing Drama to an EFL Classroom: Student's Perceptions in Short Story	559
Lasma Dwina	
Native-Speakers as English Language Instructors in Higher Learning Institutions	567
Faizah Mohamad Nor	
Communicative Strategies for Communication among Students in Various English Proficiency Levels	575
Lucyana Dorothy Siahhan, Agnes Siwi Purwaning Tyas, and Rieta Anggraheni	
Trace the Moral Doctrine Implied in "Serat Wulang Sunu" Script; Philology Approach	583
Aang Fatihul Islam	
The Difference of Grammar Translation Method and Contrastive Analysis on Aspect and Tense System between Indonesian and English toward Students Grammar Achievement	595
Andi Dian Rahmawan	
Semantic Analysis: Swear Words in Bahasa Batak Toba	597
Devi Melisa Saragi	
World Cultures Exhibition: Empowering Students' Global Identity through English	605
Inggrit O. Tanasale and Bella C. F. Camerling	
Legitimizing Multiple Identities through Focused Reading Group (FRG) "Language, Culture and Identity"	611
Inggrit O. Tanasale	
Indonesian ELT Practitioners Writing in Australia: Previous Writing Experience and Negotiation to Dominant Writing Practices	617
Nova Ariani	
Acoustic Analysis of English Vowel Formant Frequencies Produced by Indonesian Native Speakers	625
Rudha Widagsa	
The 'Two Sides' of Learner Autonomy in English Language Learning	635
Sukasih Ratna Widayanti	

Assessing English Teaching Knowledge through Online Case – Based Analysis	639
Sunu Dwi Antoro	
How New Technology Trend Has Changed Learning Culture	647
Tri Wahyuni Floriasti	
The Translation of ‘ <i>κηοN</i> ’ into English Modal Auxiliaries: An implication for English Grammar Textbook Revision	655
Peerapat Yangklang	
Second Language Literacy and Its Impact on the Writer’s Identity	671
Yofita Lawe Duka	
East Indonesian Perception on Long-Short Vowel Phonemes: A Sound Production Analysis	679
Yune Andryani Pinem	
Ecological Awareness in Students’ Creative Writings	693
Henny Herawati	
Theorizing Students’ Attributions on Their EFL Learning Process	703
Yustinus Calvin Gai Mali	
Student-Teachers’ Strategies in Giving Feedback in Teaching Speaking	715
Christina Kristiyani and Caecilia Tutyardari	

The Benefit of Indirect Comprehensive Error Corrections in Improving Advanced EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy

Katharina Rustipa
Stikubank University (UNISBANK) Semarang, Indonesia
katrin_esde@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

A language pedagogical goal is developing pupils' language proficiency. In learning an L2, a learner develops an interlanguage not free from errors which need corrections to avoid fossilization. This experimental study explored the ways direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedbacks affect students' ability to produce target-like writing. Twenty advanced level students participated in this study. They were divided into direct comprehensive feedback group (DCFG) and indirect comprehensive feedback group (ICFG). The DCFG received a teacher's DCF, while the ICFG received a teacher's ICF. The research results indicate that ICF has more benefit to improve advanced EFL learners' writing accuracy. Its implication is ICF should dominate the written products of higher proficient learners because self editing enhances the greater understanding of the target language accuracy.

Key words: comprehensive feedback, interlanguage, writing accuracy

Introduction

A language pedagogical goal is developing pupils' language skills. In output production in speaking and writing, learners need to process language more deeply with more mental effort. Writing a good and coherent text, even in one's native language is a demanding task because one has to simultaneously pay attention to the text's content, organization, linguistic adequacy, etc. Writing in the target language is of course more demanding. And one of the tasks of the teachers is to guide their students to become competent writers.

In learning a second or foreign language, a learner develops interlanguage through their learning experience with L2 comprehensible input (Krashen, (1981). Selinker (1972) states " A learner's interlanguage is viewed to be independent of both his L1 as well as the target language system, with its own grammar, lexicon, etc."

Learners' interlanguage errors need correction to avoid fossilization which is most probably occurs in foreign language learning. Huiying Sun (2013) states" lacking large amount of input and output, adult L2 learners rely more on explicit knowledge and corrective feedback to monitor and improve their accuracy in production." Thus, corrective feedback is needed to achieve accuracy and to avoid fossilization.

Corrective feedback is indication to the learner that his use of the target language is incorrect (Lightbown and Spada, 2006). It aims at indicating that some usage in the writing does not conform to the norms of the target language. This study is concerned with the benefit of comprehensive error correction in improving advanced EFL learners' writing.

Ellis (2009) explains that in giving direct corrective feedback the teacher provides both an indication of the errors as well as the corresponding target forms. In giving indirect corrective feedback, on the other hand, the teacher provides some indication of the errors, but it is left to the learners to derive the target forms. In focused or selective corrective feedback method, EFL teachers select type(s) of errors to correct, while

errors outside the chosen focus are left uncorrected. On the other hand, in the unfocused or comprehensive feedback method, the teachers correct all the errors.

Studies on direct, indirect, selective, comprehensive error correction have been done by applied linguistic researchers. Some previous studies are as follows. Ferris (2006) reported the more effectiveness of indirect correction in improving 86 ESL students' accuracy of newly written texts overtime, while students who received direct correction made the more accurate revision. Bitchener and Knoch (2010) reported the more effectiveness of direct correction than indirect correction.

Mirzaii and Aliabadi (2013) investigated the impact of written corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on job application letters to Iranian advanced-level EFL learners. The results show that direct corrective feedback is more effective than indirect corrective feedback. Van Beuningen (2011) reported the effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback in promoting both grammatical and non grammatical accuracy during revision as well as in new pieces of writing.

Rustipa (2014) reported the more effectiveness of direct comprehensive feedback than indirect comprehensive feedback in improving the students' capability in composing a text. However, the difference of the effect of the direct and indirect comprehensive feedback is statistically not significant. The more effectiveness of direct comprehensive feedback than the indirect comprehensive feedback is more likely because the participants of the study are of low proficient learners who might be unable to correct their own errors based on indirect corrective feedback. This current study is actually a follow up of her previous study. The difference of this current study and the previous study is on the research subjects who are more advanced or more proficient student writers.

This study is significant in providing evidences of the comprehensive corrective feedback benefit. Hopefully, it can inspire the EFL teachers in doing the students' writing error correction.

Research Methods

This study is quantitative research investigating a teacher's direct and indirect comprehensive feedback. It comprises three parts: investigating the effectiveness of direct comprehensive feedback, investigating the effectiveness indirect comprehensive feedback, comparing the effectiveness of direct and indirect comprehensive feedback towards the accuracy of the students' writing. The main aim of the study is searching the effects of direct and indirect comprehensive feedback on both students' revised and newly written texts.

Twenty English Department students of UNISBANK participated in this study. They were divided into direct comprehensive feedback group (DCFG) and indirect comprehensive feedback group (ICFG). The DCFG received a teacher's direct comprehensive feedback, while the ICFG received a teacher's indirect comprehensive feedback. In order to get participants of the similar writing competence, of advanced level, the participants of this study were selected, i.e. only the students getting grade A for Paragraph-Based Writing and Genre-Based Writing subjects.

The data were collected by asking the students to do pretest, to write 4 essays, to do two post tests. The participants received a teacher's written comprehensive corrective feedback on the four essays under two treatment conditions: group 1 (DCFG) received a teacher's direct comprehensive feedback, and group 2 (ICFG) received a teacher's indirect comprehensive feedback. The feedback was given by one researcher, i.e. their teacher. Having one person to provide the feedback enabled consistency in the treatment .

After the treatment, the students were asked to rewrite and revise their texts based on the corrective feedback given by the researcher. And then posttests were administered. The students were assigned to write five-paragraph texts with the provided topics.

Discussion

The measurement of the students' revision accuracy based on the teacher's feedback showed that the direct comprehensive corrective feedback group, at average, could revise 91.75% of the teacher's error corrections, while the indirect comprehensive corrective feedback group, could only revise 76.53% of the teacher's error corrections. It means that the students who got direct comprehensive corrective feedback made more accurate revisions than those who got indirect comprehensive corrective feedback did. This research result confirms the hypothesis "Direct comprehensive corrective feedback helps the students improve the revision accuracy of an initial piece of writing more effectively than indirect comprehensive corrective feedback does."

DCFG and ICFG performed almost equally well on the pretest, i.e. DCFG gained a mean score of 80.7 while ICFG gained a mean score of 81.1. After getting the treatment, i.e. writing 2 X 2 essays and revising 2 X 2 essays based on the teacher's feedback, all of the students experienced improvement in their writing. DCFG's mean score raised from 80.7 to 82.5, while ICFG's mean score raised from 81.1 to 84.1. This finding strengthens hypothesis "Comprehensive corrective feedback helps the students improve their subsequent new writing."

The two groups DCFG and ICFG got the same treatment, i.e. writing 2 X 2 essays with the same topics and revising 2 X 2 essays based on the teacher's feedback. The time interval given by the two groups in the treatment was also the same, i.e. 2 X 80 minutes for writing 4 new texts, and 2 X 80 minutes for revising 4 texts based on the teacher's feedback. The difference was only in the ways the teacher corrected the errors to the students' written products. The DCFG's written products were given direct comprehensive corrective feedback while ICFG's written products were given indirect comprehensive corrective feedback. Thus, the mean gain difference between the DCFG and ICFG are caused by the type of corrective feedback received by the two groups on their written products.

In giving direct comprehensive feedback, the researcher underlined the errors and gave the correct form or order, and also provided the missing words/ sentences as Ellis (2009) explains "In giving direct corrective feedback the teacher provides both an indication of the errors as well as the corresponding target forms." In giving indirect comprehensive feedback, the researcher underlined the errors and inserted the codes of the errors such as the absent and/ or the mistaken words, asked for clarification, asked for completion, asked for confirmation as Bitchener (2008) explains "With indirect feedback, an error is called to the students' attention using various strategies such as underlining or circling errors, recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line, confirmation checks, and request for clarification." In giving direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback, the researcher also indicated the errors of content, organization, mechanics.

The main factor differentiating direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback is the explicitness and the students' involvement in the correction process. The direct comprehensive corrective feedback offers explicit information that facilitates the student writers to edit their texts. This is because of the teacher's supplying the students with the target language form at or near the error. It is more likely that in editing their texts, the students just need to rewrite the teacher's corrective feedback. On the other

hand, the indirect comprehensive corrective feedback only offers an indication that an error has been made. In editing their texts with indirect comprehensive corrective feedback, it is more likely that the students are self editing their writing. Thus, it is not surprising that the research finding revealed: “the students who got direct comprehensive corrective feedback made more accurate revisions than those who got indirect comprehensive corrective feedback did, i.e. 91.75% : 76.53%.” This strengthens Ferris’ study (2006) finding out “students who received direct corrective feedback made the most accurate revisions.” To know the students’ opinion concerning the direct comprehensive corrective feedback, the researcher held interview with some research subjects. The researcher’s interview with 6 students (3 from DCFG, 3 from ICFG) revealed that her students preferred direct comprehensive corrective feedback to indirect comprehensive corrective feedback. The reason is that revising a text based on direct comprehensive corrective feedback is more easy and it saves their time besides it also avoids frustration.

The usefulness of students’ revision activity is admitted by the scholars such as Ferris (2010) stating that corrective feedback is valuable from a learning-to-write perspective because it has the ability to help learners develop more effective revision and self-editing skills. In other words, it has short term (revision/ editing accuracy) benefit. One cannot underestimate the short-term benefit because “editing one’s text after receiving error feedback is likely a necessary, or at least helpful, step on the road to longer-term improvement in accuracy. Rehearsing and repeating might play a major role in order for a noticed item to be retained in a long-term memory” (Ferris ,2004, 2010).

Providing corrective feedback is also in line with a key concept of the process approach to writing instruction proposing multi-drafting writing cycle and applying different feedback strategies at different stage. Ferris (2008) explains that the most obvious teacher’s reason to give written corrective feedback is to give the students’ written assignments. The teachers hope it can help students improve their subsequent drafts and future writing.

The results of the study showed that both direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedbacks were effective in improving the students’ performance in writing new texts. In other words, both direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedbacks have long-term effect. It is proved with the result of the first post test. All of the students experienced accuracy improvement in writing a new text. The first post test revealed DCFG’s mean score raised from 80.7 (pre test) to 82.5 (1st post test), while ICFG’s mean score raised from 81.1 (pre test) to 84.1 (1st post test). It means that the students who received indirect comprehensive corrective feedback outperformed those who received direct comprehensive corrective feedback.

The result of this current study is similar to those of the Ferris’ study (2006) finding the more effectiveness of indirect correction in improving 86 ESL students’ accuracy of newly written texts overtime, while students who received direct correction made the more accurate revision. This is also similar to Lalande’s longitudinal study (1982) revealing that students who received indirect corrective feedback outperformed students in a direct corrective feedback group. However, the results of this current study is different from those of Rustipa’s study (2014) reporting the more effectiveness of direct comprehensive feedback than indirect comprehensive feedback. However, the difference was statistically not significant. It was predicted that the more effectiveness of direct comprehensive feedback was more likely because the participants of that study were of low proficient learners who might be unable to correct their own errors based on indirect corrective feedback.

In order to know the significance of the mean difference between the DCFG and ICFG, *t*-test was calculated. A *t*-test is a statistical test to compare two means. Based on

the data analysis, the *t*-value is 3.0073. This calculated value is bigger compared with the *t*-value from the *t*-table: at the level of significance .01, i.e. 2.821, and at the level of significance .05, i.e. 1.813. This means that the null hypothesis (Indirect comprehensive corrective feedback does not help the students improve their subsequent new writing more effectively than direct comprehensive corrective feedback does) is rejected. This also means that there is significant difference between the DCFG and ICFG mean scores.

The results of this current study indicate that indirect comprehensive corrective feedback can enhance the accuracy of EFL writing more effectively than indirect comprehensive corrective feedback. It has great potential to improve EFL writing, specifically it helps the higher level learners improve and acquire the mastery of writing in the target language. This idea emerges because participants of this study were selected, i.e. only the students getting grade A for Paragraph-Based Writing and Genre-Based Writing. Thus, it can be said that they are the students of advanced level.

To gain more insight concerning the durability of the effect of the indirect comprehensive corrective feedback, i.e. to know whether after receiving the feedback the student writers are able to maintain their ability to write a new text, three weeks after the first post test or one month after the last treatment, a second or delayed posttest was administered. In other words, the delayed posttest was used to know whether or not the effect of comprehensive written corrective feedback still prevailed one month after the comprehensive written corrective feedback provision. The result of the delayed or second posttest is that the DCFG and ICFG gained mean scores of 82.5 and 84.95. These mean scores are similar to those of DCFG and ICFG in the first posttest, i.e. 82.5 and 84.6. This finding indicates that direct and indirect comprehensive written corrective feedbacks are durable or has longer effect. This research result means that corrective feedback is necessary for second language acquisition to foster learners' interlanguage development because in order for output production fosters L2 acquisition, it should be accompanied by feedback.

The reason why the students who received indirect comprehensive corrective feedback outperformed those who received direct comprehensive corrective feedback was stated by language scholars based on theoretical foundation. Ferris (2006) states "... indirect corrective feedback is more beneficial to second language development than direct correction because it engages learners in reflective learning processes." Lanlade (1982) predicts that learners benefit more profound form of language processing as they are self editing their output. Sheen (2007) explains that corrective feedback is more effective in promoting noticing and understanding when students expose greater capacity to engage in language analysis. From these statements, it can be summarized that the more benefit of indirect comprehensive corrective feedback is caused by the reflective learning processes, the profound language processing, the language analysis experienced by the student writers during self editing their written outputs. These activities force the student writers to process language more deeply with more mental effort that will result in the increase of their understanding of language accuracy.

The other factors influencing the effectiveness of indirect comprehensive corrective feedback are the learners' motivation and awareness to self edit their written outputs based on the indirect comprehensive corrective feedback given by the teacher. The researcher's interview to 3 students from ICFG revealed that revising a text based on indirect comprehensive corrective feedback was demanding and sometimes frustrating. However, this challenged and encouraged or motivated them to solve the problem. When asked the benefits they got from indirect comprehensive corrective feedback, they answered that they got deeper understanding of the English language knowledge. Thus, the students' personality affects the effectiveness of corrective feedback as also said by

Huiying Sun (2013) that learners' attitude toward written corrective feedback is dependent on learners' attitude toward written corrective feedback such as learners' motivation, aptitude and learning style.

Conclusion and Suggestion

Based on the discussion, some conclusions can be drawn as follows: comprehensive written corrective feedback, direct or indirect is beneficial to improve EFL students' writing accuracy, both during revision and in new pieces of writing. The research results indicate that direct comprehensive written corrective feedback helps the students improve the revision accuracy of an initial piece of writing more effectively than indirect written comprehensive corrective feedback does. On the other hand, indirect comprehensive written corrective feedback helps the higher level learners improve and acquire the mastery of writing new texts in the target language more effectively. Thus, indirect written comprehensive corrective feedback has more benefit to improve advanced EFL learners' writing.

The implication of the current study is that EFL teachers should use written corrective feedback in writing class since it is a useful instrument to help learners improve their accuracy in writing. In providing corrective feedback, the teacher should consider a learner's educational level since the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback depends on the learner's competence level. Indirect comprehensive written corrective feedback should dominate the written products of the higher proficient learners because they can self edit their written output. These self editing activities force the student writers to process language more deeply with more mental effort that will result in the increase of their understanding of the target language accuracy.

References

- Bitchener, J. & Knoch U. (2008). The Value of Written Corrective Feedback for Migrants and International Students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 409-431.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch U. (2010). Raising the Linguistic Accuracy Level of Advanced L2 Writers with Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 19 (4), 207-217.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*. 63(2), 97-100.
- Ferris, D.R. (2006). Does Error Feedback Help Student Writers? New Evidence on the Short- and Long-Term Effects of Written Error Correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp.81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D.R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing Student: Where are we? and Where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime...?) *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49—62.
- Ferris, D.R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201.
- Ferris, D.R. (2008). Feedback: Issues and Options. *Teaching Academic Writing*. 14, 93-24.
- Huiying Sun, Sonja. (2013). *Written Corrective Feedback: Effects of Focused and Unfocused Grammar Correction On the Case Acquisition in L2 German*. Kansas: University of Kansas
- Krashen, Stephen D. (1981). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. English Language Teaching series. London: Prentice-Hall International (UK) Ltd.

- Lalande, J.F. (1982). Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*. 66(2), 140-149.
- Lightbown, P.M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages are Learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mirzaii, Mostafa and Aliabadi, Reza Bozord. (2013). Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in the Context of Genre-Based Instruction on Job Application Letter Writing. *Journal of Writing Research*. 5 (2), 191-213.
- Rustipa, Katharina. (2014). The Effectiveness of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving EFL Learners' Hortatory Exposition Writing. *English Language Curriculum Development: Implications for Innovations in Language Policy and Planning, Pedagogical Practices, and Teacher Professional Development*. Solo: English Education Department-Teacher Training and Education Faculty-Sebelas Maret University.
- Selinker. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL* 10 (3), 209-231.
- 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
- Van Beuningen, Catherine. (2011). *The Effectiveness of Comprehensive Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing*. Amsterdam: ACLC.