



The Use of Corrective Feedback to Improve English Speaking and Writing Achievements of The Eleventh Graders of Man 3 Palembang

Yuniarsih Manggarsari
Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia
E-mail: msyuni6@gmail.com

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: 2024-09-07 Revised: 2024-10-27 Published: 2024-11-11 Keywords: <i>Writing; Speaking; Corrective Feedback; Students' Perception Toward Corrective Feedback.</i>	<p>This study aimed at investigating (1) whether or not there was significant differences in writing and speaking achievements between the students who were given the corrective feedback and those who were not, (2) how much speaking and writing aspects contributed to the students' English writing and English speaking achievements, (3) the students' perception on the use of corrective feedback in learning writing and speaking. Quasi-experimental design was used in this study. There were two groups in this study, experimental and control groups. Both groups consisted of thirty four students. English writing and English speaking pretest and posttest were given to both groups, but only experimental group was given the treatment. The data obtained were analyzed by using pair sample t-test, independent t-test, stepwise regression analyses, and percentage analysis to analyze the questionnaires. The result of independent sample t-test showed that there was significance difference in writing posttest ($p < 0.05$) but the writing aspects such as grammar and mechanics had no significant difference ($p > 0.05$). Meanwhile, the result of independent sample t-test of speaking posttest showed that there was significant difference ($p < 0.05$). Based on the result of stepwise regression, grammar contributed 59.1% for student writing achievement. In speaking, corrective feedback contributed 739% to the students' fluency. Based on the result of questionnaire, the students' had positive perception towards the corrective feedback.</p>
Artikel Info	Abstrak
Sejarah Artikel Diterima: 2024-09-07 Direvisi: 2024-10-27 Dipublikasi: 2024-11-11 Kata kunci: <i>Menulis; Berbicara; Umpan Balik Korektif; Persepsi Siswa Terhadap Umpan Balik Korektif.</i>	<p>Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki (1) apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam pencapaian menulis dan berbicara antara siswa yang diberikan umpan balik korektif dan yang tidak, (2) seberapa besar aspek menulis dan berbicara berkontribusi terhadap pencapaian menulis dan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa, (3) persepsi siswa terhadap penggunaan umpan balik korektif dalam pembelajaran menulis dan berbicara. Desain kuasi-eksperimental digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Ada dua kelompok dalam penelitian ini, yaitu kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok kontrol. Kedua kelompok terdiri dari tiga puluh empat siswa. Pretest dan posttest menulis dan berbicara bahasa Inggris diberikan kepada kedua kelompok, tetapi hanya kelompok eksperimen yang diberikan perlakuan. Data yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan uji t sampel berpasangan, uji t independen, analisis regresi bertahap, dan analisis persentase untuk menganalisis kuesioner. Hasil uji t sampel independen menunjukkan bahwa ada perbedaan signifikan pada posttest menulis ($p < 0,05$), tetapi aspek menulis seperti tata bahasa dan mekanik tidak menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan ($p > 0,05$). Sementara itu, hasil uji t sampel independen pada posttest berbicara menunjukkan bahwa terdapat perbedaan signifikan ($p < 0,05$). Berdasarkan hasil regresi bertahap, tata bahasa berkontribusi sebesar 59,1% terhadap pencapaian menulis siswa. Dalam berbicara, umpan balik korektif berkontribusi sebesar 739% terhadap kelancaran siswa. Berdasarkan hasil kuesioner, siswa memiliki persepsi positif terhadap umpan balik korektif.</p>

I. INTRODUCTION

English serves as a global communication tool, comprising both receptive and productive skills. Linse and Nunan (2006, p. 24) define receptive skills as reading and listening, which involve the intake of information, while productive skills encompass speaking and writing. Students often view speaking and writing as key indicators of

their success in language learning (Brown, 2004). Moreover, teachers aim for their students to utilize English effectively. Nur (2003) emphasizes that proficiency in a foreign language significantly enhances one's life in today's interconnected world. Susilohadi and Seyayoga (2009, p. 11) identify three language functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. Through

the ideational and interpersonal functions, students can articulate their thoughts and interact with others. The textual function enables students to connect ideas within a text.

Despite its importance, many individuals worldwide struggle with speaking and writing in English. The English Company cites statistics showing that over 50 billion people do not communicate effectively in English, whether as their first or second language, including about 1.9 billion people aged between 6 and 24 (Graddol, 2006). Additionally, Efrizal (2012, p. 3) notes that seventh-grade students at MTS Ja-alhaq boarding school in Bengkulu face challenges in speaking English due to limited vocabulary and lack of self-confidence. Myles (2002) observes that many students in ESL writing classes dislike the lessons because they struggle to begin and develop their ideas in writing. Atika (2013) found that students in the eleventh grade at Muhammadiyah 1 Palembang were often confused about what to write and faced difficulties selecting appropriate words; however, their performance improved following intervention. Another critical factor in learning English is its status in Indonesia. English is considered a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia, as it is not commonly used in daily conversations and is taught as a subject in junior high schools, senior high schools, and higher education institutions. This limited exposure restricts students' opportunities to use English in real-life contexts, primarily confining its use to the classroom environment.

The restricted use of English in Indonesia poses challenges for students, making it difficult for them to practice the language effectively. They often only use English in class and may lack the confidence to apply it outside the classroom. Setiawan (2008) highlights that writing is one of the most challenging subjects for university students, many of whom tend to avoid writing assignments due to low proficiency levels, struggling with both sentence construction and word choice.

Regarding speaking, Ngestirosa (2011) indicates that Indonesian students still face significant challenges in enhancing their speaking skills. Many are passive participants due to difficulties with pronunciation and a limited vocabulary, coupled with a lack of opportunities to build confidence through practice. To improve their speaking and writing abilities, students need to engage in ample practice and seize every opportunity to use the language both orally and in writing. Such practice will enable them to express their ideas

effectively. Therefore, students should be given as many opportunities as possible to develop these skills.

The author observed eleventh-grade students and interviewed English teachers at MAN 3 Palembang. The teachers reported that many students struggled with writing and speaking, primarily due to fear of grammatical mistakes and limited vocabulary. Additionally, during the learning process, many students wrote compositions without adequately linking the ideas in their paragraphs. They often failed to use transition signals to compare, add, or illustrate their thoughts and sometimes made unclear statements, neglecting to implement the corrections given by their teachers during speaking activities. Furthermore, the teachers admitted to providing limited feedback during lessons and lacking sufficient time for corrections due to the constraints of teaching schedules. As a result, students often do not understand or review mistakes in their assignments. Consequently, when errors occur in their writing or speaking, many students tend to overlook their teachers' corrections, as they are unaccustomed to receiving them (Charles, 2006, p. 224). The author's review of the students' English scores for the first semester revealed that the eleventh-grade students scored below 70, while the minimum passing score is set at 75. Given the aforementioned issues, the author aims to implement a strategy to enhance students' writing and speaking skills through corrective feedback. This feedback involves correcting students' work, helping them understand the grammatical accuracy of their statements. This strategy aims to foster understanding and motivate students to learn from the corrections provided by their teachers.

According to Ellis (2009, p. 2), there are two types of feedback in language learning: positive and negative. Positive feedback offers emotional support that boosts students' self-motivation to continue learning the language. In the classroom, teachers often express encouragement through comments like "okay," "good," or "excellent," but these do not always confirm that students are correct. Negative feedback, on the other hand, aims to rectify students' spoken or written errors, with corrective feedback being a form of negative feedback (Ellis, 2009, p. 2). Corrective feedback serves as guidance from teachers during the learning process, helping students avoid mistakes and encouraging them to engage with the grammatical accuracy of their utterances (Sheen, 2004). Through corrective

feedback, teachers can assess students' progress and their proficiency in English (Harmer, 2007, p. 95). Additionally, students not only recognize and understand their mistakes but also learn to take responsibility for their own learning, fostering greater autonomy.

Based on this overview, the author is interested in conducting a study to improve the writing and speaking skills of eleventh-grade students at MAN 3 Palembang through the provision of corrective feedback during the teaching and learning process. The author also seeks to explore how corrective feedback influences the writing and speaking achievements of these students.

II. METHOD

This chapter presents (1) Research Design, (2) Variables of the Study, (3) Operational Definition, (4) The Population and Sample, (5) Learning Materials and Teaching Procedures, (6) Technique for Collecting the Data, (7) Validity and Reliability of the Test and Questionnaire, (8) Technique for Analyzing the Data.

1. Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental design. According to Best and Kahn (2006, p. 177), a quasi-experimental design offers a lower level of control and is utilized when randomization is not possible. The writer implemented a non-equivalent control group design, which consists of both an experimental group and a control group, with both groups undergoing a pretest and posttest. In the experimental group, the writer administered the pretest, posttest, and corrective feedback as treatment, while the control group only received the pretest and posttest without any treatment. The pretest aimed to assess the students' writing and speaking skills prior to the treatment, and the posttest was conducted to evaluate their progress in these areas. The research design is illustrated as follows:

	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-Test
Experimental Group	O1	X	O2
Control Group	O3	—	O4

Where:

- O1 = Pre-test of the Experimental Group
- O2 = Post-test of the Experimental Group
- O3 = Pre-test of the Control Group
- O4 = Post-test of the Control Group

- X = Treatment for the Experimental Group (using corrective feedback)
- — = No treatment in the Control Group

In this research, both the experimental and control groups underwent writing and speaking tests as pretests and posttests. Students in both groups were instructed to select a topic, elaborate on it in paragraphs, and present their work in front of the class for three minutes. The experimental group received corrective feedback, while the control group did not receive any treatment or feedback. Two raters evaluated the students' writing and speaking performance. The writing scores were determined using an analytical writing rubric suggested by Hughes (1991, p. 91), while speaking scores were based on the analytic scale for assessing speaking proposed by Ramazani (2005). The writer implemented this strategy over 18 meetings for the experimental group. In the first meeting, both groups took the pretest. From the second to the seventeenth meeting, the treatment was applied to the experimental group, while the control group did not receive any treatment. The posttest for both groups was administered in the eighteenth meeting.

2. Variables of the Study

According to Wallen and Fraenkel (1991, p. 31), a variable is defined as any characteristic that is not constant; in other words, it is a characteristic that can change. This study identifies three types of variables: one independent variable and two dependent variables. The independent variable is thought to influence another variable, while the dependent variable is the one that is expected to be affected by the independent variable (Wallen & Fraenkel, 1991, p. 36). In this research, corrective feedback serves as the independent variable, while students' achievements in speaking and writing are the dependent variables.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

1. Findings

This section presents the results of the writing and speaking tests conducted in both the experimental and control groups. Pretests and posttests were administered to each group. For the writing assessment, students were instructed to write a paragraph based on a given topic and then

present their work to the teacher. The writing performances were evaluated by two raters who assessed the students' work based on various aspects of English writing, including grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and organization. In terms of achievement levels, the control group showed that 60% of students scored at a good level in the writing pretest. In the posttest for the control group, 60.2% of students were at a good level, while 37.2% achieved a very good level. In contrast, the writing pretest for the experimental group indicated that 51.4% of students scored at a good level, with 45.8% reaching a very good level. In the writing posttest for the experimental group, 97.3% of students achieved a very good level, while 11.5% were at a good level. Furthermore, in the speaking pretest for the control group, 97.2% of students scored at a good level. The speaking posttest for the control group showed that 97.1% of the students remained at a good level. In the experimental group's speaking pretest, 97.2% of students were at a good level. However, in the speaking posttest for the experimental group, 85.7% of students were at a good level, with 11.7% reaching a very good level.

2. Statistical Analyses

The statistical analyses were conducted to determine if there were significant improvements and differences in students' writing and speaking achievements between the control and experimental groups. To address the research questions, four statistical analyses were employed in this study. First, a paired sample t-test was utilized to assess the significance of the differences between the pretest and posttest results of both the experimental and control groups. Second, an independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the significant differences between the two groups. Third, multiple regression analysis was performed to evaluate the contribution of corrective feedback to students' writing and speaking achievements. Finally, percentage analysis was applied to analyze the questionnaire responses.

3. Results of Normality of Students' Writing and Speaking Achievements Pretest and

Posttest in the Experimental and Control Groups.

Prior to analyzing the data, the writer assessed the normality of the data sets. To evaluate normality, the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test from SPSS 23 was employed. The normality results for the writing and speaking tests are presented in the following Table 1.

Table 1. The Summary of Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Writing and Speaking Score

	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Writing	.476	.738	.354	.251
Speaking	.497	.239	.207	.093

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results for the writing achievement pretest in the experimental group indicated a significance (2-tailed) of .476, while the posttest score showed a significance of .738. For the control group, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test revealed significance values of .354 for the pretest and .251 for the posttest in writing achievement. Since all significance values (2-tailed) were greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data are considered to be normal. In terms of speaking achievement, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for the pretest and posttest results in the experimental group yielded significance values of .497 for the pretest and .239 for the posttest. Similarly, the control group's speaking achievement results showed significance values of .207 for the pretest and .093 for the posttest. Therefore, it can be stated that the obtained data were normal.

4. Results of Homogeneity of Variances Test

The result of homogeneity of variances test of writing and speaking achievements in the experimental and control groups are described in Table 2.

Table 2. The Result of Homogeneity of Variances Test

	Homogeneity							
	Pretest-Posttest Experimental		Pretest-Posttest Control		Pretest-Posttest Experimental and Control		Posttest-Posttest Experimental and Control	
	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Levene Statistic	Sig.
Writing	1.038	.312	1.103	.294	1.128	.272	.985	.330
Speaking	.521	.473	4.495	0.038	3.67	.067	3.435	.068

For writing achievement, the significance levels of Levene's test were

.312 for both the pretest and posttest in the experimental group, .794 for the pretest and posttest in the control group, .722 for the pretest comparing both groups, and .330 for the posttest between the experimental and control groups. Additionally, the significance levels of Levene's test for speaking achievement were .473 for the pretest and posttest in the experimental group, .058 for the pretest and posttest in the control group, .607 for the pretest in the experimental group, and .068 for the posttest in both groups. Since all significant values from the homogeneity test were above 0.05, it can be concluded that the data from the speaking and writing tests were homogeneous.

B. Discussion

1. Result of Paired Sample and Independent t-test of Writing

The following table presents the result of writing in the control and Experimental groups.

Table 3. Results of Paired and Independent Sample t-test of Writing

	Paired t-test					Independent t-test		
	Control group		Experimental Group			Control group		Experimental Group
	Pre test	Post test	Mean diff	T-Value and Sig.(2-tailed)		Pre test	Post test	T-Value and Sig.(2-tailed)
Writing (total)	14.91	13.76	1.147	5.168	15.34	14.93	4.12	2.508
				.000				.017
grammar	3.66	3.56	.103	.942	3.81	3.68	.132	1.953
				.353				.003
vocabulary	3.91	3.50	.412	3.534	4.21	4.09	.118	1.963
				.001				.048
mechanics	3.66	3.34	.324	3.437	3.65	3.53	.118	2.264
				.002				.030
organization	3.68	3.37	.309	3.447	3.68	3.63	.044	.902
				.002				.374

According to the results of the paired sample t-test for the writing pretest and posttest in the control group, the t-value was 5.168, and the significance value (2-tailed) was below 0.05. In terms of writing aspects, three elements—vocabulary, mechanics, and organization—showed significant differences. However, grammar did not demonstrate a significant difference, with a value of .353. In the experimental group, the writing pretest and posttest yielded a t-value of 2.058, with a significance value (2-tailed) below 0.05. All writing aspects exhibited significant differences, as their significance values (2-tailed) were under 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that there were significant differences in writing and

its components between the pretest and posttest in the experimental group.

The independent sample t-test results for the writing pretest between the experimental and control groups showed a t-value of 1.648 and a significance value (2-tailed) of .104. The significance values for grammar, mechanics, and organization were above 0.05, but vocabulary showed a significant difference with a value of 0.021, which is below 0.05. In the independent sample t-test for the writing posttest, the t-value was 3.691, and the significance value (2-tailed) was less than 0.05. All writing aspects also had significant values below 0.05. Thus, it can be asserted that there were significant differences in overall writing and its components between students who received corrective feedback and those who did not.

2. Results of the Paired Sample and Independent Sample t-tests for Speaking

The outcomes of the paired sample and independent sample t-tests for the speaking assessment in both the control and experimental groups are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Paired and Independent Sample t-test of Speaking

	Paired t-test					Independent t-test		
	Control group		Experimental Group			Control group		Experimental Group
	Pre test	Post test	Mean diff	T-Value and Sig.(2-tailed)		Pre test	Post test	T-Value and Sig.(2-tailed)
Speaking (Total)	11.31	10.85	.465	3.206	10.72	18.96	8.233	51.121
				.003				.009
Pronunciation	2.75	2.65	.103	1.421	2.57	3.44	.068	9.406
				.165				.005
Fluency	2.76	2.76	.000	.000	2.79	3.49	.691	7.509
				.000				.000
Grammar	2.91	2.71	.206	2.028	2.60	3.46	.053	12.452
				.051				.000
Vocabulary	2.88	2.74	.147	1.968	2.75	8.57	5.824	60.358
				.028				.000

Based on the paired sample t-test results for the speaking pretest and posttest in the control group, the t-value was 3.206, and the significance value (2-tailed) was below 0.05. Among the three speaking aspects—pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar—only fluency (.000) showed a significant difference. In the experimental group, the speaking pretest and posttest yielded a t-value of 51.121, with a significance value below 0.05. This indicates that the speaking skills and their components exhibited significant differences between the pretest and posttest. For the independent sample t-test conducted on the speaking pretest results from both

experimental and control groups, the t-value was 3.302, with a significance value (2-tailed) of 0.02, which is also below 0.05. However, all speaking aspects had values greater than 0.05, indicating no significant differences in overall speaking or its components. In contrast, the independent sample t-test results for the speaking posttest showed a t-value of 41.659, and the significance value (2-tailed) was below 0.05, indicating significant differences across all speaking aspects. This suggests that there were notable differences in overall speaking skills and their components between students who received corrective feedback and those who did not.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

The explanations and analyses of the results discussed in the previous chapter provide the basis for drawing conclusions related to the problems outlined in this study. Firstly, it can be concluded that corrective feedback had a significant positive impact on the students' writing and speaking achievements. The data indicated that students in the experimental group achieved higher scores in both writing and speaking compared to those in the control group. Secondly, regarding speaking achievement, the analysis revealed a significant difference in speaking aspects between students who received corrective feedback and those who did not. The stepwise regression analyses indicated that vocabulary, grammar, organization, and fluency contributed to the students' writing and speaking achievements, while pronunciation had the least impact on speaking achievement. Overall, it can be concluded that the implementation of corrective feedback significantly enhanced the students' writing and speaking skills.

B. Suggestion

Based on the results obtained in this study and the discussion in the previous chapter, the author would like to make several recommendations. Firstly, given the significant impact of corrective feedback, teachers should select effective strategies for providing corrective feedback on students' writing and speaking. Common challenges students face include grammar proficiency, pronunciation, and the ability to express ideas in English. If teachers neglect these issues by merely underlining or crossing out mistakes

without providing constructive comments that students can understand, it may lead to decreased motivation among students. Teachers should prioritize offering corrective feedback that encourages and supports students. Secondly, teachers need to be aware of their students' needs so they can provide feedback that is beneficial, focusing not just on evaluations but also on motivating students, especially those struggling with English writing and speaking. Lastly, future researchers can explore the application of corrective feedback in their studies by integrating it with other variables to enhance the strategies employed in the classroom.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, S. (2005). *Developing the students' writing ability by using self-editing strategy in the tertiary level*. (Unpublished Magister's thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang.
- Agustina, S. (2014). *Enhancing productive skills of the tenth grade students of sma az-zahra Palembang by using feedbacks with track changes and discussion*. (Unpublished Magister's thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang.
- Agundo, M. & Juan, D. (2013) An Investigation into how EFL Learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 15 (2). Retrieved from <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/calj/v15n2/v15n2a09.pdf>
- Atika, H. (2013). *Improving reading comprehension and writing achievement in hortatory text by using dialogue journal of eleventh grade students of senior high school muhammadiyah 1 Palembang*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang.
- Best, J. & Kahn, J. (2006). *Research in education*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Brown, J. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practice*. San Francisco: Longman.com
- Charles, D. (2006). Differing perception in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 219-233. Retrieved from <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/education/pdf/david-carless.pdf>

- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). *Communicative focus on form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving students' speaking skill communicative language teaching method at MTS Ja-alhaq islamic boarding school of Bengkulu, Indonesia. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(20), 127-134
- Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2). Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.514.8196&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(2), 3-18. Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/it em/2504 d6w3# page-1>
- Field, A (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Graddol, D. (2006). *English next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a foreign language*. London: British Council.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Harlow, Essex: Person Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Pearson Longman.
- Hattie, J., Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. Retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/~mvp19/ETF/Feedback.pdf>
- Hornby, A. S. (2000). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary* (5th ed.). New York, NY: University Press.
- Huges, A. (1991). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge, MA: Cambrige University Press.
- Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *TESL Journal*, 12(11), 1-6. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-TeachingSpeaking.html>
- Linse & Nunan. (2006). *Practical English language teaching: Young learners*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Luu, T. T. (2011). Teaching writing through genre-based approach. *BELT Journal*. 2(1), 121-136. Retrieved from <http://revistaseletronicas.pucrs.br/ojs/index.php/belt/article/viewFile/9361/7023>
- Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: the writing process and error analysis in student texts. *Journal TESL-EJ*, 6(2). Retrieved on 28th November, 2015 from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html>
- Najamaddin, Shler. (2010). *Teachers' and students' perception of types of corrective feedback in writing*. The Department of Teaching English as Foreign Language. Bilkent University. Ankara.
- Ngestirosa, E. EWK. (2011). Teaching speaking by drama parody for English literature students. *Proceeding 58th TEFLIN International Conference : In Language teaching and character building* (pp. 220-228). Semarang: IKIP PGRI Semarang.
- Nur, C. (2003). *English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practices*. Singapore: Times academic press.
- Rahman, M. M. (2014). Learning english through interaction in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Languages and Literatures*, 2(2), 203-217. Retrieved from <http://ijllnet.com/journals/ijll/Vol 2 No 2 June 2014/12.pdf>
- Ramzani, C. B. (2005). *Speaking Rubric*. Retrieved from <http://academics.edu/cbauer-ramzani/BU113/Rubrics/present rubric.htm>
- Richards, J.C. & W. A. Renandya. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, A. (2012). ESL: Importance of speaking English. Retrieved from <http://www.cnmag.ca/issue-22/513-esl-importance-of-speaking-english-n00>.
- Sanavi, R. & Nemati, M. (2014). The effect of six corrective feedback strategies on iranian english language learners' IELTS writing task 2. Retrieved from <http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/spsgo/4/2/2158244014538271.full.pdf>

- Sayyad, F. S., & Sayyadmahaleh, M. (2013) The effect of direct corrective-feedback on iranian intermediate efl learners' writing proficiency. *Asian Journal Of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 2(4), 64-73. Retrieved from [http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2\(4\)/AJSSH2013\(2.4-07\).pdf](http://www.ajssh.leena-luna.co.jp/AJSSHPDFs/Vol.2(4)/AJSSH2013(2.4-07).pdf)
- Schutz, P. A. & Weinstein, C.E. (1990). Using test feedback to facilitate the learning process. *Asian EFL Journal*, 12(22).
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classroom across instructional Setting. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263-300.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitude on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Eds.), *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Colloction of Empirical Studies*. Oxford University Press.
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities. In J.C. Richards, & W. A. Renandya (Eds), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp.204-209). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spiller, D. (2009). Assessment: Feedback to promote student learning. The University of Wakaito. Retrieved from http://www.waikato.ac.nz/tdu/pdf/booklets/6_AssessmentFeedback.pdf
- Susilohadi & Setyayoga. (2009). *Panduan teknis peningkatan mutu pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Diktorat Pembinaan Sekolah Menengah Atas. Retrieved from <https://mudarwan.files.wordpress.com/2010/08/panduan-teknis-peningkatan-mutu-pembelajaran-bahasa-inggris-rsmabi.pdf>
- Susilowati, R. (2015). *The Effect of written feedback and writing motivation on argumentative writing achievement of the sixt semester students of STKIP Muhammadiyah Kotabumi*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang.
- Wallen, N. E. & Fraenkel, J. R. (1991). *Educational Research: A guide to the Process*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill,inc.
- Widiawati, U. & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The teaching of EFL speaking in Indonesian context: The state of art. *Bahasa dan Seni*, 32(2), 269-292.
- William, J. G. (2003). Providing feedback on ESL students' written assignments. *The Internet TESL Journal*, IX (10). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Williams-Feedback.html>