# **CHAPTER IV**

# **RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presented the result of the findings. It was intended to answer the problems of the research. In finding, the researcher described the process of calculating and presenting result of the data. Whereas, in the discussion section the researcher analyzed the finding.

**4.1 Research Findings**

The researcher did the research and got the complete data from all the research instruments. To gain the objectives of the research, the researcher analyzed the data systematically and accurately. The data was analyzed in order to draw conclusion about the objective of the research. Researcher described the findings as follows:

**Table 4.1**

**The calculation of participant’s perception of grammar instruction in writing class**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No of Students** | **Questionnaire Items** | | | | | | |
| **a** | **b** | **c** | **d** | **e** | **f** | **g** |
| 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 9 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| Total | 39 | 41 | 42 | 32 | 39 | 42 | 34 |
| Mean Rating | 3.9 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 4.2 | 3.4 |

The table above is the calculation of Likert Scale from the students, in the end of the total it was divided to ten because there are ten students that being the subject in this research.

**Table 4.2**

**Participant’s perception of grammar instruction in writing class**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questionnaire items** | **Mean Rating** |
| a. Grammar instruction is essential for mastering the writing of English. | 3.9 |
| b. Study of grammar improves my writing skill of English. | 4.1 |
| c. I believe that my English writing will improve quickly if I study and practice English grammar. | 4.2 |
| d. I like studying English grammar | 3.2 |
| e. I need more grammar instruction in my English writing classes | 3.8 |
| f. I keep the English grammar rules in mind when I am writing in English | 4.2 |
| g. I think that language practice in real contexts is more important than grammar instruction in the classroom. | 3.4 |

**\*1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree**

**Figure 4.1**

**Participant’s perception of grammar instruction in writing class**

The table and figure above showed the participants’ perceptions of WCF. As shown in table [4.2,](#_bookmark4) overall, the students held a very positive view regarding WCF in writing instruction. The highest average from questions of *“I believe that my English writing will improve quickly if I study and practice English grammar”* with mean rating 4.2. In contrast the lowest average from questions of *“I like studying English grammar”* with mean rating 3.2. There, they indicated that the importance of WCF came from the following factors: (1) WCF is able to help with the identification of recurring errors; (2) WCF provides opportunities for further improvement in writing quality; and (3) unlike spoken language, English writing requires more attention to form and accuracy. The participants also believe that errors in English writings by the lecturers are very important. 8 out of 10 participants believe it is very important and 2 out of 10 giving neutral opinion.

To further examine the participants’ perceptions of different types of WCF, the researcher asked about their most preferred error types for correction. As table 4.3 showed below.

**Table 4.3**

**Participant’s preferences of error correction types in English writing class**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The most preferred error type for correction** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Grammar errors | 10 | 100 |
| Vocabulary errors | 0 | 0 |
| Spelling errors | 0 | 0 |
| Organization errors | 0 | 0 |
| Punctuation errors | 0 | 0 |

**Figure 4.2**

**Participant’s preferences of error correction types in English writing class**

From the table 4.3 and figure it showed that all of the students believe that grammar error the most preferred error type for correction, with 10 frequency and 100 percentage. Moreover the table 4.4 below showed the responses in which their opinions on instructors’ error correction priority were examined.

**Table 4.4**

**Participants’ opinion on teachers’ error correction priority**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **If there are many errors in your writing, what do you prefer your lecturer to do?** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| My lecturer should correct all errors. | 9 | 90 |
| My lecturer should correct major errors but not the minor ones. | 1 | 10 |
| My lecturer should only correct errors that interfere with communicating ideas. | 0 | 0 |
| My lecturer should not correct grammatical errors, and should focus on the content only. | 0 | 0 |

**Figure 4.3**

**Participants’ opinion on teachers’ error correction priority**

From the table 4.3 it showed 9 frequency for *“My lecturer should correct all errors”* With 90% and 1 frequency for “*My lecturer should correct major errors but not the minor ones”* with 1 frequency. In terms of the students’ qualitative responses, the participants also give common reason like “Our lecturer should correct all errors.So, we do not repeat the writing error again and we can increase our knowledge while learning about the mistakes we have made”, “Because if all errors are corrected then the possibility of errors will not be repeated again”, and “We think that the minor errors not really important, so the lecturer does not need to focus too much on it, for the minor errors the lectures can give some advices”. Moreover the table 4.5 below showed the responses in which participants’ preferences of error correction technique.

**Table 4.5**

**The calculation of participants’ preferences of error correction technique**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No of Students** | **Questionnaire Items** | | | | | | | |
| **a** | **b** | **c** | **d** | **e** | **f** | **g** | **h** |
| 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 29 | 38 | 31 | 31 | 42 | 50 | 12 | 19 |
| Mean Rating | 2.9 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 4.2 | 5 | 1.2 | 1.9 |

The table above is the calculation of Likert Scale from the students, in the end of the total it was divided to ten because there are ten students that being the subject in this research.

**Table 4.6**

**Participants’ preferences of error correction technique**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Questionnaire items** | **Mean Rating** |
| a. Underlining the error without correcting it. | 2.9 |
| b. Underlining the error and then directing you to a source for information. | 3.8 |
| c. Indicating the type of error without locating or correcting it. | 3.1 |
| d. Locating the error (e.g., by underlying it) and also indicating the type of error. | 3.1 |
| e. Underlining the error and then correcting it | 4.2 |
| f. Correcting the error and then providing an explanation for the correction | 5.0 |
| g. Simply indicating that you have an error in the sentence by putting a cross next to it without locating or correcting the error. | 1.2 |
| h. Asking my classmate (s) to correct the error. | 1.9 |

**\*1=Very useless; 2=Useless; 3=Neither useful nor useless; 4=Useful; 5=Very useful**

**Figure. 4.4**

**Participants’ preferences of error correction technique**

Table 4.4 investigated the participants’ preferences of error correction techniques. The most preferred technique among the students was *“Correcting the error and then providing an explanation for the correction”*, with a total average rating of 5.0. The comment given by a participant is “more effective and easy to understand”. Followed by *“Underlining the error and then correcting it”* with a total average rating of 4.2. The comment given by a participant is “in order to directly know”. The lowest preferred technique among the students was *“Simply indicating that you have an error in the sentence by putting a cross next to it without locating or correcting the error”,* with a total average rating of 1.2.

**4.2 Discussion**

This research is to illustrate how the participants of Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah Medan perceive various WCF techniques. The research also sought to examine whether an EFL context makes participants’ perceptions distinctive from non-ESL contexts. The research results revealed that although a sizeable amount of survey participants held neutral or negative opinions toward explicit grammar instruction, they still expressed a favorable attitude toward error corrections and comments.

The results also demonstrate that the students preferred direct correction to indirect correction because the students can get a feedback without waiting for any longer and also the teacher point out the mistakes so that WCF is expected to be able to diminish the same mistakes. It can be seem from the direct corrective meaning itself. This might take a number of different forms crossing out the unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near the erroneous form. For instance direct CF has the advantage that provides learners with vivid guidance about how to correct their errors. Many students also expressed strong desires formore self-correction as well as interactive activities in the revision process. This signals a potential limitation of unidirectional WCF techniques.

Other research has pointed to the kind of feedback being furnished as having a vital position in shaping students’ perception. Local or global feedback, peer or self-evaluation and direct or oblique error remarks have all been shown to contribute extensively to students’ perceptions of teacher comments practices. Perhaps the most tough elements to consider when evaluating the success of comments are person learner traits such as linguistic and educational backgrounds, cultural differences, proficiency with the target language and even motivations for taking a class, even points to the quantity of exposure to the goal language (unrelated to L2 proficiency) as effecting students’ attitudes and utilization of trainer commentary.

We can not honestly seem at teachers’ written feedback or transcripts of their oral comments as properly as students’ revisions and conclude that we know the whole thing we want to be aware of about a precise teacher, student, or class. Because a good deal of the preceding research into written corrective feedback has been accomplished in a decontextualized manner, a case study strategy was once favored over amassing larger pools of data. In this way, it used to be viable to furnish a a lot deeper appreciation and level of element to join the studying context with attitudes closer to written corrective feedback. This richer description can also help form quality practices when expending the time, effort and assets it takes to thoroughly provide feedback in composition classes.

The results of this research found that overall the students held a very positive view regarding WCF in writing instruction. The participants also stated they will want their lecturer provide the feedback on the grammatical error on the final draft. They also think lecturer should tell the location of the error and explain as detailed as possible what the writing error when students make errors in their writings.

Finally, the survey also highlighted the importance of problem regarding how lecturer treat students’ errors. They stated that so far the lecturer only indicating the type of error without locating or correcting it. So, they hope the lecturer can write it down or tell verbally what the writing error. Followed by that the participants think that their errors should be corrected and correcting the error then providing an explanation for the correction. Lastly the participants also think that usually when they get back their writing with the teacher’s comments and feedback they will improve it and repeat it with the truth in the next exercises. This showed the willingness of the participants itself.