THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEACHER CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK USING DIARY IN VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

Yulia Primitasari, Muhammad Asrori, Sri Haryati
English Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Universitas Sebelas Maret
Email: yuliaprimita@student.uns.ac.id

Abstract
The present study reports on a case study that investigated the implementation of Corrective Feedback, and primarily focus on how students and the teacher perceive the usefulness of Corrective Feedback in writing class. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from 36 students in the tenth grade of vocational students in Surakarta by means of interviews and a closed-ended questionnaire using a Likert scale. The other qualitative data were collected through the observation conducted during the English class, in-depth interviews with the teacher and the students, and the documents of the students' pieces of writing. The result showed that the practice of Teacher Corrective Feedback was carried out outside the English class since the diary was not stipulated in the syllabus yet. Overall, the students and the teacher expressed a positive perception regarding the usefulness and implementation of Teacher Correction Feedback using a diary. Nevertheless, it still takes a long time for the students to have a significant improvement in creating sentences with high complexity. Based on the present study's findings, it is suggested that the teacher need to discuss and ensure the students' understanding of the objectives of Corrective Feedback using a diary and their responsibility in revising and correcting the errors.
Keywords: corrective feedback; diary; vocational high school

INTRODUCTION

       Writing is a necessary life skill for the students since it is used for various purposes and produced in different forms. Many products of writing can be found in daily life or academic fields. Brown (2007, p. 390) defines writing as the process of expressing the ideas, opinion thought or feeling into words on the paper, in order to deepen the main ideas and provide the construction, cohesion, and coherent organization of the text. Writing is also a process to generate a language and deliver ideas or thoughts into written communication (Harmer, 2004, p. 31). In conclusion, writing is a process of producing a language in

written forms. In the modern era, writing is a productive skill where the writer writes not only on paper but also on electronic media.

Many researchers such as Nekatgoo (2011), Cumming (2001), and Sheen (2007) stated that writing is a highly complex skill because students have to pay more attention to macro-level skills, for instance, drafting, planning, or organization, as well as micro-level skill such as lexical (spelling, word choice), grammatical (verb, tense, pronoun), or structural (punctuation, comma). Spratt, Mary, Pulverness, Williams, & Melanie (2005, p. 26) mentions that since writing involves several subskills, especially accuracy, the process of producing a piece of English writing without the errors is categorized as challenging tasks for EFL students. Furthermore, the product of writing, which still contains various types of errors may result in misunderstanding and miscommunication for the readers (Phuket & Othman, 2005, p. 99).

Accuracy, which includes micro-skills of writing, is an essential sub-skill. It is since accuracy is one of the benchmarks to measure the students' language acquisition. (Ellis, 2008, p. 17). Thus, a lack of accuracy in writing such as lexical, morphological, and syntactical accuracy may lead the students to inadequate users of the language (Ferris, 2001, p. 14). Besides, it can affect the readers' judgment regarding the topic, content, or even the writer. In order to minimize the students' errors and to sharpen their awareness about the errors, the teacher has some responsibilities in choosing the appropriate techniques implemented in the teaching process.

Jordan (1997, p. 171) stated that any academic writing still needs feedback regarding its acceptability and accuracy. Besides, Sermsook, Liamnimitr & Pochakorn (2017, p. 43) mention that one of the accepted techniques to enhance the students' ability in writing, including the accuracy, is teacher's feedback. Feedback is not only to provide the students' work with the assessment but also to assist their understanding of their work and to allow the students to check and monitor the progress of their learning (Harmer, 2007, p. 151). It means that the teacher can provide positive feedback that gives a response to how well the students' writing or negative feedback that responds to the errors and mistakes of the students' writing by correcting.

One type of feedback that can be provided by the teacher in writing activity is a correction (Ellis, 2009, p. 3). Corrective feedback focuses on the treatment of errors and guidance for the teacher. The teacher's role in this type of feedback is by writing the comments and correcting the errors on students' pieces of writing. Harmer (2007, p. 149) claims that teachers not only gives marks on the students' work but also can write summarizing comment at the end of students' work about what was appropriate and what needs correcting.

Corrective feedback insists the students pay more attention to the grammatical accuracy of the utterances produced by them (Sheen, 2007, p. 255). Lightbown and Spada (2013, p. 139) stated that Corrective Feedback is the feedback to indicate that the student uses the incorrect of a target of language, which contains grammatical inaccuracy or fails in the act of communication. It means that Corrective Feedback allows the students to recognize the information related to their writing performance by receiving marks of the errors. However, the effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in improving the students'

accuracy in writing performance is still debatable and controversial among the other researchers for ages. This issue is initially sparked by Truscott (1996, 1999, 2004, 2007). Truscott questions the effectiveness of Correction Feedback as an instructional tool for the students' writing accuracy development by providing some evidence in his studies. Other researchers support Truscott's studies, including Fazio (2001); Truscott & Hsu (2008); Bruton (2009); Sheppard (1992).

On the other side, most of the researchers, including Ellis et al. (2008), Ferris & Robert (2001), Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005), Ferris (2006) support the positive role of Corrective Feedback on students' writing accuracy. For example, Bitchner, Young, and Cameron (2005) found that the different types of Corrective Feedback improved the students' accuracy in some structures, but have no overall effect on accuracy improvement. Although the result is still unclear about what types and amounts of Corrective Feedback work the best, those researchers' findings are again proving the positive influence of Corrective Feedback at a certain level.

Implementing Corrective Feedback as a technique of teaching writing requires the teacher to select the appropriate types of writing performance, which supports the technique in which one of them is a diary. Dincel & Savur (2018, p. 48) states that a diary is a self-writing where the student can write and share any topics and talk to any person based on their will even to himself, or someone imaginary. Furthermore, diary writing allows students to write freely and continuously since the more students write, the more their writing skills improve.

Based on the theories explained before, there are three objectives that can be formulated in this study: 1) to describe the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using a diary, 2) to analyze the students' perception toward the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using diary in their writing classes, and 3) to analyze the effect of the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback on the students' writing accuracy viewed by teacher's perception.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Teacher Corrective Feedback in Writing

Corrective Feedback is the response from the feedback providers to the students who make a linguistic error in their speaking or writing (Ellis, 2009: 3). Sheen and Ellis (2011, p. 593) also noted that Corrective Feedback as the feedback where provided when the student commits a linguistic error, whether in oral or written production. Likewise, Chaudron (1988, p. 149) stated that Corrective Feedback is the "true" correction, which succeeds in modifying the student's inter-language rule so that the error is decreased for the next production. It implies that Corrective Feedback is not only about the teacher correcting the student's work, but also the students should revise the error that they committed to producing a better target language in the future.

Written Corrective Feedback occurs offline, which means that there is a delay when the students commit errors and receive feedback (Sheen, 2010, p. 204). It has led the teacher to have more time to think carefully about how to give feedback and on what. Hence,

Written Corrective Feedback is usually provided at the end or during the process of writing.

Written Corrective Feedback concerns more on syntactical and lexical errors because those are the most error the students committed in writing. As stated by Sheen (2011), cited by Buffa (2016, p. 12), Written Corrective Feedback focuses on lexico-grammatical from SLA (Second Language Acquisition) perspective. It involves input-providing feedback that refers to direct correction, and output-prompting feedback refers to an indirect correction (Sheen & Ellis, 2011, p. 593). The direct correction means that the students are provided the correct form of their error text, whereas indirect correction indicates that the error has been committed in the text where the error occurs.

There are several techniques of Written Corrective Feedback, which can be implemented by the teacher. Ellis (2008) highlights six basic strategies in providing written Corrective Feedback; direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focused versus unfocused, electronic feedback, and reformulation.

Direct Corrective Feedback requires the teacher to cross out a wrong word, phrase, or morpheme, even inserting a missing word or morpheme, then writing the correct one in students' written work (Ellis, 2008, p. 99). She added that the implementation of direct Corrective Feedback provides the students with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors since they are not capable yet of doing self-correcting the errors, especially for the students who lack self-correction.

Meanwhile, for indirect Corrective Feedback, Ellis (2008, p. 98) explained two ways in its implementation, that is by indicating and locating the error where the teacher can underline the errors to show omissions in students' written text, and an indication only which the teacher gives a cross sign in the margin next to the line where the error exists.

Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback requires the teacher to provide the students' written work with explicit comments about the error that they made. Ellis (2008) stated that explicit comment takes two forms. The most common explicit comment is the use of error codes. For electronic feedback, it provides the students with technology as a means to correct their errors and give more experienced writers. It helps the teacher save time that can be used for other types of writing instruction

Reformulation involves rewriting the students' written work with the correction being made by the native speaker but still retaining the intended meaning (Jordan, 1997, p. 174). Then, the students are asked to revise their written work without access to their reformulated correction.

Hence, for implementing the technique of Corrective Feedback, the teacher needs to select the appropriate techniques based on the students' needs and students' levels.

Reflective Practice

Finlay (2008, p. 1) defines reflective practice as the learning process through and from experience in order to gain new understandings of self and/or practice. Widodo and Ferdiansyah (2018, p. 923) state that reflective practice is a way to make sense of routine pedagogical practices and events to enable practitioners to perceive their own or others' practices as a plan for change or learning. Mathew, Mathew, and Peechattu (2017, p. 126)

argue that reflective practice refers to a process that provides learning, teaching, and understanding, and it has a vital role in practitioners' professional development.

Burhan-Horasanlı & Ortaçtepe, and Farrell (as cited in Widodo & Ferdiansyah, 2018, p. 923) argue that there are three kinds of reflective practice: reflection-on-action, reflection-in-action, and reflection-for-action. Reflection-on-action means the reflection process takes place after an action (metacognitive action). Reflection-in-action refers to the reflection that occurs during an action (spontaneous reflection). While in reflection-for-action, the reflection takes place before action and involves planning (proactive reflection).

Loughran (2005, pp. 84-87) states that the reflective cycle consists of five elements or phases with varying levels of use. There are problems, hypotheses, suggestions, reasoning, and testing.

Accuracy in Corrective Feedback

The effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in promoting language acquisition, especially writing accuracy, is still debatable and controversial among other researchers for ages. Based on the previous studies, some researchers who conducted the study regarding Corrective Feedback argue that Corrective Feedback does not promote and facilitate the students' performance, especially in the writing context. This debate is initially sparked by Truscott (1996). In his study, Truscott (1996) argues the ineffectiveness of error correction in the students' writing accuracy. He stated the reasons and evidence why grammar correction should be abandoned for both theoretical and practical reasons. Furthermore, Truscott (1996) claimed the harmfulness of Corrective Feedback on the students' writing accuracy. This study follows another Truscott's research about the negative role of Corrective Feedback on writing accuracy in 1999, 2004, and 2007)

On the other hand, many researchers assumed that Corrective Feedback could reduce the students' errors related to accuracy in writing (Sermsook, Liamnimitr & Pochakorn, 2017; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris & Robert, 2001; Bitchener, Young, and Cameron, 2005; Ferris, 2006). Ellis (2008), in his research, indicated that written Corrective Feedback is effective for EFL learners, especially on the errors of English articles. Bitchner, Young, and Cameron (2005) also found that the different types of Corrective Feedback improved the students' accuracy in some structures, but have no overall effect on accuracy improvement.

Based on the literature review above, the researcher attempted to investigate the effectiveness of Corrective Feedback on the students' writing accuracy based on the students' and teachers' perceptions.

Perceptions of Corrective Feedback

Perception is an essential aspect because it affects the students in the learning process (Kleinke, 1978). The students' perception would be affected by their response and attitude in the learning process. Some previous studies have extensively shown the differences between students' and teacher's perceptions of Written Corrective Feedback. The researchers such as Simard et al. (2015), Baker (2007), and Brown (2009), Lee (2005) have revealed a positive view regarding Corrective Feedback. Simard et al. (2015) found that some teacher's corrections led to misunderstanding for the students regarding the intent of the teacher and the meaning of correction. Besides, some

researchers, for instance, Armhein and Nassaji (2010); Lee (2008); Chen, Nassaji, Liu (2016) also investigate the teacher's and students' preference for certain techniques of Corrective Feedback and types of errors focused.

RESEARCH METHOD

The participant of the study was one class of the Office Administration (AP) in tenth-grade students in the academic year of 2018/2019. The selected class, X AP 1, consists of 36 (thirty-six) students, with 35 (thirty-five) females and one male.

In collecting the data, the researcher used reliable techniques stated by Creswell (2012, p. 212), which are observation, interview and questionnaire, and documents. The closed-ended questionnaire with four points Likert scale was carried out to gather the quantitative data to analyze the students' perceptions toward the implementation of Corrective Feedback using the diary. The questionnaire used in this study was developed by Chen et al. (2016) and Irwin (2017) questionnaires with both involved EFL context. A set of questionnaires consist of 43 statements, and eight categories were addressed to 36 students of a class.

In order to analyze the data, the researcher employed the interactive model analysis by Miles and Huberman (2014, p. 31). The quantitative data in the closed-ended questionnaire, which includes Likert scale responses, was calculated and recorded in an excel spreadsheet.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. The Implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using Diary Writing

From the observations, the teacher's interview, and also the documents, it was found that the use of a diary to support the technique of Teacher Corrective Feedback was not stipulated in the syllabus of tenth grade in the second semester in vocational high school. It showed that the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using a diary was carried out outside the English class since a diary was not defined in the syllabus yet. The finding showed that the students' practice of writing a diary could bolster and advance their ability to produce the other genre of the text other than a diary, which is based on the Basic Competence, for instance, writing a memo, an announcement, and a text descriptive.

The implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback was demonstrated from the procedure of its practice and the teacher's technique in providing Corrective Feedback. In terms of the manner in providing Corrective Feedback, it was found that the students were facilitated to collect the diaries through e-feedback by WhatsApp and paper-based. The finding revealed that the teacher preferred and prioritized e-feedback through WhatsApp than paper-based because of its ease and practicality in correcting. Hence, she can correct the diary in any place and any time without carrying too many books or papers. Overall, the reason was in accordance with the findings reported by Tuzi (2004, p. 232), who argued that e-feedback offered the teacher or instructor to read and provide comments and revision from any Internet location without consuming class time.

In terms of the techniques in providing Corrective Feedback, it was also clear that the teacher applied the direct unfocused Corrective Feedback. Hence, the teacher corrected the students' diary by underlining the wrong words for all linguistic errors, then wrote the correct forms above or next to the errors. It was consistent with what Ellis (2008) mentioned in her research. More importantly, the teacher affirmed that one reason behind it was that the technique was suitable for the students' level. She perceived that some students still found it arduous to find the correct forms by themselves since some errors they committed had not been explained in the material. This reason was in complete agreement with Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005), Pham (2015), and Koksal et al. (2018) who found that in deciding the technique of Corrective Feedback, the teachers needed to consider the proficiency level of their students and other factors.

Furthermore, the essential of Corrective Feedback is how the students respond to the correction provided. The findings showed that the students did not require to directly revise their errors by re-write their diary with the correct sentences. However, the students were asked to study the correction and not repeat the same mistakes. Likewise, the teacher mentioned that the students' errors were decreased in the final students' diary at the end of the semester. The finding is in line with Ellis (2008, p. 105), who stated that the correction could only work if the students recognize, process, and examine it. Thus, if the students were asked to study the corrections carefully, they might have shown a similar improvement in accuracy to the students who revised following the Corrective Feedback.

2. The Students' Perception Toward the Implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback Using Diary in Writing Class.

A questionnaire using four points Likert scale was carried out, and the students' interview was conducted to verify the data obtained from the polls in order to analyze the students' perception toward the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback. The following data in Table 1 represents the students' experiences or preferences in each category.

Table 1. The Students' experiences and preferences for Teacher Corrective Feedback

Category	Statements	Number of Response				
		SA (Strongly Agree	A (Agree)	D (Disagree)	SD (Strongly Disagree)	Total
Frequency	1. Teacher always corrects and comments on each of my diaries.	19 (52.8%)	15 (41.7%)	2 (5.6%)	0 (0.0%)	36 ±100%
Understanding of feedback	2. I understand the teacher's corrections and comments on my diary.	10 (27.8%)	26 (72.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	36 ±100%
Comment on teacher	3. I think the teacher's correction in my	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	31 (86.1%)	5 (13.9%)	36 ±100%

		diary is not objective.					
Efforts after received marked paper	4.	I always read my diary, which has been corrected by the teacher	12 (33.3%)	23 (63.9%)	1 (2.8%)	0 (0.0%)	36 ±100%
Student's feeling after getting feedback	5.	I think the teacher's corrections and comments often make me feel disappointed and dissatisfied with my English skills.	0 (0.0%)	12 (33.3%)	21 (58.3%)	3 (8.3%)	36 ±100%
The usefulness of feedback	6.	I think the teacher's correction in my diary is useful.	23 (63.9%)	13 (36.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	36 ±100%

As shown in Table 1, statement one regarding the frequency reported that 94.5% of the students answered that they strongly agreed (52.8%) or agreed (41.7%) that they always received the teacher's correction and commented on each of their diaries. Besides, in terms of clarity, it showed that the students opted for strongly agreed (27.8%) or agreed (72.2%) of their understanding of the teacher's correction in their diary.

Furthermore, some students confirmed in the interview that their teacher's corrections and teacher's comments were understandable and legible since they could read their teacher's writing. These findings refuted the previous result reported by Salteh and Sadeghi (2012, p. 378), which argued that the teacher's corrections and comments were vague and abstract for the students to understand. They proved it by highlighting the other researches, for instance, Hendrickson (1978) and Zamel (1985), which acknowledged that the students had difficulties in understanding the teacher's correction, especially with the unintelligible comments. The issue may cause misunderstanding for both students and teachers, whether the teacher was misreading the text or the students misunderstanding the provided comments.

On the category of objectivity, all of the students were disagree that the teacher's correction on their diaries was not objective, with a percentage, 86.1% of the students opted to disagree or 13.9% of the students opted for strongly disagree. It means that approximately all of the students surveyed felt strongly positive that their Teacher Corrective Feedback, was objective. As highlighted in statement four related to the effort of the students, the majority of those who responded felt that they always read the teacher's correction in their diary. The response rate was 33.3% strongly agree, and 63.9% agree. Besides, regarding the drawback of Corrective Feedback, the result of the questionnaire revealed that over half of the students checked to disagree or strongly disagree that they feel disappointed and dissatisfied with their English skills because of the teacher's correction and comments. The response rate was 58.3% on disagreeing, and 8.3% on strongly disagreeing. The 36 students who took part in the questionnaire reported that over half of those surveyed felt comfortable, and had a favorable attitude on the practice

of teacher's correction. Even the student who gets the comments from the teacher regarding plagiarism did a private talk with the teacher, then at the end, she did not feel bothered by those comments, tried to understand, and reflected her actions.

In terms of the utility of Teacher Corrective Feedback, the finding intimated that over half of the students (percentage of 63.9% of the students opted for strongly agree and 36.1% for agreeing) acknowledged the necessity of Teacher Corrective Feedback in their writing class. The students noted that teacher correction assisted them to understand where the errors were placed and the correct forms of the errors. Besides, some of them would know better that one of the teacher's jobs was not only giving them tasks but also providing corrections. The students' claim was in line with Armhein and Nassaji (2010) who reported that the students asserted the importance of teacher correction to discover their errors and learn from them. What is more, the students indicated a favorable view of the improvement in their writing skills during the practice of Teacher Corrective Feedback. These results correlate favorably with Irwin (2017), and Chen et al. (2015).

The finding of the study also revealed the students' preference for error correction techniques and error correction types, which can be implemented in their writing class. As reported by Chen et al. (2015), the students showed their preference for error correction techniques on the option of "locating the error and indicating the type of error," which includes a metalinguistic Corrective Feedback technique. The result highlighted that the learners with advanced levels needed less explicit feedback or direct Corrective Feedback of their errors. In contrast to earlier findings (Chen, Nassaji, and Liu, 2015, p. 8), this study showed that students prefer direct Corrective Feedback to other techniques. This students' preference was in line with the teacher's technique of Corrective Feedback implemented in the writing class. The students revealed that having direct Corrective Feedback assists them to identify their errors directly and may wish not to get the difficulties in finding the correct forms by themselves. The students' preference for the direct Corrective Feedback technique also corroborates the previous result by Chung (2015), which reported that both Korean and Japanese EFL learners had a favorable view of direct techniques of Corrective Feedback in their written work.

What is more, the students' preference for correction was the teacher paying more attention to their errors on grammar, vocabulary, and lexical than the content errors. They argued that due to the various topic in their diary writing, it was not suitable for their case if the teacher focused on the content of their writing. These findings concurred thoroughly with Nasaji and Armhein (2010, p. 106), who found that the students showed a negative response for correction on the content. However, it significantly differs from Chen et al. (2015, p. 10), who discovered that the students preferred the comment on the content errors to grammatical errors for correction.

3. The Teacher's Perception of the Implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback Using Diary on the Students' Writing Accuracy.

The finding of the study demonstrated the teacher's perception toward the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback on the students' writing accuracy. The teacher mentioned the advantages and the drawback of the use of Teacher Corrective Feedback on students' writing accuracy. The teacher found an improvement in the students writing in sentence structures and word choices similar to Hosseiny's (2014) research. The research underlined that direct Corrective Feedback had more benefits than indirect Corrective Feedback in the context of sentence structure and word choices when the teacher could make sure that the students understand the provided correction.

More importantly, the finding of this study showed the teacher's claims that the use of direct Corrective Feedback was adequate and had a positive influence on the students' writing accuracy. Nevertheless, it took time for almost a year and needed a long process for a certain level of the students. Research from Bitchener and Knoch (2008, p. 329) had also discovered that direct error correction alone was effective as the other type of direct corrective feedback in increasing the students' writing accuracy with the implementation over than two-month period.

Even though the teacher highlighted the positive influences of Corrective Feedback, she underlined the drawback of Teacher Corrective Feedback. The teacher's explanation indicated that at a certain point when the teacher always corrected the students' errors even for simple errors, the students might become too dependent on the correction provided by their teacher. Besides, it might lessen the students' awareness of the errors they committed. This drawback matched well with Pham's (2015, p. 15) finding, which denoted that Corrective Feedback made the students become 'spoiled' if the teacher always corrects their errors even they were simple.

Based on the teacher's interview, the overall finding of the study showed that the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using a diary had a positive influence on the students' writing performance. It was in contrast to Truscott (1996, 1999, 2007, 2008) who believed that error correction was ineffective for developing the students' accuracy in writing. Thus, the finding of this study concurred thoroughly with Ellis et al. (2008, p. 368), who found the effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback in enhancing the students' grammatical accuracy in writing for ESL or EFL context and also confirmed the previous findings by Ferris (2006). This manner was also supported by Van Beuningen, De Jong, and Kuiken (2012, p. 36), which uttered that Corrective Feedback was a beneficial educational tool in assisting the students to improve their accuracy in writing.

IMPLICATION

First, the finding reveals that the technique of Corrective Feedback given by the teacher was direct Corrective Feedback. It implies that the practice of Corrective Feedback requires less effort of the student to correct the errors and transfer all responsibility of error correction to the teacher. Hence, the teacher needs to leave a little room for the

students to do the self-correction so that the students might be more aware and responsible for correcting the errors they commit.

Second, the finding shows that by correcting the students' writing, the teacher is aware and knows the most error committed by the students, which is on grammar (tenses, pronoun) and diction. It implies that the student's knowledge of grammar and diction is essential for the students' to create the comprehensible and free-error piece of writing. Therefore, the teacher can teach and prepare the lesson for the students frequently regarding those most errors made by the students (grammar and diction) so that it can be effective in improving the students' writing.

Third, the study has demonstrated that the teacher provided the correction or comments on students' diaries regarding lexical, grammatical, and structural errors. It implies that the feedback related to the contents, organization, and ideas are not implemented yet by the teacher. Therefore, in order to assist the students in enhancing their writing skills, especially on the macro-skill of writing, the teacher needs to provide balanced coverage of the feedback, which not only focuses on the language errors but also on the organizational and content issues.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Firstly, the practice of Teacher Corrective Feedback using the diary in the tenth grade of one of the vocational schools in Surakarta is unexpectedly carried out outside the English class. What is more, it builds the students' habit of writing the other genre of English text, which is based on its Basic Competence, for instance, a memo, an announcement, and descriptive text. Moreover, in terms of the technique in correcting, it revealed that the teacher opted for direct unfocused Corrective Feedback.

Secondly, despite its shortcomings, the students have their positive perception toward the implementation of Teacher Corrective Feedback using a diary. The majority of the students feel the necessity and the usefulness of teacher's corrections and comments in their diary writing. Besides, having corrections and comments from the teacher enhances their knowledge in grammar aspects, for instance, verbs, tenses, spelling, and improves their ability to create simple sentences with proper arrangement.

Lastly, the teacher also shares a positive perception toward the implementation of Teacher Correction Feedback using a diary on the students' accuracy. The teacher mentions the positive influence of the Corrective Feedback in the aspect of micro-skill of writing, especially in sentence structure, grammatical, and lexical. Despite its successes in enhancing the students' writing performance, the Teacher Corrective Feedback might make the students too dependent on the teacher if the teacher always corrects the students' errors even for simple errors.

Since the teacher provided the Corrective Feedback, it is better if the teacher avoids and lessens personal comments, for example, the students' handwriting, which makes the students feel ashamed or insulted. Moreover, the teacher needs to discuss and ensure the students' understanding of the objectives of Teacher Corrective Feedback using a diary and their responsibility in revising and correcting the errors.

There are many other aspects of Corrective Feedback, which can be explored more by the other researchers. The researcher may wish for future research to deepen and develop the study with consideration of different perspectives, and linguistic contexts.

REFERENCES

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14(3), 191–205.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of focused approach to written corrective feedback. ELT Journal, 63(3), 204-211.

Brown, H. (2007) Teaching by principles: An interaction approach to language pedagogy (3rd ed). United Stated: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bruton, A. (2009). Improving accuracy is not the only reason for writing, and even if it were... System, 37(4), 600–613.

Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from mainland chine. Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 1(5), 1-17.

Creswell, J. (2007). Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches (2nd ed). United States: Sage Publication International.

Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. International Journal of English Studies, 1(2), 1-23.

Dincel, B., & Savur, H. (2018). Diary keeping in writing education. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 7(1), 48-59.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97-107.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. L2 Journal, 1(1), 3-18.

Fazio, L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority- and majority-language students. Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(4), 235–249.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes how explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(3), 161-184.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? new evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds), Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (pp. 81-104). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fraenkel, J., Wallen, N., & Hyun, H. (2015). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw-Hill Education.

Harmer, J. (2004). How to teach writing. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2007). The practice of english language teaching. England: Pearson Longman.

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving iranian efl students' writing skill. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 668–674.

Jordan, R. (1997). English for academic purpose: A guide and resource book for teacher. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koksal, D., Ozdemir, E., Tercan G., Gun, S., & Bilgin, E. (2018). The relationship between teachers' written feedback preferences, self-efficacy beliefs and burnout levels. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14(4), 316-327.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2013). How languages are learned (4th ed). China: Oxford University Press.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3er ed). United States: Sage Publication, Inc

Nekatgoo, B. (2011). The effects of portofolio assessment on writing of EFL students. English Language Teaching, 4(2).

Pham, T. (2015). Different forms of corrective feedback and their effects on l2 students' writing accuracy: a case study. Asian Journal of Educational Research, 3(1), 10-17.

Phuket, P., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. Journal of Education and Practice, 6(32), 99-106.

Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An analysis of errors in written english sentences: a case study of thai EFL students. English Language Teaching, 10(3), 101-110.

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.

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 203– 234.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: corrective feedback in language teaching. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference?. RELC Journal, 23, 103–110.

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2005). The teaching knowledge test course. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case againts grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case against grammar correction in l2 writing classes": a response to ferris. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(2), 111-122.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: a response to chandler. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13, 337-347.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. Journal of Second Language Writing, 16(4), 255–272.

Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(4), 292–305.

Van, B., De Jong, N., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. Language Learning, 62(1), 1–41.

Yin, R. (2011). Qualitative research from start to finish. New York: The Guilford Press.