

PROSIDING TURNITIN

by Nisa Astrid Prosiding

Submission date: 19-Dec-2022 09:01AM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1984160734

File name: proceeding_AES.pdf (498.94K)

Word count: 3400

Character count: 18526

Implementing Teacher Written Feedback and Oral Writing Conference:

Do They Work for Introvert and Extrovert Students?

Annisa Astrid*

² Post Graduate Program
Raden Fatah State Islamic University
Palembang, Indonesia

*annisaastrid_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Manalullaili

² Da'wah Faculty
Raden Fatah State Islamic University
Palembang, Indonesia

manalullaili_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Abstract—Teacher's written feedback and oral writing conference are the techniques used to give feedback to the students during writing process. There has been many research studies related to the implementation of these techniques. However, there was limited information whether the techniques go well for the students with different personality traits. Thus, this research aimed at finding out the effect on the implementation of teacher's written and oral feedback for students with different personality (Extroversion Vs Introversion). The method used in this research was explanatory mixed method data collection. The quantitative data were collected by using essay writing test. Meanwhile, the qualitative data were gained from observation, interview and documentation. The quantitative data were analyzed by using MANOVA statistical analysis, meanwhile thematic analysis was used to analyze the qualitative ones. The results of this study were as follows: 1) Students with different personality factor showed significantly different writing performance; 2) Extrovert and introvert students did not show the difference on the writing performance paragraph organization and coherence; 3) Extrovert students showed better performance in the aspect of format and content than introvert ones and 4) Introvert students had better achievement in terms of sentence structure and vocabulary than extrovert ones.

Keywords—teacher written feedback, oral writing conference, extroversion, introversion

I. INTRODUCTION

The fact that writing in English is problematic has been researched in Indonesia. First, students were found to have negative attitude toward writing. They regard writing as a difficult skill [1]. The problems faced by students are commonly on how to produce coherent paragraphs with correct grammatical sentences [2,3]. Then, it was found that writing has become neglected subjects and it has been less priority to learn at school [4,5].

In order to alleviate the problems students, have in writing, a good teacher of English should be able to determine the appropriate teaching methods in teaching writing. There are

two approaches used in teaching writing; process and product writing approach. The basic difference between product and process approach is the emphasis of teaching where the main goal of process writing approach is to have students in several stages of writing where the students follow the cycle from brainstorming, drafting, editing and revising. Meanwhile, the main goal of product writing approach is to make the students compose such an error-free paragraph or essay where the teacher focused on how to make the students imitate the writing model or such kind of writing template provided by the teacher [6].

In the editing and revising parts, the students get the feedback to enhance the quality of their writing. The main source of feedback is from the teacher. According to Ferris [7], teacher feedback is expected to bring improvement to students' writing. The feedback could be given in the form of written feedback Ferris [7] or oral one through one to one oral writing conference [8]. Further, written feedback is such kind of the bridge between the teacher and the students. Through the feedback, the teacher could give corrections or suggestions in written form which is expected to be useful for the students to revise their writing and guide the students to go through the steps in writing process and make them aware on them of their writing progress and weaknesses [9-11].

Meanwhile, oral writing conference is conducted as one – to – one meeting between the teacher and the students in order to manage students' confusion toward teacher's written feedback [7,12]. Oral feedback is defined as in-class conferences (5-10 minutes) with individual students, while the rest of the class is engaged in other activities; or out-of-class longer (15-30 minutes) conferences with individual students or groups [12,13]. The oral feedback or conferences should follow planned procedures and stages of opening, student-initiated comments, teacher-initiated comments reading of the paper and closings [14].

Oral writing conference is considered important since it is such kind of tool to help students and the teacher to talk about things that cannot be written in the students' draft Ferris [7]. In

this activity, the teacher could approach the student personally about their problems in writing and this activity is beneficial for students who are unwilling to talk in front of their peers in class [15]

There are some pros and cons about the implementation of teacher feedback. Some researchers argued that teacher feedback is beneficial to improve the quality of students' writing in their revision during the writing process [7,16]. Besides, by having feedback from their teacher, the motivation in writing of the students can be fostered [17]. Meanwhile other researchers said that teacher feedback was ineffective since the students value their teacher's feedback since the teacher has absolute power to determine the score of their writing, and somehow the students just follow their teacher's correction without any further considerations [18]. Besides, students become not autonomous since they really depend on the comments of their teacher [19]. Recently, the concern in English language teaching is not only about the selection of appropriate teaching method or learning materials but also about individual variations. One of individual differences which have been researched are personality factors. Two types of personality namely extroversion and introversion have been two different types of personality which become the phenomena happen at teaching and learning activities [20, 21].

People who are introvert or extrovert have different manners. Eysenck and Eysenck [22] mentioned that someone who is introvert tend to be silent, dislike to interact with others, and likes to spend time by reading books. Meanwhile, extrovert person has contradictory manners to introvert one. Extrovert person does not like to be alone; he/ she likes to mingle with people. In a new situation, an extrovert one is easy to initiate conversation with strange people and befriend with them. In studying or working, extrovert person likes to collaborate with others in group.

There are many researchers who have researched that the two kinds of personality factors in relation to English Language Teaching (ELT). Many researchers found that since extrovert students tend to be easier to communicate with compared to introvert ones then the extrovert ones get more chances to have more input in language and produce more output [20,23]. Besides, relating to their manners, many researchers have focused on the relationship of the two personality traits with speaking and writing performance. Many research studies showed that extrovert students perform better in speaking, meanwhile the introvert ones showed better achievement in writing [24-28]. Meanwhile, there are some previous studies which claim that personality traits do not affect students' language performance [29-31].

Based on the previous explanation, it can be inferred that there are still limited studies about how the implementation of teacher written feedback and oral conference for with two different personality traits, extroversion and introversion. Thus those reasons made the researchers interested in conducting the research study which aimed at exploring the effect of the implementation of written and oral teacher feedback toward

each aspect of writing performance of students with two different personality traits, extraversion and introversion.

II. METHODS

In this research, mixed method data collection was used. The explanatory sequential design was selected [32]. In the first phase, the quantitative phase, the experiment was conducted in a writing class in 16 meetings. The students were taught by using teacher feedback in the form of written feedback and oral writing conference. Then, in the second phase, qualitative data collection, interview, observation and documentation of students' essay tasks were carried out to explore the phenomena gained from the experimental study.

12 out of 20 students of Post Graduate Program were selected in term of their personality traits (Extroversion and Introversion) by using General Factor of Personality Questionnaire (GFPQ) developed by [33]. At the end of the meeting, the students were given the test in the form of essay writing test. The data gained from essay writing test were analyzed by using MANOVA statistical analysis. Meanwhile, the data from interview, observation and documentation were analyzed by using thematic analysis.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the results of MANOVA statistical analysis and thematic analysis, the findings were classified as follows

A. Students with Different Personality Factor Showed Significantly Different Writing Performance

The results of the data analysis of students' essay writing scores were listed in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1. MULTIVARIATE TEST RESULT

Effect		Value	F	Hypo df	Error df	Sig.	
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.998	1589,747 ^b	3,0	8,000	.00	
	Wilks' Lambda	.002	1589,747 ^b	3,0	8,000	.00	
	Hotelling's Trace	596,155	1589,747 ^b	3,0	8,000	.00	
	Roy's Largest Root	596,155	1589,747 ^b	3,0	8,000	.00	
	Personality	Pillai's Trace	.723	6,954 ^b	3,0	8,000	.01
		Wilks' Lambda	.277	6,954 ^b	3,0	8,000	.01
		Hotelling's Trace	2,608	6,954 ^b	3,0	8,000	.01
Roy's Largest Root		2,608	6,954 ^b	3,0	8,000	.01	
					0	3	
Root							

Based on the data from Table 1, it can be seen that the significance value of personality trait is 0.013 or below 0.05. In other words, students with different personality factor. It was

supported from the data gained from observation. During the writing process, the students with different personality showed different attitude in writing process. This result is in line with the other research studies which shows that the difference personality gives impact to students' writing ability [34,35].

Extrovert and introvert students did not show the difference on the writing performance paragraph organization and

coherence. The results of MANOVA statistical analysis about how writing performance of students with different personality factor for each aspect of writing; format & content, organization & coherence, and sentence structure & vocabulary were listed in Table 2.

TABLE II. THE RESULTS OF TEST OF BETWEEN SUBJECT EFFECT

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	FC	126,750 ^a	1	126,750	13,180	.005
	OCh	4,083 ^b	1	4,083	4,016	.0733
	SV	90,750 ^c	1	90,750	6,153	.033
Intercept	FC	11594,083	1	11594,083	1205,624	.000
	OCh	3168,750	1	3168,750	3116,803	.000
	SV	9918,750	1	9918,750	672,458	.000
personality	FC	126,750	1	126,750	13,180	.005
	OCh	4,083	1	4,083	4,016	.073
	SV	90,750	1	90,750	6,153	.033
Error	FC	96,167	10	9,617		
	OCh	10,167	10	1,017		
	SV	147,500	10	14,750		
Total	FC	11817,000	12			
	OCh	3183,000	12			
	SV	10157,000	12			
Corrected Total	FC	222,917	11			
	OCh	14,250	11			
	SV	238,250	11			

The data displayed in Table 2 confirmed that the significance value for one of the writing aspects; organization and coherence is 0.073, which is higher than 0.05. It can be inferred that extrovert and introvert students did not show any significant difference of their writing performance in terms of the aspect of paragraph organization and coherence. This finding from interview and observation illustrated the explanation. Either extrovert or introvert students said that they feel the written feedback given by the lecturer was enough for the improvement of the aspect of paragraph organization and coherence in their paragraph. From the observation, it was found that neither the students nor the lecturer discussed about the aspect of coherence during oral writing conference.

B. Extrovert Students Showed Better Performance in the Aspect of Format and Content Than Introvert Ones

The data displayed in Table 2 showed that the sig. value for 'format and content' writing aspect is 0.005 which is lower than 0.05. It is clear that there is significant difference of the writing performance in the aspect of format and content between extrovert and introvert students, where extrovert students performed better than introvert ones. The data gained from observation and interview illustrated that extrovert students were much active during the oral writing conference where they frequently discuss about how to elaborate the content of the essay together with the lecturer. Meanwhile, the introvert students seemed reluctant to initiate the conversation with the lecturer. They only tended to respond what the lecturer asked them. Some experts have mentioned that the

strength of extrovert ones is that they are sociable. They love to get involved in interactional activities to others and get better achievement by learning with other people [36-38]. This condition makes extrovert students admitted during the interview that they were really comfortable when they were asked to discuss with their lecturer during the oral conference. They admitted they could share the ideas and asked for suggestions from the lecturer to elaborate the ideas into their essay writing.

C. Introvert Students Had Better Achievement in Terms of Sentence Structure and Vocabulary Than Extrovert Ones

From the data written in Table 2, it showed that for the aspect of sentence structure and vocabulary, the significance value is 0.033 which is lower than 0.05. It means that there is significant difference on writing performance of the introvert and extrovert students in the aspects of sentence structure and vocabulary where the introvert students performed better than the extroverts ones. Based on the observation, even though introvert students seemed shy to initiate questions to the lecturer during the writing conference. However, from the interview, introvert students admitted that they got much feedback in terms of grammar and diction. All of the comments were understandable for them, and made them aware for not doing the same mistakes again. This is caused by the long term memory which the introvert students have which. Introvert students tend to be good in listening and analyzing something, thus every new information is much easier to remember [26,38].

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION

This research derived some conclusions related to the effect of the implementation of teacher's written feedback and writing conference; First, Students with different personality factor showed significantly different writing performance. Secondly, extrovert and introvert students did not show the difference on the writing performance paragraph organization and coherence. Third, extrovert students showed better performance in the aspect of format and content than introvert ones and forth, introvert students had better achievement in terms of sentence structure and vocabulary than extrovert ones.

It can be implied that students' personality factor influence students' performance in writing in terms of writing aspects. Therefore, the teacher of writing should pay more attention to students' differences in their personality in order to select appropriate teaching techniques in which the students could experience suitable writing activities to enhance their writing ability.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Ismail, S. Elias, I.S.M.A. Albakri, P.D. Perumal, and I. Muthusamy, "Exploring ESL Students' Apprehension Level and Attitude towards Academic Writing," *Int. J. Learn.*, vol. 17, no. 6, 2010.
- [2] S. Abdullah, "Developing the Students' Writing Ability by Using Self-Editing Strategy in the Tertiary Level," *Unpubl. master's thesis, Grad. Sch. Sribwij. Univ. Palembang*, 2005.
- [3] W. Rahmatunisa, "Problems Faced by Indonesian EFL Learners in Writing Argumentative Essay," *English Rev. J. English Educ.*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 41-49, 2014.
- [4] A.C. Alwasilah, "From Local to Global: Reinventing Local Literature through English Writing Classes," *TEFLIN J.*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 11-27, 2006.
- [5] H.W. Anggraini, "The Differences among Writing Anxiety, Gender and Writing Achievement of English Study Program Students of Pgrri University, Palembang," 2016.
- [6] A. Raimes, "Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in the Teaching of Writing," *TESOL Q.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 407-430, 1991.
- [7] D.R. Ferris, *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge, 2003.
- [8] V. Zamel, "Responding to Student Writing," *TESOL Q.*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 79-101, 1985.
- [9] J. Harmer, "How to Teach Writing. Edinburgh Gate." Pearson Education Limited, Longman, 2004.
- [10] N.M. Noor, I. Aman, R. Mustaffa, and T.K. Seong, "Teacher's Verbal Feedback on Students' Response: A Malaysian Esl Classroom Discourse Analysis," *Procedia-Social Behav. Sci.*, vol. 7, pp. 398-405, 2010.
- [11] N. Srichanyachon, "Teacher Written Feedback for L2 Learners' Writing Development," *Humanit. Arts Soc. Sci. Stud. (FORMER NAME SILPAKORN Univ. J. Soc. Sci. Humanit. ARTS)*, pp. 7-17, 2012.
- [12] W. Grabe and R.B. Kaplan, *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Routledge, 2014.
- [13] S.M. Brookhart, *How to give effective feedback to your students*. ASCD, 2017.
- [14] J.M. Reid, *Teaching ESL writing*. Prentice Hall Regents Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1993.
- [15] G.G. Patthey-Chavez and D.R. Ferris, "Writing Conferences and the Weaving of Multi-Voiced Texts in College Composition," *Res. Teach. English*, pp. 51-90, 1997.
- [16] K. Hyland and F. Hyland, "Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing," *Lang. Teach.*, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 83, 2006.
- [17] R. Silver and S. Lee, "What Does It Take to Make a Change? Teacher Feedback and Student Revisions," *English Teach. Pract. Crit.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 25-49, 2007.
- [18] M. Yang, R. Badger, and Z. Yu, "A Comparative Study of Peer and Teacher Feedback in a Chinese EFL Writing Class," *J. Second Lang. Writ.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 179-200, 2006.
- [19] N. Annisa Astrid, D. Dwi Rukmini, S. Ahmad Sofwan, and W. Sri Wuli Fitriati, "The Analysis Of Students' Engagement To Writing Feedback Activities Viewed From Students' Writing Anxiety," *Int. J. English Educ.*
- [20] H.D. Brown, *Principles of language learning and teaching*, vol. 4. Longman New York, 2000.
- [21] B. MAHER, "Eysenck on Extraversion," *PsycCRITIQUES*, vol. 19, no. 10, 1974.
- [22] H.J. Eysenck and S.G.B. Eysenck, "The Eysenck Personality Inventory," 1965.
- [23] Z. Dömyei and P. Skehan, "18 Individual Differences in Second Language Learning," *Handb. Second Lang. Acquis.*, vol. 589, 2003.
- [24] S. Callahan, "Responding to the Invisible Student," *Assess. Writ.*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 57-77, 2000.
- [25] R. Ellis, "Second Language Acquisition, Teacher Education and Language Pedagogy," *Lang. Teach.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 182-201, 2010.
- [26] T.J. Karten, *More inclusion strategies that work!: aligning student strengths with standards*. Corwin Press, 2007.
- [27] T. Oya, E. Manalo, and J. Greenwood, "The Influence of Personality and Anxiety on the Oral Performance of Japanese Speakers of English," *Appl. Cogn. Psychol. Off. J. Soc. Appl. Res. Mem. Cogn.*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 841-855, 2004.
- [28] S. Qanwal and M. Ghani, "Relationship Between Introversi/Extroversi Personality Trait and Proficiency in ESL Writing Skills," *Int. J. English Linguist.*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. 107, 2019.
- [29] P. Alavinia and A. Hassanlou, "On the Viable Linkages between Extroversi/Introversi and Academic Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Proficiency," *English Lang. Teach.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 167-175, 2014.
- [30] G.R. Kiany, "English Proficiency and Academic Achievement in Relation to Extraversion: A Preliminary Study," *Int. J. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 113-130, 1998.
- [31] M.D. PAZOUKI and M. RASTGAR, "Extraversion-Introversion, Shyness, and EFL Proficiency," 2009.
- [32] J. Creswell, "Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Researc." Pearson Education. <http://basu.nahad.ir/uploads/creswell.pdf>, 2012.
- [33] S. Amigó, A. Caselles, and J.C. Micó, "The General Factor of Personality Questionnaire (GFPQ): Only One Factor to Understand the Personality," *Span. J. Psychol.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 5-17, 2010.
- [34] Z. Zainuddin, "The Impact of Personality: Extrovert vs. Introvert on the Ability in Syntax in Essay Writing," *Stud. English Lang. Educ.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 158-169, 2016.
- [35] H. Zaswita and R. Ihsan, "The Impact of Personality Types on Students' Writing Ability," *JPI (Jurnal Pendidik. Indones.)*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 75-84, 2020.
- [36] H.H. Stern, E.E. Tarone, H.H. Stern, G. Yule, and H. Stern, *Fundamental concepts of language teaching: Historical and interdisciplinary perspectives on applied linguistic research*. Oxford university press, 1983.
- [37] S. Loewen and H. Reinders, *Key concepts in second language acquisition*. Macmillan international higher education, 2011.
- [38] A. Pritchard, *Ways of learning: Learning theories for the classroom*. Routledge, 2017.

PROSIDING TURNITIN

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	R Hidayati, Y Supriyati, A S Budi. "The effect of learning models and divergent thinking on higher-order thinking skills", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021 Publication	2%
2	journal.uinjkt.ac.id Internet Source	1%
3	Submitted to Bolton Institute of Higher Education Student Paper	1%
4	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On