

# **The effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing performance at the First Grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung**

**Nida Friskila Devi<sup>1</sup>, Patuan Raja<sup>2</sup>, Khairun Nisa<sup>3</sup>**

*Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No. 1, Bandar Lampung*

<sup>1</sup>Correspondence: [nida.devi12@gmail.com](mailto:nida.devi12@gmail.com)

## **ABSTRACT**

The aims of this research were to find out whether there was any effect of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on students' recount writing performance and to analyze which aspect of writing improved the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback. This research is quantitative research using one group pre-test and post-test design. The population was the first-grade students of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. The sample was one class of the first grade: X2 class consisting of 30 students. The instrument was writing test in the form of essay. The data were in the form of scores taken from the pre-test and post-test which were analyzed by using Paired Sample t-test. The results showed that there was statistically significant difference between the mean score of the pre-test (56.8) and post-test (67.5). The significant value was determined by sign  $p < 0.05$  with the result  $0.000 < 0.05$  and the t-value  $> t$ -table with the result  $18.270 > 2.045$ . The aspect of writing which improved the most was language use. This is because most of the Indirect Written Corrective Feedback used in this research focused on the English structure such as verb tense, verb form, preposition, word-order and subject-verb agreement which are covered in language use aspect of writing. It is suggested that Indirect Written Corrective Feedback can be implemented in teaching other types of text in a long-term period and other educational levels of school. Further research may focus on symbols to correct error in content and organization aspect.

**Keywords:** *Indirect Written Corrective Feedback, teaching writing, recount text, writing performance.*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

In teaching and learning English we should focus on the basic skills in English which are listening and reading skill as receptive skills while speaking and writing as productive skills. Writing skill is one of the most important skills to master. Nunan (2003) states that writing is the process of thinking to invent ideas, thinking about how to express into good writing, and arranging the ideas into statement and paragraph clearly. Through writing, people are capable of sharing ideas, feelings, persuading and convincing others. According to Harmer (2004), writing is a basic language skill, as important as speaking, listening, and reading. Students need to know how to write letters, how to put written reports together, how to reply to an advertisement and increasingly how to write using electronic media. In brief, the most recording of ours is in writing form.

However, writing is a difficult skill to master. According to Hedge (2005), writing is more than producing accurate and complete sentences and phrases. She states that writing is about guiding students to: produce whole pieces of communication, to link and develop information, ideas, or arguments for a particular reader or a group of readers. Byrne (1988:4) says that writing is difficult for most people both in mother tongue and in foreign language. That is why teachers should give the right methods in teaching writing English as a foreign language. Raimes (1983: 27) mentions that teaching writing is a unique way to reinforce learning. It means that teaching writing is very important in order

to build students language skill. Raimes (1983) also states that in order to be successful in writing, English teachers should guide the students in writing, in which the materials presented are relevant to their interest, needs, capacities and age until they are able to make composition with few or no error. There are several types of text that students learn to write in English subject. One of them is recount text which is relevant to their capacities, interests and needs as recount text covers personal experience that happened in a chronological way. According to Anderson (2003), recount is a text which tells about events happening in the past in a sequence of time.

In improving students' writing ability, the use of feedback is important in order to give the students correction so that they will know they mistakes and try to be better in the future. Students also need to do problem solving to understand their mistakes and avoid making the same mistakes in future activities. Generally, Written Corrected Feedback is divided into three, direct written feedback and indirect written feedback and metalinguistic feedback. Ellis (2009) created a typology of feedback strategies that consists of five types and two of them are direct feedback and indirect feedback. Direct feedback is the feedback provided by the teacher by showing the correct form of language while indirect feedback is the feedback given by the teacher by indicating the errors students make but not correcting them. Indirect cf refers to indicating students' errors, typically by using symbols hinting at the type of error, or underlining, circling, or marking the section or word where an error has occurred (Frear and Chiu, 2015).

In relation to feedback provision, Aridah (2003) believed that feedback is useful to examine the success or failure of students' performance, including writing performance. This is supported by Hyland (2009) who states that feedback is vital to the process of learning. Research evidence revealed that feedback enables students to assess their performances, modify, their behavior and transfer their understandings.

The researchers used a set of symbols adopted from three sources (Ben Gadd, Collins writing program, and Edmonds CC writing center) to correct students' writing work during the treatment in this research.

## **II. METHODS**

This research used quantitative approach with the pre-experimental design. The researchers used one group pretest and posttest design. The population of this research was the first-grade students in the second semester of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung in academic year of 2022/2023. The sample of this research was class X.2 containing 30 students of the first grade from one of the classes which was randomly selected using cluster sampling. The instruments for this research were writing tests in the form of pre-test and post-test. The objectives of this research were to find out the significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' writing performance and which aspect of writing improves the most after the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback.

## **III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Result of the pre-test and post-test**

The pre-test was administered to measure the students' prior knowledge about recount text. The pre-test was given in the form of writing test. The students were asked to write a recount text about their funny experience. It was found that the students struggled in writing recount text especially using the language features such as past tense verbs, conjunction, preposition, and adverb of time. The treatment was conducted in four meetings in which the students were guided to write recount text with different topics using the correct generic structure and language features in recount

text that cover the five writing aspects. Indirect written corrective feedback was used to correct students' mistakes in their writing work. The post-test then was administered to see if there is a significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing performance. It was found that there is significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback as there is an improvement in the mean of post-test from the mean of pre-test that was given before the treatment. The following table is the comparison between the students' scores in the pre-test and post-test.

**Table 1. Distribution of Students' Scores in Pre-test and Post-test**

Pre-test			Post-test		
Mean	Interval	Number of Student	Mean	Interval	Number of Student
56.83	40-45	1	67.55	40-45	0
	45-50	4		45-50	0
	50-55	7		50-55	0
	55-60	7		55-60	0
	60-65	8		60-65	9
	65-70	3		65-70	10
	70-75	0		70-75	10
	75-80	0		75-80	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>

From the result of pre-test and post-test, it can be seen there is an improvement of students' recount writing performance after being corrected with indirect written corrective feedback. The mean score improved from 56.83 to 67.55. However, the researchers need to know whether the improvement was statistically significant or not. The data were analysed using *Paired Sample T-test* in SPSS 26. The hypotheses used in this research were:

H0 indicates that there is no any significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance.

H1 indicates that there is significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance. The criteria are:

If the sign level is less than 0.05: H1 is accepted

If the t-value is higher than t-table: H1 is accepted

**Table 2. Result of Paired Sample T-test**  
**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-test	10.716	3.213	.586	11.916	9.517	18.270	29	.000
	Post-test								

From the table above, the significant value was 0.000 which is less than 0.05 so it can be concluded that there is significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback in Students' recount writing performance. It is known that the t-value was 18.270. The next step was finding the t-table,

where t-table can be known based on the value of df (degree of freedom) and the significant value (0.05/2). It was known that the value of df was 29 and the significant value 0.05/2 equals 0.025. It was found that the t-table is 2.045. Because the t-value was 18.270 which is higher than 2.045, it can be concluded that H1 is accepted. It can be concluded that the hypotheses testing for both criteria were approved in order to answer the first research question.

**Table 3. The Improvement of Students' Achievement in Each Aspect of Writing**

No	Aspect of Writing	Mean Score of Pre-Test	Mean Score of Post test	N-Gain	T-value	Sig. level
1	Content	16.0	17.6	0.11	8.981	0.000
2	Organization	12.4	14.4	0.26	8.269	0.000
3	Vocabulary	12.5	14.7	0.29	9.890	0.000
4	Language use	13.2	17.8	0.39	19.987	0.000
5	Mechanics	2.9	3.7	0.38	10.465	0.000

It can be concluded that Language Use is the aspect of writing that improves the most after the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback with the n-gain 0.39, the t-value is 19.987 and the significant level is 0.000. The percentages of six symbols used to correct language use errors on students' writing work decreased the most of the symbols used to correct the other four aspects.

## Discussion

The result of pre-test was a mess. The students even did not know how to write in paragraphs. The researcher gave topic questions in order to help them gain ideas by considering the topic questions and the researcher already told them to organize their ideas into paragraphs not in numbers like the topic questions, but there were still some students who wrote their ideas in numbers. So, it seemed they answered the topic questions not organizing into paragraphs.

The topic questions were intended to encourage the students to organize an understandable recount text with a clear and detailed questions, but the researcher found that the students seemed did not understand the topic questions themselves. Their ideas did not stand out well. There were a lot of confusing sentences with a wrong sentence structure, wrong word-order, spelling, and vocabularies. For example, "I spend holiday happy with family las year. It was holiday good." In the sentence, the verb is still wrong. Recount text uses past tense not present tense, so it should be "spent". The word-order "holiday happy" and "holiday good" should be "happy holiday" and "good holiday" and spelling of the word "last".

Another example, "I not know do what in holiday until my friends ask me go holiday together." the sentence is not cohesive because there were many mistakes in the terms of tense, word order and preposition, so the idea did not stand out. It should be "I did not know what to do in holiday before my friends asked me to go on a holiday together." And how they organized the texts in *Bahasa*. The writing is in English but they seemed to organize the texts by literally translating them into English without considering the English structure.

The students tended to use small letters even at the beginning of a sentence, person's name, months or day. They forgot to put a comma or full stop in the necessary spot. They made many mistakes in capitalization. The researcher gave treatment and tried to encourage the students to make

better writing recount text. The researcher explained about recount text before giving writing tasks with specific topics. The researcher used common topics such as experience watching favorite movies and experience having holidays in order to lead them to focus on their personal experiences so they can gain their ideas personally.

In the stage of revising, the researcher implied indirect written corrective feedback to their writing drafts which led them to analyze what kinds of mistakes they must revise as the feedback were implicit. The researcher had given explanations about the indirect written corrective feedback in the form of a table containing the symbols, example in sentences, and the meaning, like “sp” for spelling before so the students got the understanding of each feedback they received.

The result of the post-test was better. The students had shown better performance in their writing tasks. Their spelling was getting better. They also managed to identify the verb tense and verb forms correctly. They started to understand the word-order in English structure as well as the vocabularies and prepositions. The capitalization was also getting better. This result made good progress in students’ writing performance, partly due to the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback.

The finding corroborates with the previous findings. As stated by Bitchener (2012, p. 353), the students who were treated with written corrective feedback improved their writing accuracy. They showed that they noticed the feedback, were able to analyze the feedback and understood how to apply the knowledge in a new piece of writing. The finding is also in line with the other previous findings of Shirotha (2016) related to the effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students’ accuracy. Aridah (2016) whose research was related to the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing performance. Beuningen et al (2008) whose research was related to the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners’ written accuracy. They all proved that corrective feedback to be a way of improving the accuracy of L2 students’ writing.

The noticed improvement was that the students managed to avoid making the same mistakes. For example, once students made a mistake on one word like “eat” instead of “ate” or “am” instead of “was” for past tense, they managed not to repeat the same mistakes in their writing tasks for the other topic. The other improvement was in the vocabulary used in the writing work. Many of them wrote the word “house” instead of “home” for the phrase “at home”. They got the understanding to use the words in the right context.

The mechanical problem was also solved by using indirect written corrective feedback. The students become able to start their sentence with a capital letter. They also wrote the words with the correct spelling. For example, there were mistakes like the word “prety” which should be “pretty”. There were also mistakes like the word “thought” instead “though” There were not many mechanical problems appeared in the post-test.

The researcher found that language use is the aspect which improves the most after the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback. The gain score is 4.6 with the t-value reached 19.987. It may be due to the symbols of feedback that are used to correct language use aspect are the most among the symbols used to correct other four aspects. The researcher provided one symbol for content, one for organization, one for vocabulary, six for language use and two for mechanics. It is because language use covers a lot of detail structures like verb tenses, verb forms, subject agreement, verb agreement, word order and preposition.

The finding corroborates the previous findings. Bitchener (2012, p. 353), stated that the students who were treated with written corrective feedback improved their writing accuracy. Accuracy itself demonstrates the ability to use vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation correctly in English written works. So, it can be said that accuracy covers grammar (language use) as one of the aspects that should be focused on and improved in writing performance. The finding is also in line with the other findings of Shirotha (2016), Frear and chiu (2015), Beuningen et al (2008), Fazio

(2001) and Chandler (2003). However, there are still improvement in other aspect of writing, seen from the t-value, content 8.981, organization 8.269, vocabulary 9.890 and mechanics 10.465.

And lastly, indirect written corrective feedback could improve students' writing performance in writing recount text. It is because the researcher had set the feedback to cover the details in the generic structure and language features of recount text and in accordance with the five writing aspects. The generic structure which covers content and organization aspect. Meanwhile language features cover the vocabulary, language use and mechanics aspects of writing. Indirect written corrective feedback could help students to be more aware of paragraphing, past tense verbs, vocabulary, word-order, preposition, capitalization, spelling and punctuations.

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

##### Conclusion

The implementation of indirect written corrective feedback was effective to improve students' writing performance especially in recount text writing. It is because indirect written corrective feedback provides feedbacks related to the generic structure and language features of recount text which helps the students revise their mistakes and not to make the same mistakes in future writing work. In addition, it also builds students' interest as the feedbacks are all implicit so solving the meaning of the feedback is challenging for them. Indirect written corrective feedback was also effective in improving students' performance in five aspects of writing namely, content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

The aspect that improved the most after the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback is language use because the feedback encourages students to revise their mistakes which mostly appeared in language use content such as verb tense, verb form, word-order, subject-verb agreement and preposition. Indirect written corrective feedback implicitly helps students in doing problem solving on how to reflect their linguistic form and leads them to long term learning.

Considering the advantages of indirect written corrective feedback, the researcher suggests English teachers to implement indirect written corrective feedback in teaching writing not only writing recount text but also in writing other types of text like descriptive text, narrative text or procedures text which are covered in the Indonesian Educational Curriculum. The implementation of indirect written corrective feedback should be a continuously implemented in the teaching and learning process because it leads students to long-term learning.

Further research may try to find out the effect of indirect written corrective feedback in different levels of school, such as elementary school, junior high school, or university level. This research focused on teaching recount text. It is suggested that further research focus on other types of text like descriptive text, narrative text or procedure text which are covered in the Indonesian Educational Curriculum for English subject. Obviously, the improvement in content aspect is still quite low. Further research are suggested to do more analysis related to the set of symbols which can be used to correct mistakes that appeared in content aspect.

##### REFERENCES

- A. Cynthia, Boardman. (2008). *Writing to communicate*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Anderson, M., and Anderson K. (2003). *Text types in English*. Australia: Macmillan. P. 50
- Aridah. (2003). *The role of feedback in the teaching and learning of writing*. CELT, 3 (2), pp.105- 114.
- Aridah. (2016) The effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in EFL writing performance, *Proceedings of the fourth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4)*. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id>
- Blanchard, K and Root. B. (2003). *Ready to write*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.



- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 348-363.
- Bitchener, J., and Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203832400
- Brown, H. D. (1980). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An Interactive approach to language*. San Fransisco: Longman
- Brown, D. (2012, December). *The written corrective feedback debate: next steps for classroom teachers and practitioners*. TESOL Quarterly, 861-867. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43267895>
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skill*. England: Longman Group UK Ltd
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12, 267–296
- Christopher Tribble. (1996). *Language teaching writing*, (New York: Oxford University Press) p. 130
- Edelstein, M. E and Pival. (1988). *The writing commitment*. New York: Hartcourt Brouce Javanovich Publisher.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Typology of written corrective feedback types*. ELT Journal Volume 63(2), pp. 97-107. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccn023
- 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, 235–249.
- Frear, D., and Chiu, Y. H. (2015). *The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing*. System, 53, 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.006>
- Gerot, Linda and Pitter Wignell. 1994. *Making sense of functional grammar*. Sidney: Gerd Stabler.
- Guilford, J. P. (1942). *Fundamental statistic in psychology and education*. New York & London: McGraw-Hill Book Company. Inc.
- Guilford, J.P. (1956). *Fundamental statistic in psychology and education*. 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. New York: Longman
- Harris, D. P. (1979). *Testing English as a second language*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K., and Hyland, F (2006) Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback in Ken Hyland & Fiona Hyland (eds.) *Feedback in Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hyland, K. (2009). *Teaching and researching writing*, England: Pearson Education
- Jacobs, H. L., Wormuth, D. R., Zinkgraf, S. A., and Hearfiel, V. F. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Massachuset: Newbury House.
- Jeremy Harmer. (1991). *The practice of English language teaching* ....., p.4
- Jyi-yeon Yi. (2009). *Defining writing qbility for classroom writing assessment in high schools*, Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, vol. 13 no.1, p.58
- Knapp, P., and Watkins, M. (2005) *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing*. UNSW Press. P. 32.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). *Reducing compositions errors: An experiment*. The Modern Language Journal, 66(2), 140-149.
- Laras SekarTanjung. (2017). *The Effect of guided writing strategy toward students' writing skill at senior high school 1 Ulakan Tapakis*, (S1 Thesis, Imam Bonjol University, Padang), p. 30-33
- Linda Gerot, Peter Wignell. (1994). *Making sense of functional grammar*, (Sydney: Gerd Stabler), p. 162

- Marriane Celce-Murcia, Elie Olshtan. (2003). *Discourse and context in language teaching*, (Cambridge: University Press), p. 142
- Mi-mi, L. (2009). *Adopting varied feedback modes in the EFL writing class*. *US-China Foreign Language*, 60-63.
- Nunan, David. (2003). *Practical English language practice*. Singapore: Mc Graw-Hill Company.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shirotha, Fastha Bagus. (2016). The Effect of indirect written corrective Feedback on Students' Writing Accuracy. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 6(2), 101-118.
- Suzuki, M. (2003). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL*. Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 1-21.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16, 255–272.
- Van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N., and Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156, 279–296. <https://doi.org/10.2143/itl.156.0.2034439>