JOURNAL OF ENGLISH EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Vol. 03 No. 01, March 2022, pp. 44-54

Available online at:

http://jeet.fkdp.or.id/index.php/jeet/issue/current

ISSN: 2721-3811 (media online)

The Effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy on Students' Writing Skills of Recounting Text

Himmatul Arifah[1], Muhammad Edy Thoyib[2]

Institut Keislaman Abdullah Faqih Gresik [1]
Universitas Islam Negeri Malang[2]

himmatularifah@gmail.com[1], edythoyib@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id[2]

ABSTRACT

This research focuses on the effectiveness of using an indirect corrective feedback strategy on students' writing skills of recount text to provide an alternative and effective way to complete their work in writing, especially in writing recount text. The researcher uses a quasi-experimental design by Collecting data using a test, and each class is given a pre-test before treatment and a post-test after treatment. It indicates that the treatment was successful. Independent T-test calculation researcher. T-test was calculated to compare the two means between the experimental and control groups. The table above shows that the value of sig (2-tailed) is 0.000 at the critical value for the 5% level. The significance value is less than 5% or (0.000 ‹0.05). So, the null hypothesis can be rejected. It can be concluded that the study's indirect corrective feedback strategy is effective.

Keywords: Indirect Corrective Feedback Strategy, Recount Text, Writing Skill

I. INTRODUCTION

In education, the English language is widely known by all groups, from low to high levels of education. Seeing from the current development, English has become an essential communication tool in any case. Therefore in English language education, learning can improve student communication skills. According to Walberg 2004 in (Irons & Elkington, 2021), Communication skills are crucial to learning every curriculum. One of the four essential aspects of learning English is learning writing. Writing is a tool used to express feelings, thoughts, and ideas (Maulidah & Aziz, 2020; Muhsin & Aziz, 2020).

Writing skills must be mastered by students to express and share them with others (Sharples, 2002). On the other hand, Huges (2003) argues that writing is getting sources influenced by vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and organization. Writing is a process, not a product. In writing, it needs to be reviewed and revised so that writing activities will not be complete. Therefore, being a writer or a student must know the writing process to do good writing. Writing is considered a complex skill (Chitravelu et al., 2005). Because writing not only takes on the material of interest, learning, and understanding but so requires mastery of language, organization, conventions, mechanical, and the writing process (Latifah et al., 2018).

In writing, there must be a strategy that can support the improvement of students in writing so that students do not find problems in writing. The writing process is not short because writing is not a natural process but a discovery process after continuous practice. The essence of writing is a process of thinking, compiling, and revising, which requires special skills in using discourse markers and rhetorical covens by placing them cohesive, which means that the writing is more precise and produces the final product. Many researchers have found problems in writing, and many researchers have also investigated cases of difficulty in writing. Therefore, a strategy is needed to improve a student's writing skills in this writing learning.

The teaching and learning process cannot be separated from the strategy. Strategies are needed to make the teaching and learning process effective and efficient. Because teaching is a reciprocal relationship between teachers and students who are active in carrying out activities, thus learning can be interpreted as a plan designed by educators in learning activities to achieve the goals set in the curriculum. Researcher has found problems in learning to write, and many have investigated cases of difficulty in writing (Muhsin & Aziz, 2020). The test in writing is due to boundary correction, grammar errors, and organizational errors. There is a limitation of modification in students' writing, so students may make mistakes again if they are not corrected (Huy, 2015).

Many students experience grammatical errors such as spelling, fragments, run-ones, concords, punctuation, and organizing (Astuti, 2013). Many students are still confused about writing, so they have difficulty writing. So, the problem is due to errors in the learning process. In this case,

there is a problem-solving strategy. Because using the technique is capable of good stimulation in student learning. In this case, the role of design is considered very important in the learning process. Because of their strategy, the teaching and learning process can be effective and efficient.

Then, the various strategy that can be used in learning is the indirect corrective feedback strategy. This corrective feedback strategy is the feedback that is given by the teacher to students when students complete the writing process to provide proof of students' writing results (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). The form of feedback that is often used in class is feedback given by the teacher. With this indirect corrective feedback, students can identify their mistakes and learn from them with this feedback. Indirect corrective feedback is easier to understand aspects of writing from the feedback given by the teacher. So that students learn from their mistakes and will not repeat writing mistakes as before. The purpose of indirect corrective feedback is to provide information to the author for the revision, with a view of others' comments, questions, and suggestions addressed to the author's prose gat-based readers instead of prose-based writing (Keh, 1990).

Basically, in guiding students to write, the teacher should provide advice or suggestions called feedback. Feedback is one of the specific and practical ways teachers give students about their learners. Students who receive feedback during the writing process have a better knowledge of how well they are writing and what areas they need to be effective. The indirect Corrective feedback strategy is fundamental to students' learning process. It can be seen from students who receive feedback from the teacher, who are usually more motivated to improve and revise their writing to make it better. The teacher feels that the feedback is very effective in the student's writing process.

In this study, the researcher used the indirect corrective feedback strategy during the writing chase at MTs Al Ibrohimi class VIII to correct students' writing errors to determine the effectiveness of the quality of writing in recount text. The type of text is recount text because, according to the National Curriculum from Indonesia, recount text is included in Class 8 learning materials. A recount text is a text that recounts safe experiences or events in the past. For this reason, this study aims to see the effectiveness of the indirect corrective feedback strategy on students writing skills

of recount text at the 2nd of MTs Al Ibrahimi.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Teaching Writing

Teaching writing, especially in Junior High School, is not easy as teaching other language skills that must be learnt as other language skills that are mastered. It demands very much of learners, either the primary language proficiency, to control their language performance. While writing, students also need much time to think. The teacher asks students to focus on proper language use and ideas about what they will write. A specific technique is required in teaching writing English for junior high school.

Teaching writing teaches the students how to express their idea or imagination in writing form. Writing is more than a productive skill in the written mode (Brown, 2000). It is more complicated than the other three skills, even for native speakers of a language, since it involves a graphic representation of speech and the development and presentation of thoughts in a structured way. Thus, the teachers can select suitable material in writing class so that materials and techniques could be understandable for the students and express their idea and thinking in good writing.

Based on those statements, the writer can conclude that the teacher's role is needed to motivate students in the teaching-learning process. In contrast, students in transition and teachers must be creative in preparing materials that feature real-life situations and authentic language in teaching because they have different characteristics.

In practising their writing, they have to follow the steps of process writing to make their writing more effective and help the students to write a text become easier. All of what the students do before writing is critical because the student can be guided to think about a topic related to a perceived audience. This activity of writing involved the process of writing.

B. Indirect corrective feedback

Indirect corrective feedback demonstrates the correction of grammar errors to improve students' writing ability (Truscott, 1996). Written indirect corrective feedback is a means of helping students acquire and demonstrate mastery in the use of targeted linguistic forms and structures (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). Written indirect corrective feedback is one of the instructional strategies designed to facilitate the effectiveness of L2 writing (Ferris, 2010). From several definitions, it can be concluded that written corrective feedback is a way

that aims to correct student errors in writing. Students need to write corrective feedback that may come from various sources, such as teachers, peers, and computer programs (Nakamura, 2016). There are six types of written corrective feedback, direct (Ellis, 2009). However, in this study, researchers used indirect written corrective feedback. Indirect feedback is a strategy that teachers use to help students correct their mistakes by pointing out mistakes without providing the correct form.

In this type, Elashri (2013) mentions two subtypes: Indirect coded and non-coded feedback. Coded indirect feedback is when the teacher underlines the error and writes a symbol on top of that error. Then he gives a composition to students to correct the mistake because this symbol encourages students to think and then provides indirect feedback. The teacher underlines or circles the error without writing the character whatever. Students must think about the error and correct it (Seiffedin & El-Sakka, 2017). This study uses indirect feedback using indications and locating with the coded indirect feedback sub-type; (1) The teacher gives orders to students with a theme for writing recount text, and the first result is used as a pre-test, (2) The teacher gives lessons about recount text and offers students a theme for writing recount text, (3) The teacher corrects and applies the corrective feedback method by only providing code to students. Without justifying, It works until students get an increase in writing skills.

III. METHOD

the researcher involved two classes, one class as an experimental class and one class as a control class. The pre-tests and post-test were given to the students in the practical and control classes. The treatment was applied in the experimental type of writing recount text using an indirect corrective feedback strategy. Meanwhile, the controlled class was only treated with explanations about the characteristic of recount writing. The results of the pre-test and post-test will be compared and observed.

A. Research Instrument

A test is a set of stimuli presented to individuals to obtain responses based on numerical scores. Tests are given to measure student competence, intelligence, knowledge, and abilities possessed by individuals or groups. The study passed an essay writing test to know students' skills.

There are two tests in this study, namely the Pretest and Post-test. This was given to both groups to see how skilled they were in

writing before providing treatment. The researcher developed a test based on a syllabus that emphasized writing skills and the material on recount text: Pretest. In this study, data collection was carried out through a pre-test in the experimental and control class to determine students before being given treatment to the practical class children. The test is in the form of a written test because it focuses on writing skills. Post-test is carried out after treatment, and post-test to determine whether students have progressed in writing skills. The post-test scores will be compared to whether the treated class students' scores are better than untreated students.

To assess the quality of students' writing, the researcher used an assessment rubric. Aspects of assessment are content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

B. Sample of Research

The sample of this study was 25 students of class VIII F as the control class who were taught without giving a strategy and class VIII G 25 as the experimental class who were conducted using the indirect corrective feedback strategy.

C. Data Analysis Method

Researchers analyzed the data using a comparative technique between the control and experimental classes. The scores of the practical course and the control class in the post-test will be compared to determine the difference in the experimental and control classes' learning outcomes. It will be processed by using Adnan's statistical hypothesis test. The scores collected during the post-test by the control class and the experimental class will be calculated using the IBM SPSS version 20 program. And the researcher uses an independent sample t-test as the formula to see the significant mean difference between students and post-test scores between those experimental groups

IV. FINDING

1) THE DESCRIPTIVE OF PRE-TEST SCORE

This part explains the students' writing skills in recounting text in the pre-test. The results showed the descriptive statistic of the per-test in table 1 below.

Table 1; *The Descriptive Statistic Pretest*

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental Class	25	22.00	51.00	73.00	1445.00	57.8000	5.49242
Control Class							
Valid N (listwise)	25	20.00	50.00	70.00	1471.00	58.8400	5.89265
	25						

Based on table 4.1 above, it is known from 25 students in the experimental class. The lowest score in the pre-test was 51, and

the highest was 73. And that from 25 students in the control class. The lowest score in the pre-test was 50, and the highest score was 70. On the other side, the mean score of each group was different. The mean score of the experimental pre-test class was 57,80, and the mean score of the pre-test control class was 58,84.

Table 2; *The Descriptive Statistic Post-test*

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Experimental class	25	19.00	75.00	94.00	2088.00	83.5200	5.30817	28.177
Control class	25	17.00	57.00	74.00	1618.00	64.7200	4.27707	18.293
Valid N (listwise)	25							

Based on table 2 above, it is known from 25 students in the experimental class. The lowest score in the post-test was 75, and the highest score was 94. And that from 25 students in the control class. The lowest score in the pre-test was 57, and the highest was 74. On the other side, the mean score of each group was different. The mean score of the experimental pre-test class was 83,52, and the mean score of the pre-test control class was 64,72.

2) THE DESCRIPTIVE OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST SCORE

The experimental class was VIII-G students of MTs Al Ibrohimi, consisting of 25 students taught using an indirect corrective feedback strategy. The data were collected from students' pre-test scores, which were conducted before the researcher implemented the teacher's indirect corrective feedback, and students' post-test score, which was conducted after the researcher implemented the teacher's indirect corrective feedback.

Based on the result is known from 25 students in the experimental class. The lowest score in the pre-test was 51, and the highest was 73. After the researcher treated the students using an indirect corrective feedback strategy, the researcher held a post-test. The data shown in the post-test is the lowest value of 75 and the highest value of 94.

In the controlled class of students' pre-test scores and post-test scores, the lowest score in the pre-test was 50, and the highest score was 70. After the researcher gave teaching without using an indirect corrective feedback strategy, the researcher gave a post-test. In the data shown in the post-test, the lowest value is 60, and the highest value is 74.

3) NORMALITY TEST

A normality test was conducted before calculating the t-test. This aims to determine whether the data from the two classes have a normal distribution or not. Researchers used Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk to

test for normality. SPSS 20 was used to analyze the data.

Table 3; Table of Normality

Tests of Normality							
Kelas		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Hasil belajar	Experimental Group	.099	25	.200*	.963	25	.473
	Control Group	.105	25	.200*	.965	25	.521

The data above shows that pre-test scores from the experimental and control groups were in a normal distribution. The result of the pre-test score from the experimental group was sig 0,200 were, higher than the level of significance 0,005 (0,200›0,05), and the result from the pre-test score of the control group was sig 0,200 were higher than the level of significance 0,005 (0,200›0,05). It showed that both groups' pre-test scores were in a normal distribution.

4) HOMOGENITY TEST

After doing the normality test, the researcher did the homogeneity test to test the similarity of the sample in both classes. The researcher used the Levene statistic test to calculate the homogeneity test.

Table 4; Table of Homogeneity

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Writing	Based on Mean	1.125	1	48	.294
	Based on Median	.975	1	48	.328
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.975	1	45.620	.329
	Based on trimmed mean	1.073	1	48	.305

Based on the output above, it is known the value of sig. The mean for the problem-solving ability variable is 0.294 because of the importance of sig. 0.294 › 0.05, it can be concluded that the variance of the problem-solving ability data on the control and experiment was homogeneous.

5) TESTING HYPOTHESIS

After getting the data, the researcher input the data using the SPSS Program between the experimental group, which brought the treatment using an indirect corrective feedback strategy in recount text. The control group got the treatment by only being treated with explanations about recounting writing characteristics. The researcher analyzed, compared the mean of two groups, and then chose Independent Sample T-test.

Table 5; Group Statistics

Group Statistics					
Kelas		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	Experimental Group	25	83.5200	5.30817	1.06163
	Control Group	25	64.7200	4.27707	.85541

Table 6; Independent sample T-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. 2tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Writing	Equal variances assumed	1.125	.294	13.789	48	.000	18.800,00	1.3633 8	16.0587 4	21.54126
	Equal variances not assumed			13.789	45.923	.000	18.800,00	1.3633 8	16.0555 4	21.54446

From the table above, it can be seen that the result of the mean experimental group was 83.5200 and the control group 64.7200. it showed that the practical class gained a higher mean than the control class. It was indicated that the treatment was working. However, independent T-test computation was conducted to see the significance of the mean difference. The T-test was calculated to find out the comparison from two means between the experimental group and the control group. From the table above, the value of sig (2-tailed) was 0,000in critical value for 5% level = 0,05. The significance value was less than 5% or (0,000<0,05). So, the null hypothesis is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It can be concluded that there is enough evidence to conclude that the use of indirect corrective feedback in recount text is better than only treating with explanations about the characteristic of recount writing in student's writing skills in the eighth grade of MTs Al Ibrohimi Manyar Gresik.

V. DISCUSSION

This research was carried out to look at the effectiveness of the indirect corrective feedback strategy on students' written tests in recount text in class VIII MTs Al Ibrohimi Mnayar Gresik. In this case, the researcher uses a quasi-experimental research design which consists of 2 groups, namely the experimental group and the control group, by giving pre-test and post-test to the two classes.

Further research by Mei Rahmawati S (2019) entitled Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on EFL Students Writing Skill: A Case Study in a Junior High School Bandung. This study investigates the impact of direct corrective feedback and

indirect corrective feedback and which feedback is better to improve EFL students writing skills. Statistical analysis revealed that indirect corrective feedback was more effective than direct corrective feedback in improving students writing skills researcher gave a pre-test to measure how well the students were before being given treatment in the experimental class.

After being given treatment using an indirect corrective feedback strategy, the researcher, in the final stage, gave a post-test to see the students' results after being given treatment. The student's learning outcomes in this class are in the pre-test having an average of 57,8 and in the post-test having an average of 83,52

In the control class, the researcher gave a pre-test and a post-test. The difference was when the treatment was given. In the treatment, the control class was not given an indirect corrective feedback strategy Learning in this class is when the pre-test gets an average of 58,84, and the post-test receives 64,72.

In giving pre-test and post-test for both classes, the researcher gave the same test and the same theme. As previously stated, the researcher used an independent sample t-test. The t-test was used to examine the significant difference in the scores achieved by the two groups. Data analysis shows that the sign. value (2-tailed) is 0.000 < 0.05. So, Ho (Null Hypothesis) is rejected, and Ha (Alternative Hypothesis) is accepted. It can be concluded that the indirect corrective feedback strategy is effective in writing students in recount text.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it was concluded that using the indirect corrective feedback strategy for the study in class VIII MTs Al Ibrohimi in the Experimental class and the Control class, there was a significant difference between the two. Class VIII G (Experimental Class), who was given indirect corrective feedback strategy teaching, got a higher average score than class VIII F (Control Class). This can be seen from the data with statistical hypothetical significance levels calculated using SPSS version 20 shows that the average value of the experimental class after being taught using the indirect corrective feedback strategy was higher than the control class, which was not given the confident treatment. Therefore, the teacher's indirect corrective feedback significantly improved students' recount text writing Skills.

VII. REFERENCES

Astuti, A. P. (2013). The effectiveness of peer feedback to improve the writing ability of the tenth grade students of SMA Kanisius Harapan Tirtomoyo in the academic year of 2012/2013 (Skripsi). *Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University*.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 409–431.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching By Principles : An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). longman.

Chitravelu, N., Sithamparam, S., & Teh, S. C. (2005). *ELT methodology: Principles and practice*. Oxford Fajar.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 97–107.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 181–201.

Huy, N. T. (2015). Problems affecting learning writing skill of grade 11 at Thong Linh high school. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(2).

Irons, A., & Elkington, S. (2021). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. Routledge.

Keh, C. L. (1990). *Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation*.

Latifah, Y., Suwarno, B., & Diani, I. (2018). THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS'DIRECT AND INDIRECT FEEDBACK ON STUDENT'S WRITING ABILITY. *JOALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, *3*(2), 47–58.

Maulidah, U. N., & Aziz, I. N. (2020). The Effectiveness of Online Collaborative Learning on Students Writing Skills. *EDUCATIO: Journal of Education*, *5*(2), 141–149.

Muhsin, R. H. B., & Aziz, I. N. (2020). The Effect of Online Gamification Learning on Students' Motivation and Students' Writing Descriptive Text. *JEET, Journal of English Education and Technology*, *1*(04), 256–266.

Nakamura, S. (2016). Insights from studies on written corrective feedback: Implications for language pedagogy. *REFLections*, *22*, 89–102.

Seiffedin, A. H., & El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2017). The impact of direct-indirect corrective e-feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(3), 166.

Sharples, M. (2002). *How we write: Writing as creative design*. Routledge.

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