THE EFFECT OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' RECOUNT WRITING PERFORMANCE AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMA PERINTIS 1 BANDAR LAMPUNG

(Undergraduate Thesis)

NIDA FRISKILA DEVI

1913042037

ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2023

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECT OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' RECOUNT WRITING PERFORMANCE AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

By

Nida Friskila Devi

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 researches may focus on symbols to correct error in content and organization aspect.

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

THE EFFECT OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEBACK ON STUDENTS' RECOUNT WRITING PERFORMANCE AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMA PERINTIS 1 BANDAR LAMPUNG

By

NIDA FRISKILA DEVI

Undergraduate Thesis

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The requirement for S-1 Degree**

**In
The Language and Arts Department of
Teacher Training and Education**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT STUDY PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF LAMPUNG
2023**

Research Title   : **THE EFFECT OF INDIRECT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' RECOUNT WRITING PERFORMANCE AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMA PERINTIS 1 BANDAR LAMPUNG**

Student's Name   : **Nida Friskila Devi**

Student's Number   : **1913042037**

Study Program   : **English Education**

Department   : **Language and Arts Education**

Faculty   : **Teacher Training and Education**

APPROVED

Advisory Committee

Advisor   **Co-Advisor**

Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M. Pd.   **Khairun Nisa, S. Pd., M. Pd.**
NIP 19620804 198905 1 001   NIK 231804921003201

The Chairperson of
The Department of Language and Arts Education

Dr. Sumarti, M. Hum.
NIP 19700318 199403 2 002

ADMITTED BY

1. Examination Committee

   Chairperson   : **Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M. Pd.**   ....

   Examiner   : **Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M.A.**   ....

   Secretary   : **Khairun Nisa, S. Pd., M. Pd.**   ....

2. The Dean of Teacher Training and Education Faculty

   Prof. Dr. Sunyono, M.Si.
   NIP 19651230 199111 1 001

   Graduated on: **June 7th, 2023**

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN

Yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Nida Friskila Devi

NPM : 1913042037

Program Studi : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris

Jurusan : Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni

Fakultas : Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan

Judul Skripsi : The Effect of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Recount Writing Performance at The First Grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung

Menyatakan bahwa skripsi ini adalah hasil karya saya sendiri. Sepanjang sepengetahuan saya, karya ini tidak berisi materi yang ditulis oleh orang lain, kecuali bagian-bagian tertentu yang saya ambil sebagai acuan. Apabila ternyata terbukti bahwa pernyataan ini tidak benar, sepenuhnya menjadi tanggung jawab saya.

Bandar Lampung, 7 Juni 2023

Yang membuat pernyataan,

Nida Friskila Devi

NPM 1913042037

CURRICULUM VITAE

Nida Friskila Devi was born on December 11th 1999. She is the second and the last daughter in the family of Sarjuni and Rosida. She has one older sister, Carla Ocviani, A.Md.Kep.

She started her study at TK Amelia in Bandar Lampung and went to SDN 1 Sukamaju, Bandar Lampung. After she graduated from elementary school in 2012, she continued her study at SMPN 3 Bandar Lampung and graduated in 2015. Then she continued her study at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. She graduated in 2018. During her study, she took an English course which encouraged her to be a teacher. She successfully passed SBMPTN (Joint Entrance Selection of State Universities) program in 2019 and was accepted as a student English Education Study Program of University of Lampung.

During her study in University of Lampung, she joined SEEDS (Society of English Education Department Students) an organization in English Education Study Program. From June to August 2022, she did KKN (Community Service) program in Talang Padang, Tanggamus. From September to October 2022, she conducted PLP (Field Work Practice) at SMAN 2 Natar, Lampung Selatan. To complete her study, she undertook a research related to the effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing performance at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung.

DEDICATION

The writer dedicates this work to:

1. Her beloved parents – Sarjuni and Rosida
2. Her Sister – Carla Ocviani
3. Her Almamater – University of Lampung
4. Her friends in English Education Study Program
5. English Teachers

MOTTO

"However difficult life may seem, there is always something you can do and succeed at."

-Stephen Hawking

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Praise is only for Allah SWT, The Almighty God, for blessing the writer with health and ability to finish this script. This script, entitled "The Effect of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Recount Writing Performance at The First Grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung", is presented to the Language and Arts Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Lampung University as partial fulfilment of the requirements for S-1 degree. Among many individuals who gave generous suggestions for improving this script, first of all the writer would like to express her sincere gratitude and respect to:

1. Prof. Dr. Patuan Raja, M.Pd., as the first advisor, for his patience, encouragement, comments, suggestions and who has been willing to spend his time to assist the writer in accomplishing this script.

2. Khairun Nisa, S. Pd., M. Pd., as the second advisor who has contributed and given her endless support, evaluations, comments, suggestions for the writer during the completion of this script.

3. Dr. Muhammad Sukirlan, M. A., as the examiner, for his encouragement, meaningful comments and suggestions, and contribution during the seminar until this script is finished.

4. The lecturers and administration staffs of English Education Study Program.

5. Special appreciation goes to SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung, especially to Agustina Nawawi, S. Pd., as the English teacher, and the students of class X2 for the cooperation during the research process.

6. My beloved parents, Sarjuni and Rosida. Thank you for your endless love, support, prayer, and everything you gave to me all the time.

7. My beloved sister, Carla Ocviani, A.Md.Kep., thank you for your love, advice, support, prayer and encouragement.

8. My "Tolong" squad: Anjeli Dahlena Putri, Annisa Nur Zakiah, Ikke Yennika Anlestari and Renanda Syelivia. Thank you for the precious and happy moments we had together. My college life could not be more amazing without you all.

9. My incredible friends: Janti Normauli Silaen, Linda Wijayanti, Diana Yunita, Aisyah Cahya Vindita, who are absolutely encouraging the writer by sharing laughter and love and always being very helpful.

10. My friends in Class A and English Department batch 2019. Thank you for the time we had together.

Finally, the writer believes that her writing is still far from perfect. There might be weaknesses in this research. Comments, critics, and suggestions are always open for better research. Somehow, the writer hopes this research would give a positive contribution to educational development, readers and to those who want to conduct further research.

Bandar Lampung, June 7th 2023
Writer

Nida Friskila Devi

CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDICES

I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background, research questions, objectives, uses, scope of the research and definition of terms.

1.1 Background

English as a global language is important to know especially in this era where global competition must be acknowledged by many people around the world. That is why teaching and learning English is necessary either as a foreign language or second language.

It is already common knowledge that when 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 because writing skill encourages the learners to be able to produce a good writing work based on the aspects of writing.

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. It plays a major role in expressing one's ideas, thoughts, opinions, and attitudes. Through writing, people are capable of sharing ideas, feelings, persuading and convincing others. People may write for personal enjoyment or for some other purpose. Writing is one of the most important English skills beside listening, reading and speaking which students have to master. Good writing texts are the results of good writing ability.

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. It means that in writing skill there are a lot of things that can be done in order to use the language to communicate with each other. There are aspects that students need to pay attention in mastering writing skills.

Brown (2001) also says that writing is not only about the representation of spoken language. In short Brown means that writing is not an easy activity. In his opinions Brown says writing is different from talking.

In Indonesia, where students learn English as a foreign language, writing skills in English is difficult because Indonesian structure and English structure is different. When learning English, learners must try to understand how to make a good sentence in English from the beginning. For example, when I want to translate an Indonesian sentence into English, I must arrange the words based on the English structure, not literally put the English words in the same position as the sentence in Indonesia. The aspects such as vocabulary, language use, mechanic are also the factors why writing in English is difficult to do.

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. It means that teachers should know students' interests and needs in order to give relevant materials in their writing process.

According to Anderson (2003), recount is a text which tells about events happening in the past in a sequence of time. It means that in a recount text, there was a series of events that happened in a timeline chronologically before the text is written. Knapp (2005) also says that recount text is a sequential text that does little more than sequencing a series of events. It means that a series of events in recount text need to be written clearly with the period of time shown.

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. He mentioned that the language features that comprise writing performance are the features of organization, grammatical accuracy, referencing and plagiarism, tone and style.

According to Shirotha, a researcher from Muhammadiyah University of Malang in his research in 2016, who did a research by using a quantitative approach, which employed a pre-experimental design. The data is in statistical measure of pre test scores and post test scores. The objective of the research was to find whether Indirect Written corrective feedback is effective enough to improve students' writing accuracy.

The result of the research stated that the indirect written corrective feedback does statistically significantly improve the students' writing accuracy. The implication of this research is great. Many previous researchers have found the exact same outcome. The finding put the written corrective feedback on stronger position.

Another researcher Aridah, from Mulawarman University, in her research in 2016 which was done by using a quantitative approach which employed a true experimental design. There were two experimental groups and one control group. The first experimental group was given direct feedback and the second group was given indirect feedback while the control group used peer feedback. The instrument used to collect the data was writing task, each of which was given at the end of every cycle of writing process.

The aim of the research was to find whether direct and indirect feedback are effective enough in increasing students' writing performance. The result of the research stated that indirect feedback was also effective in increasing students'

writing performance. Teacher written corrective feedback is still valuable and preferred by most of the students.

In 2008, another research done by Van Beuningen, de Jong, and Kuiken at University of Amsterdam which was quantitative research with the aim of finding out whether written corrective feedback is effective in improving learners' writing accuracy. The study was conducted at two Dutch secondary schools with multilingual student populations. Around 80% of the students came from a non-Dutch language background, Arabic and Turkish being the most common L1's2.

The population in this study consisted of three classes of students (N=62) in their second year of secondary pre-vocational education (or vmbo-t in Dutch). Students all were around 14 years of age. Within classes, participants were randomly assigned to four different treatment groups, so that treatment and class did not confound.

To test for initial accuracy differences between treatment groups, a repeated measures ANOVA was prepared with accuracy as the dependent variable, Task Topic as a within subject factor, and Treatment. Results revealed no significant difference between groups concerning the number of forms related errors per 10 words that were committed (i.e. accuracy) in the initial phase (T1) of either the metamorphosis or laundry instructions tasks.

The researcher decided to use indirect corrective feedback in order to improve students' writing performance especially in recount text subject. The reason why the researcher chose the topic is that because it is important to know that the use of indirect corrective feedback is effective in improving students' writing performance. The researcher also wanted to know which writing aspect improves

better after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in correcting the students' recount writing work.

1.2 Research Questions

The research questions for this research are as below:

1. Is there any significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance?
2. Which writing aspect improves the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on students' recount writing performance?

1.3 Objectives

1. To find out whether is there any improvement as the effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance
2. To find out which writing aspect improves better after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on students' recount writing performance.

1.4 Uses

The benefits of the research are as below:

1. **Theoretically**

The researcher hopes that the result of the research may present useful information for future research regarding the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in teaching Writing.

2. Practically

From this research, it is hoped that English teachers can get information about the use of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback is effective to improve students' writing performance.

1.5 Scope

This research was a quantitative one. It was conducted in the first year of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. The sample of the research was a class that consists of 30 students. The class was randomly selected by using cluster sampling. This research used Written Corrective Feedback which is implemented as response to linguistic errors made in learners' writing. There are five types of Written Corrective Feedback and one of them is Indirect Written Corrective Feedback which the researcher chose to be used as the treatment and the material of the subject was limited only to personal recount text, a text which tells about events happening in the past in a sequence of time. The text covers the five aspects of writing, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic.

1.6 Definition of Terms

In order to avoid misunderstanding among the readers, definition of terms are provided below:

1. Writing is the process of delivering the ideas from someone's mind into the visible words, paragraphs, stories, reports, advertisement or other forms of writing in a good organization with appropriate words in the right context that can be understood by the readers.

2. Teaching writing is a unique way to reinforce learning. In order to be successful in writing, English teacher 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 (Raimes, 1983)

3. Recount is a text which tells about events happening in the past in a sequence of time (Anderson, 2003)

4. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback 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).

5. Effect is something that inevitably follows an antecedent (such as a cause or agent) (Merriam Webster dictionary).

Those all above are what this chapter discusses, including background, research questions, objectives, uses, scope of the research and definition of terms.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter contains the following topics: previous studies, theories of writing, theories of writing ability, components of writing, teaching writing, writing process, how to measure writing skill, text, recount text, written corrective feedback, indirect written corrective feedback in teaching writing, procedures of using indirect written corrective feedback, advantages and disadvantages of indirect written corrective feedback, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.

2.1 Previous Studies

There are several previous studies that corelated to this research. The first one is from Shirotha, a researcher from Muhammadiyah University of Malang. He conducted a research in 2016 by using a quantitative approach, which employed a pre-experimental design. The data were in statistical measure of pre test and post test scores. The objective of the research was to find whether Indirect Written corrective feedback is effective enough to improve students' writing accuracy.

The instruments used in the research were pretest and posttest writing. The writing test was developed based on the tests' needs. The tests were intended to measure the students' accuracy in writing, so the double test would be an assessment test. Then, the researcher made a writing prompt. The writing prompt should have instruction. The instruction has to be clear on how many paragraphs and timed controlled. The writing prompt was open-ended and encouraged students to write a narrative essay based on the two provided ideas in 30 minutes.

Then, the instruction of writing prompt asked the students to write the essay that consists of three paragraphs namely introductory, body and concluding paragraph. Next, the writing prompt also informs students that their writing will be scored upon the organization, adequate vocabulary, flawless language use, and accurate mechanics. Then, the researcher makes a scoring rubric. The researcher decided to use an analytical scoring rubric.

The result of the research stated that the indirect written corrective feedback does statistically significantly improve the students' writing accuracy. The implication of this research is great. Many previous researchers have found the exact same outcome. The finding put the written corrective feedback on stronger position.

Another researcher, Aridah, from Mulawarman University, conducted a research in 2016 using a quantitative approach which employed a true experimental design. There were two experimental groups and one control group. The first experimental group was given direct feedback and the second group was given indirect feedback while the control group used peer feedback. The instrument used to collect the data was writing task, each of which was given at the end of every cycle of writing process.

The aim of the research was to find whether direct and indirect feedback are effective enough in increasing students' writing performance. The sample was 63 students of English department in Mulawarman University. They were selected randomly by using systematic random sampling.

The instrument used to collect the data was writing tasks, each of which was given at the end of every cycle of writing process. Each writing task contained different topics and different methods of development. The first writing task was

an essay which was developed by using examples, then followed by comparison and contrast, classification, process and argumentation consecutively.

The students were required to write approximately 300 words for each essay, except for the argumentation, they were required to write about 400 words. All of the essays were graded by two competent raters to maintain the reliability of the scores. The scoring rubric was ESL Composition Profile developed by Jacob, at.al (1981) which includes the aspects of Content, Organization, Vocabulary, Language Use, and Mechanics.

The data were analyzed quantitatively by using statistical analysis of one-way ANOVA and one-way ANOVA repeated measures. The Program of SPSS version 21 was used to help analyze the data. The finding implied that both types of feedback, direct and indirect were equally effective in promoting students' writing performance. Teacher written corrective feedback is still valuable and preferred by most of the students.

Another research done in 2008 by Beuningen et al at University of Amsterdam which was quantitative research with the aim of finding out whether written corrective feedback is effective in improving learners' writing accuracy. The study was conducted at two Dutch secondary schools with multilingual student populations. Around 80% of the students came from a non-Dutch language background, Arabic and Turkish being the most common L1's2.

The population in this study consisted of three classes of students (N=62) in their second year of secondary pre-vocational education (or vmbo-t in Dutch). Students all were around 14 years of age. Within classes, participants were randomly assigned to four different treatment groups, so that treatment and class did not confound.

To test for initial accuracy differences between treatment groups, they performed a repeated measures ANOVA with accuracy as the dependent variable, Task Topic (i.e. metamorphosis vs. laundry instructions) as a within subject factor, and Treatment (i.e. Direct feedback, Indirect feedback, Practice and Self-Correction) as a between subjects factor. Results revealed no significant difference between groups concerning the number of forms related errors per 10 words that were committed (i.e. accuracy) in the initial phase (T1) of either the metamorphosis or laundry instructions tasks**.**

Based on several studies above, it can be concluded that indirect written corrective feedback is strongly related to students' language skills, including writing skills. Many researches have proved that indirect written corrective feedback is effective in decreasing students' writing errors and improving their writing performance.

The researcher decided to conduct a research regarding the effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' writing performance which focused on specific kind of text, personal recount text in the hope to find something different from the previous studies in the term of using indirect written corrective feedback on students' writing performance.

2.2 Theories of Writing

It is important to know the theories of writing in order to get the understanding of the term especially the fundamental definition from experts so that it will be easy to draw a conclusion of what writing is.

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.

It means that writing is the skill which we need to be good at as it will be used in our daily life especially in this era, when electronic media become the trend and tool of communication of people around the world. People form one country can communicate with the people from other countries using our writing conversation in social media. We do not need to meet in person to communicate with each other. Writing will let us communicate with other people even from a distance.

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. It plays a major role in expressing one's ideas, thoughts, opinions, and attitudes. Through writing, people are capable of sharing ideas, feelings, persuading and convincing others. People may write for personal enjoyment or for some other purpose.

Hedge (2005) also states that 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.

Boardman (2017) states that writing is a continuous process of thought and arranging, rethinking, and reorganizing. It means that we experience a process when we make a writing work. We express our ideas or thought in a good organization, appropriate words in the right context. Another definition of writing, is from Merriam Webster dictionary, writing is the act of forming letters or characters that serve as visible signs of ideas, words or symbols. We form our writing by combining words of our ideas that can be understand by other people.

Based on the statements from some experts above, the writer concluded that writing is the process of delivering the ideas from someone's mind into the visible words, paragraphs, stories, reports, advertisement or other forms of writing in a good organization with appropriate words in the right context that can be understood by the readers. Writing also can let people communicate with other people from around the world even without meeting in person.

2.3 Definition of Writing Ability

An ability is something that should be mastered in order to have good performance in related area. Writing skill is an important thing to know especially in teaching and learning process. By understanding what writing skill is, the teaching and learning process can be held appropriately. According to Hyland (2002), writing ability is the capacity to produce "a contextually" correct forms of language, following prescribed patterns at either sentence or discourse level. Students are capable to produce a good writing work if they have a good writing ability. Another definition of writing ability is from Marriane and Elite in their research, writing ability is the skill of a writer to communicate and share information with readers.

It can be said that it is important to improve writing ability. People should be good at organizing their ideas into good arrangement in the right context because communication and sharing information need to be done well in order to avoid understanding and misconception.

Writing ability in this process/cognitive-oriented approach is, therefore, defined as the ability to initiate and evolve ideas and then use certain revising and editing practices to develop them to maturity in a given context. How well people organize their ideas into a good writing work is determined by how good their

writing ability. The act of revising and editing writing work is necessary in the aim of developing maturity in a given context.

Based on the statements by experts above, it can be concluded that writing ability is an important skill that people need to practice and improve in order to make a good result of their writing work.

2.4 Teaching Writing

Teaching writing is to teach students how to organized their ideas, knowledge or imagination in written forms. It is important for the teacher to provide the relevant materials for students' interest, need and capability. Brown (1980:7) states that teaching is showing or helping someone to learn how to do something, causing to know or to understand. It means that teacher helps the students to understand the material well in order to apply the lesson in their daily activities.

Raimes (1983: 27) mentions that teaching writing is a unique way to reinforce learning. It means that teaching writing is very important to build students' language skill, especially writing performance in writing skill. It is also important to know what kinds of difficulties students encounter during the learning process in order to know the right way to overcome the problems in the writing class. The researcher decided to use personal recount text as the material in this research.

Raimes 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. It means that teachers should provide writing materials which are relevant for the students in order to make them understand the materials easily.

Based on the statements above, the researcher concluded that teaching writing is helping students how to express their feeling, ideas, imagination or thoughts in written forms and also providing understandable materials that are relevant to their interest, needs, capacities and ages in order to minimalize making errors.

2.5 Writing Process

Based on the definition of writing, writing is a process to deliver ideas into a good organization writing work. Writing process is important to know in order to get the understanding of what should writers do to make a good writing.

Blanchard and Root (2003) state that there are three steps in writing process, they are prewriting, writing, and revising. All of those steps are important to make our writing better and systematic.

1. Pre-writing.

Pre-writing is the first step; it is a preparation step before writing process. It gives a warming up to gather ideas which are going to write.

2. Writing

The next step is writing process. The result of brainstorming or clustering in prewriting process is guidance for us to write paragraph. When we write, the ideas in pre-writing are used as a guide in this step.

3. Revising

The last step is revising. We have to analyze the content of the draft which may be unclear, ambiguous or confusing. We have to ensure that our paragraph is unified, coherent and grammatically correct. So, in this step we can enrich our writing content with adding new sentences to support others idea, or deleting some sentences which are irrelevant with the topic.

There are three steps of writing by Edelstein and Pival (1988):

1. Pre-writing

Pre-writing is concerning to select the general subject, restricts the subject, generates the ideas, make the outline and organize the ideas.

2. Writing

Writing is to set on the paper the ideas in her or his mind into words, sentences, paragraph and so on.

3. Rewriting

Re-writing concerns with evaluating her or his writing, deals mainly with:

a) Concerning the content and form.

b) Correcting the vocabulary, punctuation, and grammar.

c) Correcting writing errors, word duplications and omission.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the processes of writing consist of pre-writing, writing and revising.

2.6 Aspects of Writing

There are some aspects that should be considered by learners in producing writing work well. According to Jacobs et al (1981) there are five aspects of writing. They are:

1. Content refers to the substance of writing, the experience of the main idea (unity). It is identified by seeing the topic sentence. The topic sentence should express the main idea and reflect the entire paragraph.

2. Organization refers to the logical organization of the content (coherence). It contains sentences that are logically arranged and flow smoothly. Logical arrangement refers to the order of the sentences and ideas.

3. Vocabulary refers to the selection of words that are suitable to the content. It can be identified by seeing the words choice or diction in order to convey ideas to the reader.

4. Language Uses/Grammar refers to the use of the correct grammatical form of syntactic pattern on separating, combining, and grouping ideas in words, phrases, clauses, and sentences to bring out logical relationships in paragraph writing.

5. Mechanics refers to the use of graphic conventional of the language, i.e., the steps or arranging letters, words, sentences, paragraphs by using knowledge of structure and some others related to one another.

In addition, Harris (1979: 68-89) also states that there are five aspects of writing. They are:

1. Content refers to the substance of writing, the idea expressed (unity).

2. Grammar refers to the employment of grammatical form and syntactic patterns.

3. Form refers to the organization of the content (coherence).

4. Style refers to the choice of structure and lexical items to give a particular tone or flavor to the writing.

5. Mechanics refers to the conventional devices used to clarify the meaning.

Based on the statements above, it can be concluded that there are five components or aspects which are used in scoring writing ability; content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

2.7 How to Measure Writing Skill

After we know the aspects of writing skill that must be scored, we need to know how to measure writing skill based on the aspects that have been mentioned before. Scoring writing achievement is not an easy thing to do. In measuring writing ability, it is supposed to be done by someone who has enough capability to score writing achievement. It is also important to have objective scoring.

The researcher needs someone else who is capable to score the writing test in order to avoid subjectivity in scoring the test for the data of this research. There must be criteria for the writing test used to measure writing skill. There are five aspects to the writing test adopted by Jacobs (1981).

They are: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

1. Content

   In measuring the content of the written product is not an easy task. To make the teacher or evaluator simple to count on, he applies several descriptors: knowledgeable, substantive, through the development of the thesis, and relevant to an assigned topic.

2. Organization

   In an organization, some descriptions have to be in well written text. They are: fluent expression, ideas clearly stated and supported, well organized, logical sequencing and cohesive.

3. Vocabulary

   Good writers have to enrich their vocabularies mastery for their writing to have a good quality. Jacobs's states vocabulary into four descriptors: sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, and appropriate register.

4. Language Use

As with vocabulary, in writing evaluation, language use consists of eight descriptors: effective complex constructions, agreement, tenses, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, and prepositions.

5. Mechanics

Mechanics is a description of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, and handwriting in the written product. It serves as the foundation for evaluating the composition profile.

The researcher applied the aspects of writing stated by Jacobs et al (1981) in measuring students' writing performance, there are descriptors for each aspect of writing which are need to be understood well by the scorer in order to avoid a subjective scoring.

2.8 Kinds of Texts

There are many kinds of English text that we may find or learn, but below are the most common ones according to Gerot and Wignell which are also included in Merdeka Curriculum for English Subject:

1. Descriptive

Description text is a text that describe an object, such as a thing, a person, a place, an animal or a plant.

2. Recount

Recount is a text which tells a series of event in the past to entertain or to inform the readers.

3. Narrative

Narrative text is text that contains a story with complication and problematic events with the resolution to solve the problems with a timeline in the story.

4. Analytical Exposition

   Analytical exposition is a text that persuades the readers or listeners that something in the case.

5. Explanation

   Explanation text is a text that explains a process of how something works or why something happens.

6. News Item

   News Item is a text that presents up-to-date information to inform the readers about events happen in the current time.

7. Procedure

   Procedure text is a text that contains an explanation of the steps or ways to do something in sequence correctly.

Based on the explanation above it can be concluded that there are some kinds of texts in English that are learnt in school which students must understand. In this research the researcher will focus on one of the texts explained above, namely recount text.

2.9 Recount text

Recount text is a text that either tells or entertain the readers about experience in the past chronologically. According to Anderson (2003) recount is a text which tells about events happening in the past in a sequence of time. It means that in a recount text, there was a series of events that happened in a timeline chronologically before the text is written. Knapp (2005) also says that recount text is a sequential text that does little more than sequencing a series of events. It means that a series of events in recount text need to be written clearly with the period of time shown.

It can be concluded that recount text is a text that tells a sequence of events in a period of time in the past.

The Generic structure of Recount text

It is important to know and understand the structure before we write a certain text in order to make a well- structured text. Each kind of text has its own general structure. According to Anderson, the generic structure in recount texts consists of three parts, they are:

1. Orientation: the opening of the text, the introduction of the topic of the text. It gives background information about who, what, where, and when.
2. Event: It is usually told in a series of paragraphs which retell the events in the order of sequence when they happened.
3. Reorientation: it functions as the closing statement. It is a paragraph which contains a personal comment of the writer.

Furthermore, according to Wardiman et al. (2008:61), there are some generic structures for constructing a written recount. They are:

1) Orientation It is introduced the main characters and possibly some minor characters. Some indication is generally given of where or when the action happens.
2) Event Events are where the researcher tells how the characteristic to the events. It includes his/her feeling and what he/she does. It can be chronological order (the order in which they happened).
3) Reorientation or personal comment is the evaluate remark, which are interspersed throughout the record of events, but it is optional.

The importance of understanding the generic structure of recount text is that we can apply in our own writing when we write a recount text, so that our text is well- structured and correct.

In order to make the generic structure explanation of recount text clearer, here is an example of a recount text with the generic structure:

Last Wednesday was a tiring day. I spent my time to do a lot of activities, that I had no time to take a rest. (orientation)

First, in the morning, I went cycling. After that I went to school to study until 3 pm. After school I went to sport hall to play badminton until 8 pm. I played too seriously that I felt really tired. After that, I went home. But when I wanted to sleep, I remembered there was some homework I had to do. I did my homework until 11 pm. And finally, I could take a rest in my bed. (events)

Those activities made me exhausted. (reorientation)

(https://www.ef.co.id/englishfirst/)

The Language Features of Recount Text

Beside generic structure, in recount text we also need to know about the language features used in order to make a text in the right language standard. According to Boardman, the language features we usually find in a recount text, such as:

1. Use of nouns and pronouns to identify people, animals or things involved.

2. Use of past action verbs to refer to the events.

3. Use of past tense to located events about speaker`s or researcher`s time.

4. Use conjunctions and time connectives to sequence the event.

5. Use of adverb and adverbial phrases to indicate place and time.

6. Use of adjectives to describe nouns.

2.10 Written Corrective Feedback

According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012) written corrective feedback (WCF) is an important aspect of second or foreign language pedagogy and has been extensively researched in the field of both second language acquisition (SLA) and second language (L2) writing. WCF occurs in response to linguistic errors made in learners' writing.

Mi-mi (2009) defines written CF as any indication to the learners that their language use is incorrect. It is supported by Suzuki (2003) who claims that written CF as the provision of negative evidence which encourages learners' repair involving accuracy and precision.

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.

However, it is undeniable that teachers may be in confusion when determining what kind of feedback is suitable for the learners. Brown (2012) has described two factors that might influence second language teachers in determining the written CF.

1. **Explicitness of Feedback**

Brown states that explicitness refers to how feedback draws the learners to notice the location or nature of error.

2. **Scope of Feedback**

Brown states scope refers to the number and type of errors that are addressed. Effective feedback can be focused on a particular error.

Ellis (2009), presented teacher options for correcting linguistic errors in students' written work. Strategies for providing Corrective Feedback (CF) are divided as follows:

1. Direct Corrective Feedback

   The teacher provides the student with the correct form.

2. Indirect Corrective Feedback

   The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. There are two kinds of Indirect CF:

   a. Indicating + locating the error

      This takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text.

   b. Indication only

      This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.

3. Metalinguistic CF

   The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error. There are two kinds of metalinguistic CF:

   a. Use of error code

      Teacher writes codes/clue in the margin.

      (e.g., when I am (wrong word) a child; I have (article) apple in my hand.)

   b. Brief grammatical descriptions

      Teacher numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.

4. The focus of the feedback

   This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students' errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options.

There are two kinds of this feedback:

a. Unfocused CF. it is extensive.

b. Focused CF. it is intensive.

5. Electronic Feedback

   The teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of correct usage.

6. Reformulation

   This consists of a native speaker's reworking of the students' entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that written corrective feedback is an important aspect in term of giving correction to students' writing work in L2 learning process. Teachers also should know how to determine the right written corrective feedback for learners by considering the explicitness of the feedback and the scope of the feedback. The researcher decided to use indirect written corrective feedback as the treatment of this research.

2.11 Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing

Indirect written corrective feedback 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). When the presence of errors is identified by underlining but no correct forms are provided, such WCF is indirect (Ellis, 2009). Lalande (1982, p. 141) states that indirect written corrective feedback leads to guided learning and problem solving. It also encourages students to reflect on their linguistic and leads to long term learning.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) also argue that indirect feedback enables students to benefit from guided learning and problem-solving, which can encourage student to reflect on existing knowledge and to retain much deeper levels of processing, which, in turn, lead to more successful self-editing and foster long-term acquisition of the target forms.

According to Ellis (2009), indirect written corrective feedback indicates that the student has made an error without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the student's text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error. To make it clear, below are the example of indirect written corrective feedback in a student' written work:

A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with XhavingX X bone. When the dog was going XthroughX X bridge over XtheX river he found X dog in the river.

X = missing word

X ___ X = wrong word

Another example of indirect written corrective feedback is from the research done by Beuningen, et al at University of Amsterdam in 2008:

Example 2: indirect corrective feedback on form related errors

Je moet het trui niet chemish**S** reinigen. [You should not dry clean the sweater]

(___ = wrong word, **S** = spelling error)

The researcher also analyzed kinds of symbols which are commonly used by some writing programs in global. One of them is from Ben Gadd, the set of symbols are as follows:

Editing symbols used by Ben Gadd for marking student papers

Symbol	Example of use	Explanation
	ten years' experience	Indicates that you've done something well: a sentence, a paragraph, a tricky bit of spelling or pronunciation, etc.
	very a ~~real~~ tough job	Substitute the correction for the crossed-out material.
	towards solutions	Remove a character.
	it w as difficult .	Close up a space.
|	long-term plans	Insert a space
>	the next time. Moving to other news,	Insert an extra line, usually for a paragraph break.
	The next day, we	Indent (press the tab key at the beginning of the line).
	Greetings!	Move words over.
∧ ∨	*the* to salesperson's wages	Add something here.
	I try hard (learn to)	Reverse characters, words or short
□	the english assignment a Government officer	If lower case, capitalize. If capitalized, make lower case.
₶	the car. Turning to	Start a new paragraph here.
- - - -	this ~~greedy~~ action	Don't make the marked change. Okay as is. (Editors sometimes change their minds.
~~	"splendid" better? a splendiferous story	Draws attention to the item. Usually accompanied by a comment.
SP	*SP* enviroment	Spelling error. Look up the word yourself, which helps in remembering it.
RUN-ON	*RUN-ON* We saw it, we ran.	Run-on sentence, usually from the comma-splice error. Make two separate sentences, or use a semicolon, a coordinate conjunction ("and" for example) plus a
FRAG	*FRAG* Although I found out.	Sentence fragment. Make it a complete sentence, with subject and verb, and don't begin with a subordinate begin with a subordinate conjunction such as "Although."

If you don't understand a correction, please ask about it.   BG 1996

https://www.bengadd.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Editing-symbols-for-student-papers.pdf

Another set of symbols used for editing writing work is from Collins Writing Program. The set of symbols used are follows:

C O L L I N S W R I T I N G P R O G R A M

REVISION and EDITING SYMBOLS

Notes on Editing and the Collins Writing Program

The Collins Writing Program has five types of writing, but in Types One and Two, teachers typically do not comment on problems of mechanics or conventions; therefore, editing symbols are not needed. In Types Three and Four, editing comments are usually limited to the areas covered by the focus correction areas (FCAs). In Type Five, teachers act as true editors, helping students produce an error-free paper.

The symbols listed below are standard symbols used by editors with the exception of theDon't forget the***** which indicates a positive comment.*****. Everyone likes to know the positive!

∧ Insert

frag. Sentence fragment

¶ Paragraph

? Hard to understand

Delete

W.C. Incorrect word choice

≡ Capitalize

*voice Strong voice

/ Lowercase, not a capital

*lead Good beginning

sp Spelling

*close Strong conclusion

rs Run on or fused sentence

*detail Good detail

https://collinsed.com/PDFs/revision_editing_symbols.pdf

Another set of symbols used by Edmonds CC Writing Center. The set of symbols
are as follows:

Edmonds CC Writing Center | MUK 113   **Common Editing Marks**
425.640.1750 | www.edcc.edu/lsc   Original handout provided by Edmonds CC ESL Dept.

C O M M O N E D I T I N G M A R K S

SYMBOL	MEANING	EXAMPLE
¶	paragraph format	
^	something is missing	She walking to school. ^
^^	two words, etc. are missing	He's listening radio. ^ ^
art	article	art She lives in United States.
cap	capital letter	cap She's from ukraine.
conj, +	conjunction	conj I have a camera. It doesn't work.
g	grammar	g We bought 2 milks.
info	informal	info I'm gonna do it.
lc	lower case	lc He went to Mexico in the Spring.
prep	preposition	prep He's listening his iPod.
punc	punctuation	punc While it was raining I went for a walk.
sp	spelling	sp They're siting in class.
s/v	subject/verb agreement	s/v Paul and Ringo was singing.
vf	verb form	vf I want buying a new cell phone.
vt	verb tense	vt He goes to the mall tomorrow.
wo	word order	wo Are they to work going?
ww	wrong word	ww He's walking at Burger King.
frag or ★	fragment	★ While I was asleep.

Based on the statements above, it can be concluded that indirect written corrective feedback is the type of correcting students' mistakes in writing work implicitly by underlining, circling, or marking the error with a symbol. This type of feedback is supposed to guide students to do problem solving which can encourage them to be more aware of their knowledge and how to reflect on it by self-editing their writing work.

The researcher decided to use indirect written corrective feedback with set of symbols combined from the three sources in teaching writing recount text to see the effect of the feedback on students' writing performance. The set of symbols the researcher used are as follows:

No	Symbols	Example in use	Explanation	Related writing aspect
1	**?**	I know about not me who are late right ?	Hard to understand	Content
2	¶		paragraph format	Organization
3		I was at house	Wrong word choice	Vocabulary
4	^	I went school 7 A.M	Missing word	Language Use
5	g	I ate much (g) apples	Grammar	Language Use
6	vf	I wanted buying(vf) it	Verb from	Language Use
7	vt	I am(vt) late yesterday	Tense	Language Use
8		I had time good	Word order	Language Use
9	Prep	I smile to (prep) her	Preposition	Language Use
10	▭	I learn english	Capitalization	Mechanic
11	Sp	I must be carefull (sp)	Spelling	Mechanic
12	**Punc**	When it was raining (punc) I was on my way home.	Punctuation	Mechanic

2.12 Procedures of using Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Teaching Recount Text

The implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback was done in one of the writing processes which was revising. The researcher conducted the treatment according to the writing process. The procedures of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback are as follows:

1. Pre-writing

   Students were given vocabularies matching. the vocabularies were related to each topic. They were asked to identify the similar meaning words from the main vocabularies. Then, they were given examples of recount text with specific topics, experience in watching favorite movie for the first topic and experience having holidays with friends or family for the second topic. The words in the text were colored differently. Red color was for nouns and pronouns. Blue color was for verbs. Brown color was for past tense helping verb. Green color was conjunction. Purple color was for adverbs and adverbial phrases and orange color was for adjectives.

   After that, they were shown questions which asked about the generic structures of recount text; orientation, events and re-orientation. Then, they were given topic questions containing questions which expected their own ideas as the answers so that they managed to organize their ideas related to the topics.

2. Writing

   After they were given the topic questions about the topics and managed to organized their ideas, they were asked to write their ideas from the topic questions they had answered into three paragraphs of recount text in the work sheet with the duration approximately 60 minutes.

3. Revising

    Their writing drafts were corrected using Indirect Written Corrective Feedback (IWCF). The researcher used a red pen to put a symbol applied from the mentioned resources before as the feedback in the aim of students analyze their mistakes from their writing work including all aspects of writing.

    After that, the researcher returned the writing drafts with Indirect Written Corrective Feedback to the students and asked them to revise their writing work according to the feedback they got. The researcher showed the twelve symbols of feedback used in correcting their writing drafts and let the students analyze their mistakes before revising their drafts. They were given 60 minutes to revise their writing drafts.

2.13 Advantages and Disadvantages of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

In using Indirect Written Corrective Feedback, there must be some advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of IWCF in teaching writing:

1. Indirect written corrective feedback leads students to guided learning and problem solving in the learning process.

2. Indirect written corrective feedback encourages students to reflect on their linguistic form.

3. Indirect written corrective feedback encourages students to retain deeper levels of processing, which, in turn, lead to more successful self-editing.

4. Indirect written corrective feedback leads students to long term learning.

The disadvantages of IWCF in teaching writing:

1. It takes some times for students to understand their mistakes because of the feedback given indirectly or not clearly stated on their writing work.

2. It is possible for students to get confused by the feedback if they do not have prior knowledge of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.

3. The students may misunderstand the feedback when the explicitness of the feedback is not well considered despite of being indirect.

2.14 Theoretical Assumption

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback is effective enough in improving students' writing performance especially recount text since it is an important aspect in the process of learning. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback encourages students to realize their mistakes in writing by analyzing the implicit feedbacks and help them to revise the mistakes into the better version by doing self-editing. It also leads them to avoid making the same mistakes for the future writing work. It encourages them to be more aware of the details in their writing work for long term learning process.

Indirect Written Corrective Feedback provides feedback which covers the five aspects of writing since each feedback focuses on specific type of writing aspects which is related to the structure and language features of recount text. It helps students to understand how to organize a recount text with the correct structure and language features. The feedbacks are provided to correct content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics aspects. However, language use has the most symbols of feedback because it focuses on small detail mistakes in the writing work. It will help them to realize their mistakes especially in grammar details, so the language use aspect will be improved the most.

2.15 Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical assumption above, the researcher formulated the following hypothesis:

1. There is significant effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance.
2. Language Use is the writing aspect that improves the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.

Those all above are what this chapter discusses, including previous studies, theories of writing, theories of writing ability, components of writing, teaching writing, writing process, how to measure writing skill, text, recount text, written corrective feedback, indirect written corrective feedback in teaching writing, procedures of using indirect written corrective feedback, advantages and disadvantages of indirect written corrective feedback, theoretical assumption, and hypotheses.

III. METHODS

This chapter discusses about research design, population and sample, data collecting techniques, research procedure, scoring criteria, instruments, validity, reliability, and data analysis, data treatment, hypothesis testing and schedule of the research.

3.1 Design

This research was a quantitative study which was intended to see whether there is any effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing performance. The research design was one group pre-test and post-test design as the researcher used only one class. The design was used to compare the students' writing performance through the score of pre-test and post-test after the treatment given.

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982: 20), the research design is represented as follows:

$$T1 \; X \; T2$$

Notes:

T1 refers to the pre-test that is given before the researcher implements Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in order to measure the students' competencies before they are given the treatment.

X refers to the treatments given by the researcher using Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in students' writing recount performance in recount text.

T2 refers to the post-test that is given after using indirect written corrective feedback and to measure how far the students' improvement after they got the treatment.

3.2 Population and Sample

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. There were several classes consist of first-grade students in the school. 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.

3.3 Data Collecting Techniques

This research was intended to gain data on students' writing performance after being taught using indirect written corrective feedback. The data was gained from:

1. **Pre-test**

    The pre-test was conducted before the researcher gave the treatment to the students. It is to see the students' writing performance before indirect written corrective feedback is given as the treatment. The pre-test was in the form of a writing test. The students were asked to write a short text about their funny experience containing at least three paragraphs.

2. **Post-test**

    The post-test was conducted after the students got Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on their writing works in order to see the improvement of the students after the treatment. The post-test was in the form of a writing test. The students were asked to write a short text about their funny experience.

3.4 Research Procedures

In conducting this research, the researcher used the following steps:

1. Determining the population and selecting the sample

   First of all, the researcher determined the population by choosing one of the schools to be the place for the researcher to collect the data. The researcher chose SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung as the school. The population was all of first-grade students in year academic of 2022/2023 and the sample was class X.2 containing 30 students which was selected using cluster sampling.

2. Preparing the materials

   After the population was determined and the sample was selected, the researcher prepared the materials for the pre-test, treatments and post-test based on the course objectives in syllabus of the first-grade students at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung in order to fits the validity. The researcher took some examples of recount text from the internet sources or developing the examples of personal recount text by own self.

3. Administering a pre-test

   The research gave the pre-test in order to measure students' writing performance before they are given the treatment. The pre-test was conducted in the form of a writing test. The students in the experimental class were asked to write a recount text about their personal funny experience. The duration was approximately 80 minutes.

4. Conducting treatments

   After the researcher gave the pre-test to the students in the experimental class, they were given treatments by writing a short recount text about specific topics and getting Indirect Written Corrective Feedback. Each treatment was conducted based on the time allocation in the syllabus of first-grade students at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung.

The treatment was conducted in four meetings. In those meetings, the students were given Indirect Written Corrective Feedback for their recount writing works and encourage them to do problem solving for the error they made so that they will have better writing skill in the future. After the students got the treatments, they were given a post-test to evaluate their writing performance in writing a recount text.

5. Administering a post-test

The researcher gave the post-test in order to see the improvement of students' performance in writing a recount text. The researcher hopes that the students in the experimental class have a better understanding about how to write a recount text correctly after they got Indirect Written Corrective Feedback. The post-test was conducted in the form of writing test. The students were asked to write their personal funny experience. The duration was approximately 80 minutes.

6. Analysing the test results (pre-test and post-test)

After the researcher scored the pre-test and post-test, the data were analysed by using SPSS 26 software program. It was to find the means of the pre-test and post-test and how significant the improvement will be.

3.5 Scoring Criteria

According to Jacobs (1981), there are five aspect of writing skill should be tested in evaluating students' writing recount text performance; content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The researcher analysed the results of the students' recount text writing work to ensure that the treatment have given an effect to their writing skill.

The researcher used Jacobs ESL composition profile (Jacobs, et al, 1981) as the

criteria of scoring system because it provides a well-defined standard. The scoring rubric has five rating categories with a 100 points scale. The score of the test was derived as follows:

1. Content: 30%

2. Language use: 25%

3. Organization: 20%

4. Vocabulary: 20%

5. Mechanic: 5%

It can be concluded that the scoring criteria of the test covers the five aspects of writing including content 30%, language Use 25%, organization 20%, vocabulary 20% and mechanic 5% of 100 points.

3.6 Instrument

The instruments for this research are writing tests. Writing tests were given to the students in order to measure their writing performance by producing a short recount text about specific topics.

3.7 Validity

In order to provide convincing opinion that this research deserve to be included in scientific work, the researcher tried to follow the rules of how to conduct appropriate research. It was including considering the validity of the instruments used for data collection in this research.

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982:281) there are two basic types of validity; content validity and construct validity.

In order to measure whether the test has a good validity, those two types of validity were analysed.

Content validity is the degree to which a test measures an intended content area. The researcher made the test based on the course objectives in the syllabus of the first-grade students at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. The type of text is recount text and the topics are the representative of writing materials in curriculum Merdeka. So, it can be said that the test has the content validity.

According to Brown (1996), construct validity is the accumulation of evidence to support the interpretation of what a measure reflects. It means that a test which measure the students' cognitive knowledge and skills according to the theory of related materials has covered the construct validity. According to Jacobs (1981), there are five aspects of writing should be tested to measure students' writing performance. Five aspects of writing were measured by the researcher since this research focused on writing. So, it can be said that the test has been covered with the construct validity.

It can be concluded that the instrument in this research was valid because it had content and construct validity.

3.8 Reliability

There is another thing needs to be considered in developing tests as the instrument of research is reliability. The tests researcher developed should be valid and reliable. According to Hatch and Farhady (1982:243), the reliability of a test could be defined as the extent to which a test produces consistent result when it administered under similar conditions. A test can be considered reliable if the test has a consistent result. In order to reassure the reliability of scores and to avoid

the subjectivity of the research, the researcher used inter-rater reliability. Inter-rater reliability is used when the score on the test is independently estimated by two raters.

In this case, the first rater was the researcher and the second rater was the English teacher at SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. It is important to know that both of the raters use the same scoring criteria before scoring the students' recount text writing work.

To measure how reliable the scoring is, this study used Spearman's *Rank – order Correlation* (Guilford, 1942) with the formula:

$$R = \frac{1 - 6\,(\sum d2)}{N.\,(n2 - 1)}$$

Notes:

R refers to the reliability of the test

N refers to the number of students

D refers to the difference of rank correlation (mean score from the pre-test and the post-test)

1 – 6 refers to the constant number

Then the researcher analysed the coefficient of reliability (Guilford, 1956: 145) after finding the coefficient between the raters with the standard of reliability below:

A very low reliability (ranges from 0.00 – 0.19)

A low reliability (ranges from 0.20 – 0.39)

An average reliability (ranges from 0.40 – 0.59)

A high reliability (ranges from 0.60 – 0.79)

A very high reliability (ranges from 0.80 – 0.100)

Based on the standard of reliability above, it can be concluded that the writing test developed by the researcher will be supposed reliable if the test reaches the minimum range of 0.60-0.79 (high reliability).

After calculating the result of students' recount writing pre-test and post-test by using the formula above (see appendix). The result of the reliability could be seen in the following table:

Table 3. 1 The Result of Reliability

	Pre test	Post test
Reliability	0.984	0.965

Based on the standard of reliability above, the writing test for pre-test is 0.984 and the post-test is 0.965. It has very high reliability (range between 0.8000 – 1.0000). It can be concluded that the instrument in this research was reliable.

3.9 Data Analysis

The data in this research are in the form of scores. In order to get the results of this research, the data were analysed by using the following steps:

1. Scoring the students' writing worksheet of the pre-test and the post-test.
2. Putting the scores from students' worksheet into a table in appendix
3. Finding the mean of the pre-test and post-test by using this formula:

$$Md = \frac{\sum d}{N}$$

Notes:

Md refers to mean

$\sum d$ refers to total score of students

N refers to number of students

4. Drawing a conclusion to answer the first research question. It was developed from the result of statistical computerization which was paired sample T-test in SPSS.

5. Drawing a conclusion to answer the second research questions by calculating the N-Gain of the pre-test and post-test scores in each aspect of writing.

3.10 Data Treatment

In this part, there is a step to do before answering the hypothesis testing, the researcher conducted normality test.

Normality Test

The purpose of conducting normality test is to find out whether the data is normally distributed or not.

The researcher used SPSS Saphiro Wilk program to analyse the data. The hypotheses of the normality test as follows:

H_0: The distribution of the data is not normal.

H_1: The distribution of the data is normal.

The level of the significance used was 0.05. H_1 is accepted if the result of the normality test is higher than 0.05 (p>q). The result of normality rest is as follows:

Table 3. 2 Test of Normality

Tests of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test	.077	30	.200[*]	.980	30	.830
Post-test	.065	30	.200[*]	.979	30	.789

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

From table 3.2, it can be seen that the value of normality test in the pre-test (0.830) and the value of normality test in the post-test (0.789) is higher than 0.05. It can be concluded that H1 is accepted. In other words, the data of the pre-test and post-test are normally distributed.

3.11 Hypotheses Testing

After collecting the data, the researcher analysed the data in order to find out whether there is significant improvement of students' writing performance in recount text after they have got Indirect Written Corrective Feedback and which aspect improves better.

The hypotheses was analysed using Paired Sample T-Test of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The researcher used the level of significance 0.05. The hypothesis is approved if sign < p. it means that the probability of error in the hypothesis is only 5%. The hypotheses are:

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

H1 indicates that there is effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount text writing performance.

H0 indicates that there is no writing aspect of students' writing performance that improves the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.

H1 indicates that Language Use is the aspect of students' writing performance that improves the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.

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

3.12 Schedule of The Research

During the implementation, this research took six meetings in total, i.e., the pre-test, the first treatment, the second treatment, the third treatment, the fourth treatment and the post test. To be more specific, the table describes the administration of the research is as follows:

Table 3. 3 Table of The Research

Meeting	Activity	Description
1st meeting February 1st 2023	Pre-test	Giving the first test about recount text
2nd meeting February 8th 2023	Treatment 1	Giving an explanation about topic 1 and writing the first draft
3rd meeting February 15th 2023	Treatment 2	Giving Indirect Written Corrective Feedback and 1st draft revision
4th meeting February 22nd 2023	Treatment 3	Giving an explanation about topic 2 and writing the second draft
5th meeting March 1st 2023	Treatment 4	Giving Indirect Written Corrective Feedback and 2nd draft revision
6th Meeting March 8th 2023	Post-test	Giving final test about recount text

Those all above what this chapter discusses, including research design, population and sample, data collecting techniques, research procedure, scoring criteria, instruments, validity, reliability, data analysis, data treatment and hypotheses testing.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This final chapter presents the conclusions of the research findings and suggestions for English teacher and further researches.

5.1 Conclusion

1) 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.

2) The aspect that improved the most after the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback is language use because Indirect Written Corrective 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.

5.2 Suggestions

In reference to the conclusion above, the writer gives some suggestions as follows:

1) **Suggestions for English Teachers**

a) Considering the advantages of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback, the researcher suggests the English teacher of the class to implement Indirect Written Corrective feedback in teaching writing performance 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. It encourages the students to do problem solving and self-editing.

b) 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. The longer the implementation of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback is, the better improvement the students will get in their writing performance. Therefore, the researcher hopes that English teachers can implement Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in English teaching and learning process for a long time period.

2) **Suggestions for Further Researches**

a) This research was conducted in a senior high school level. Therefore, further researches 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.

b) This research focused on teaching recount text. It is suggested that further researches 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.

c) Obviously, the improvement in content aspect is still quite low. Further researches are suggested to do more analysis and more observation related to the set of symbols which can be used to correct mistakes that appeared in content aspect.

Those are what this chapter discusses, the conclusion of this research and suggestions for English Teachers and further researches.

REFERENCES

H. Douglas Brown. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* Longman.

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

Boardman. (2017). on Gabriel Hibu Piga *International Journal of English and Education,* p.35

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/432678 95

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- andmajority-language students. *Journal of Second LanguageWriting, 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.

Hedge. (2005). *Writing (2nd Ed), (New York: Oxford University)*, p.7, (2001). *Pedagogy* (2nd Ed), (California: Longman), p.335

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 Ability 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, Elite 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.

Suzuki, M. (2003). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL.* Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 1-21.

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.

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