

THE EFFECT OF INDIRECT CODED FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY

Sri Nurhayati

(STAIN Pamekasan/ yaatiecie@gmail.com)

Abstract

*The purpose of this research is to know whether indirect coded feedback gives a better effect on students' writing ability rather than direct feedback. The design used in this experimental research was randomized group post test only design. The researcher did lottery to every student to divide them into A and B class. Then the experimental group and the control group were randomly chosen by a flip coin. A class or the experimental group was given correction by using codes on the errors they made in their first draft or indirect coded feedback, while B class or control group was given the correct form of the errors or direct feedback on their first draft. The treatments were done three times and the result of post test then was analyzed. The result of the data analysis that gotten from the statistical computation of the post test result showed that the *t*-value was higher than that of *t*-table. This indicated that students who got indirect coded feedback have better writing ability than the students who got direct feedback on their writing.*

Key Words:

The Effect, Indirect Coded Feedback, Writing Ability

A. Introduction

Language is used in communication, allow people to say something each other and to express their communicative needs. Language is the core of society, allowing people to live, work, and play together, to tell the truth but also to tell a lie or lies as means of communication. Language is generally used to share knowledge. It is also the most powerful emblem of social behavior.

Writing is a process of producing language rather than receiving it. Very simply, people can say that writing involves communicating a message

(something to say) by making up on page. To write, we need someone to communicate it to.

But since the existence of English as a new language may encounter various problems resulting from the differences between English and Indonesian linguistics rules, it is normal for Indonesian learners to make errors in their learning process since English is as a foreign language for them, not a second or native language. In the teaching and learning English, there are still many problems caused by the difference in the system of the native

language and English as the target language to be learnt that both teacher and student always face.

Students' problems may not be on the idea of what to say on their writing, but rather than on the way to deliver it. They faced some problems on how to form letters and words, and join these together to make words, sentences or a series of sentences that link together to communicate the message. Besides, in writing process, there are major areas of learning involved. In order to express the idea, feelings, opinions in written forms and translate them into written English correctly, those require conventions.

The psycholinguist Erin Lenneberg in Brown¹ once notes that learning to write is culturally specific, learned behavior. We learn to write if we are a member of a literate society and usually only if someone teaches us.

Teachers have to teach students how to write a good writing and it is also teachers' responsibility to respond to the students' writing. Most EFL or ESL writing teachers agree that responding to students' writing through teacher corrective feedback is an essential part of any writing course and student writers want the teacher's feedback on their written errors.² But nowadays in most

EFL or ESL context the issue is more to do with how to give error correction rather than to give feedback or not.

Since there are distinctions between direct and indirect error strategies, the researcher chose the indirect error strategies. The direct correction will directly give the correct form of the error in the students' paper and it is considered too easy for the students to revise their writing. And also this kind of feedback did not give the students' information about the errors they made and it also did not teach them to correct and improve their writing quality.

Whereas the indirect feedback only indicates the location of the error indirectly in the students' paper by underlying, highlighting or circling or indirectly by indicating in the margins that there is an error on that line without providing the correct form.³ This kind of feedback gives the students motivation as well as giving them information about the quality of their writings. Thus the students here need to think further how to correct the errors they made and they need their background knowledge to revise their writings. It is regarded as "coded-error feedback" if it is done by a symbol representing a specific kind of error (T= verb tense, Sp = spelling).

¹ Douglass H. Brown. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (Prentice Hall, New York: 2007), 363.

² Dana Ferris and Barrie Roberts, "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit

Does It Need to Be?," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 3 (2001): 161–84.

³ Icy Lee, "Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong," *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, no. 4 (December 2004): 285–312, doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001.

There is research evidence in Ferris suggesting that indirect error feedback is more helpful on students' long-term writing development than direct error feedback.⁴ However, in another longitudinal study by Robb, Ross and Shortreed, it is found that there is no significant difference was found among four groups of students who received four different types of error correction feedback. These were (a) direct correction; (b) indirect coded feedback; (c) indirect highlighted feedback (no codes); and (d) indirect marginal feedback.⁵ It was found that all four groups improved in accuracy over time but the differences between the groups were not statistically significant.

The study by Robb et al.⁶ found that salience of the error feedback (including whether the location is explicit or not) does not affect the students' performance. In contrast, in Lee's study, direct location was found to be more effective than the indirect prompting of error location for students' editing their writings.⁷

In Indonesia, teachers still use the direct correction to respond students' writing by providing the correct form of

the students' error. This kind of feedback considered new for the Indonesian learners and teachers in writing class since English is as our foreign language. That is why the researcher comes with an experimental research of the effect of indirect coded feedback on students' writing ability of English Department to introduce also to know the effect of this indirect coded correction compared to the direct one or traditional one. It is attended to answer the following research question: "Do the fourth semester students of English Department who get indirect-coded feedback have better writing ability than students who get direct feedback?"

B. Method

1. Participants

In order to answer the research question, two groups of students receiving two different kinds of written feedback – direct, indirect coded feedback – were compared on the frequencies of the writing errors they made on their post test writing. 46 students (23 for the indirect coded feedback group and 23 for the direct feedback group) who participated in this study were enrolled in two EFL writing classes in Madura university. It was their fourth semester at the university and after studying writing I and writing I, they got writing III in this semester. Students are assigned randomly to two different classes, A and B, and these two classes are randomly chosen to go to two

⁴ Ferris and Roberts, "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes," 1.

⁵ Thomas Robb, Steven Ross, and Ian Shortreed, "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality," *TESOL Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (March 1986): 83–93, doi:10.2307/3586390.

⁶ Ibid., 182.

⁷ Lee, "Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms."

different groups, experimental group and control group. The experimental group treated with giving codes on their errors they made on their writing or indirect coded feedback on their writing while the control group was treated using direct feedback or by giving the correct form of the errors directly on the students' writings.

2. Data Collection Procedure

The data collected for this research were based on the weekly writings of the students for three meetings. Writing was carried out in a guided way in two hours a week through a two-draft process as part of the main English course. Before every writing section, a topic-related listening or mostly a reading session was carried out in the class to provide the necessary content. Some related activities were done such as the students were asked to go out of the class to stimulate the students' thought to get started with the topic, and to read and look for the information about crimes in the newspaper they brought from home.

Then the useful language, related vocabulary and appropriate forms were introduced. The students were asked to write double-spaced texts in class and submit their writings by the end of the class period. The teachers checked students' writings according to the feedback type for the group –direct vs. indirect coded-and returned them to the students for the second draft writing.

The writing teacher of the two classes is the researcher herself to avoid the difference on the treatment given. The teacher taught the two classes with the same approach to writing in the sense that they both regarded production as an essential way of learning a language. Both classes received written feedback from the teacher, but the teacher used a different way of giving feedback to student writings. One class or the control class was given the direct feedback strategy. This class was given feedback by writing the correct version of the errors between the lines. When the teacher gave the writings back for the second draft, the students checked their errors and wrote the final draft by using the teacher's corrections.

The teacher gave the same treatments to the two groups for three times with different themes each meeting. These themes were about exposition essay. The themes are the rising fuel cost, building, crimes, and the post test theme was about the online KRS.

In the other class the teacher provided feedback by using codes (indirect coded feedback). Instead of correcting the errors in students' writings, she indicated the errors by using a set of symbols which students were taught before the class began. The explanation about the codes was done in every meeting treatment. After receiving the coded feedback, the students found

out the errors indicated by the codes, corrected them and wrote the second draft to submit it to the teacher. The teachers read the second drafts, marked them, provided correction for any remaining errors. It was also noticed that in some cases students did the corrections requested, but not properly. So, the teachers provided them with the proper corrections on the second draft.

3. Coding and the Analysis of Data

During the three meeting treatments the students were asked to write one composition every meeting. By the end of the treatment, they were all supposed to have written 3 different compositions each. While analyzing both direct and indirect coded feedback group papers, a list of 13 error correction categories was used. These codes (see Appendix A) were codes about spelling correctly, forming letters correctly, writing legibly, punctuating correctly, using correct layouts, choosing the right vocabulary, using grammar correctly, joining words and sentences correctly and using paragraph correctly. The error samples given in the list were selected from students' composition papers.

Using the error categories list, the papers were marked for both the direct and indirect coded feedback groups, and the number of errors was counted for each composition paper and adjusted for each error category. All the composition papers were marked by the teacher for consistency. However, an

inter-rater reliability check was also done. The researcher as the teacher asked for another writing class teacher to help correcting the students' work. This teacher is writing I teacher who knew nothing about the fourth semester students. The number and type of errors marked by both raters were counted and weighted to the scoring rubric which was adapted from Brown⁸. The errors then were scored from the range of 0.2 to 10 with the errors range from 1 to 50.

The next thing was computing the score into the t-test. The score gained from consulting the scoring rubrics then put into the t-test formula. The statistical method will be used in this research in order to get correct and accurate conclusion. After finding the *df*, knowing the level of significance, and understanding the type of the test then the researcher found the critical value of *t* from the table. The researcher found the appropriate row in the t-table by locating the 44 degrees of freedom. Then the researcher chose the directional column because the t-value was associated with certain possibilities of directional test. And the t-critic is in 5% or .05 level which means the condition will occur by chance 5 percent of the time.

⁸ Brown. *Teaching by principles*.

C. Result

1. First Meeting Treatment

The first treatment was done to B class first then continued to A class as the experimental group. At the first meeting in B class, the researcher as the teacher of this class started the class with pre-writing session. In this stage, the teacher helped the students generate ideas for their writing. The teacher told the students the topic and the students were given time to list and categorize all information related to the topic. The teacher engaged the students into a teacher- student discussion about the first topic. It was about the raising of fuel cost in Indonesia. After that the teacher asked them to reflect on their personal experience about fuel cost. This discussion was done in about 10 minutes.

The next step was planning. In this step, the students organized all ideas they have generated about the fuel cost raising and decided what they will say about the topic for about 10 minutes. Then, the teacher asked the students to write an exposition in the form of discussion about the raising of fuel cost happened to Indonesia in about 200 words in 45 minutes. State the pros' point of view and cons' point of view.

After writing the first draft, the teacher gave respond on the students' writing content, whether their writing has fulfilled the form of a discussion or not. The teacher also talked about the

comprehensibility of the students' writing.

After that, still in the stage of responding, the teacher also gave correction in the writing ability. The teacher informed that she would correct the students' writings by using direct correction where she would place the correct form of the students' errors directly on their papers.

Then the researcher as the teacher invited her friend to do correction together on the students' writings. This person is also a writing teacher. She teaches in Writing I classes for the second semester and she does not have any knowledge about the fourth semester students. It was done to reduce the subjectivity of the rater. This correction was done at the campus after the Writing session is over. And the students' draft was returned in the next meeting.

In the next class, in the experimental group, the researcher did the same thing as she did in B class. In this class the researcher responded the students' writings by using indirect coded feedback. The pre-writing, planning, and then drafting were the same.

After the drafting stage, the students submitted their writings. The teacher also checked the comprehensibility of the students' writing, the form, the content of the discussion relating it to the topic. The teacher would give the students' writing

back if there is something wrong with the writing, either on the content, the message or on the comprehensibility of the writing.

Then she informed the students that she would correct their writings' ability by using the indirect coded feedback. It was by giving the students codes on the errors they made. Then the teacher distributed the copy of codes that would be used. After that, she explained and also gave examples of how to revise their writings if they found such codes in their writings. The process of responding was also the same as the control group. The teacher asked for help to another teacher to give codes on the students' papers.

2. The Second Meeting Treatment

In the second meeting treatment which was done just as the same time as the first meeting. But before giving the topic related listening or reading to do pre-writing of the second meeting treatment, the students were asked to revise and edit their writings in about 15 minutes. This control group only revised by re-writing their first drafts by directly changing the errors they made with the correct form of word given by the teacher. While in the experimental group, the students corrected their writings by understanding the codes given by the teacher and re-read the sentences containing the errors. They may change the word or even they can delete the word.

After doing the editing, and then they submitted the second draft to the teacher. The teacher then provided any correction for any remaining errors. In the second draft of the first meeting treatment of the experimental group, the teacher still found some inappropriate correction made by the students. The teacher returned it back by giving them the direct correction and asked the students to re-write the second draft after the class.

The next step of the second meeting treatment was pre-writing. Pre writing activity was done by bringing out the students of the class after telling the students the topic would be discussed. This was to stimulate the students' thought for getting started and this was done because the second theme was about *Building* especially one of the buildings in the university. This activity also can be said by viewing the media such as the observed building. But before that, the teacher informed the students about the topic of the second meeting so that the students could easily examined the building to be easily written on their first draft. The teacher and students did this stage for about 10 minutes.

The continuation step was planning. The students then wrote the main points and the sub-points. This stage was the same as the first meeting treatment activity. The activity was also done in 10 minutes. The next step which is drafting was also the same as the first

meeting treatment except the theme given. This time the topic given was about building and the students were asked to make an exposition in the form of analytical writing. The amount of the words and the time given were the same as the first meeting treatment. The process of drafting in the control group was faster than the experimental group. The control group took not exactly 45 minutes to write while the experimental group needed two or three more minutes to finish their drafts.

After writing their first draft of the second meeting treatment, the teacher responded the students writing to make sure that they had written an analytical composition. Here the teacher found that the topics of the students' writings were various. Some of them wrote about the library, some of them about canteen, the campus' bathroom, and also about the language laboratory. But the teacher recognized that they all still wrote an analytical composition about buildings.

Then the teacher corrected the students' writings' ability after the class together with the second rater or the teacher of Writing I. But before the class stopped, the teacher informed that the students had to bring newspaper. One newspaper is for one student. It was related with the next topic would be given.

3. The Third Meeting Treatment

The steps of the third meeting treatment were the same as the first meeting treatment. Before the pre-writing step, the students were asked to revise and edit their writing in about 15 minutes. And the teacher did the correction again on the students' second draft but the teacher did not find any further errors on the students' writings. And then the teacher continued the process to pre-writing of the third meeting treatment.

Pre-writing activity was not the same because the topic was different. While in the second meeting treatment the students were asked to observe the building directly before coming to the planning stage, here in the third meeting treatment the students were asked to read news from newspaper that they brought about crimes. This was done to brainstorm the students to the topic given. The students had to read it in 10 minutes and they had to do planning to write a hortatory composition about crimes in 10 minutes too.

Then the students asked to write the first draft. They were asked to write a hortatory composition about crimes in 45 minutes. After that, they wrote their first draft. The same condition happened to the third meeting treatment, the experimental group needed much more time to finish their first draft than the control group.

After writing the first draft of the third meeting treatment, the students

submitted their drafts to the teacher to be checked about the content and also the relation with the topic. And then she corrected the students' writings' ability based on their treatments. The control group was used direct feedback and the experimental group used indirect coded feedback.

In short, the process of writings was the same. The students of control and experimental group got the same pre-writing, planning, drafting, responding, revising, and editing. The different activity only happened in the pre-writing step of the first, second and the third meeting treatment. The different activity showed in the following table.

4. The Activity of Pre-Writings

Meeting treatment	Activity of Pre-Writing
1 st meeting	The students were engaged in a teacher-student discussion about the raising of the fuel cost. The teacher tried to generate the students knowledge about the hottest news and brainstorm the students before writing.
2 nd meeting	The students were asked to go out of the classroom to examine the buildings in UNIRA so that they can chose the building t hey want to write in their exposition.

3 rd meeting	The students read about crimes on the newspaper they have brought to the class. From reading the news it was hoped that they could gather information about the crimes.
-------------------------	---

5. The Post Test

After giving the students three meeting treatments, the post test then delivered to both of the groups, the control group and the experimental group. They were given the same theme to write and they also got the same process writing. The different thing is the experimental group (A class) was treated by using indirect coded feedback while the control class (B class) was treated by using direct correction which gives the correct form of the errors the students made.

The test was a written test. The test was conducted based on the writing syllabus used by the University. The theme was about an exposition essay. The students were asked to write a 200 words essay about a given topic about "Online KRS" for about 45 minutes. The activities in the process writing of the control and the experimental group were as follows:

The control and the experimental group were having the same process of writing. Before the class started they needed to revise their first draft of the

third meeting treatment that was corrected by the teacher using their own treatment of feedback for 15 minutes. And then the students submitted their second draft of the third meeting treatment to the teacher to be corrected for the further errors. Here the researcher did not find any other errors both in the control or the experiment group.

The teacher started the process of post test writing by doing the pre-writing. The activity was the same in control and the experimental group. The teacher talked about the recent issues about the way of university students to do their KRS (Course Planning). This semester, the students experienced the new method of doing KRS which is through on-line way. The teacher asked some information about the Online KRS such as who made the Online KRS, how important it is for the students' course planning and how important the method is for the students' future planning course, etc. This activity was done to do pre-writing.

After that, the students were asked to write their argument by asking them what they thought about Online KRS and what others think about it as opposition. The teacher also asked to give argument about their lecturers' point of view toward the Online KRS. The students did planning.

After pre-writing and planning that was done in about 20 minutes, then the teacher wrote the instruction on the

board. The students were asked to write a 200 words exposition in the form of discussion text about Online KRS in 45 minutes. They wrote the first draft. The time given to the control group was the same as the experimental group but in fact the control group did it less than the time given while the experimental group needed a little more time to finish their writings. The students submitted the first draft of the post test to the teacher. The teacher checked the students' work in terms of the content, the form and the meaning of their writing. The teacher did this to make sure that the students had delivered their intention correctly on the paper.

The teacher then gave correction of the students' writing ability on the students' writings. The direct feedback was given to the control group and the indirect coded feedback was given to the experimental group. The teacher also invited her friend, the Writing I teacher, to check the students' writings. This person was the same person who helped the researcher for the three meeting treatments. This person did not know the students of Writing III because she only teaches Writing I for this semester. And the researcher hoped that this person could reduce the subjectivity of the researcher as the teacher of the class. The teacher asked for the second rater to check the students' writings to deals with the rater reliability. The correction was done and the agreement of the number of errors students made in post test was reached.

The students' post test's errors of the experimental and control group of this research are presented as follows:

The Errors Made By the Students of Experimental Group and Control Group in the Post Test.

Experimental Group		Control group	
Subjects	Errors	Subjects	Errors
A	10	A	19
B	11	B	25
C	4	C	19
D	19	D	29
E	10	E	45
F	9	F	23
G	22	G	20
H	14	H	20
I	9	I	38
J	16	J	16
K	13	K	12
L	2	L	7
M	30	M	25
N	8	N	18
O	17	O	14
P	5	P	16
Q	19	Q	9
R	8	R	7
S	7	S	12
T	7	T	6
U	4	U	11
V	26	V	16
W	8	W	11
Σ	278	Σ	418
\bar{X}	12,09	\bar{X}	18,17

The above data were gained after counting all errors made by the students in their post test. The errors from the experimental group were the total amount of all kinds of errors either errors in spelling (Sp), word order (WO), form of verb (VF), form of word (WF), preposition (Pr), wrong word (WW), article (A), missing word (/), unclear meaning or handwriting (?), punctuation (P) but the teacher did not find any wrong Collocation (C), start new paragraph here (/), and the students should know what is wrong here (!) in the students' writings.

From the above data, it was found that the students from the control group made more errors than the students from experimental group. This does not mean that the experimental group is better than the control group or the control group is better than the experimental group unless we had proven it through statistical computation because these errors still need to be weighed to scores.

After that, the students' errors were consulted to the scoring rubrics which was adopted from Brown⁹ see **appendix B**. The highest score is 10 and the lowest score is 0.2 in the range of errors from 1 to 50 errors. These are the scores that the students got after weighing their errors.

⁹ Brown. *Teaching by principles*, 244.

**The scores of the Experimental Group
Weighed from the Errors They Made
on the Post Test**

Experimental group			
Subjects	Errors	X_1	X_1^2
A	10	8.2	67.24
B	11	8	64
C	4	9.4	88.36
D	19	6.4	40.96
E	10	8.2	67.24
F	9	8.4	70.56
G	22	5.8	33.64
H	14	7.4	54.76
I	9	8.4	70.56
J	16	7	49
K	13	7.6	57.76
L	2	9.8	96.04
M	30	4.2	17.64
N	8	8.6	73.96
O	17	6.8	46.24
P	5	7	49
Q	19	6.4	40.96
R	8	8.6	73.96
S	7	8.8	77.44
T	7	8.8	77.44
U	4	9.4	88.36
V	26	5	25
W	8	8.6	73.96
Σ :	278	176.8	1404.08

It was known that the sum of the errors made by the students of experimental group 176.8. and then we squared the score to make it X_1^2 . And the scores of the control group from

weighting the students' errors are as follows:

**The Scores of the Control Group
Weighed from the Errors They Made
on the Post Test**

Control group			
Subjects	Errors	X_2	X_2^2
A	19	6.4	40.96
B	25	5.2	27.04
C	19	6.4	40.96
D	29	4.4	19.36
E	45	1.2	1.44
F	23	5.6	31.36
G	20	6.2	38.44
H	20	6.2	38.44
I	38	2.6	6.76
J	16	7	49
K	12	7.8	60.84
L	7	8.8	77.44
M	25	5.2	27.04
N	18	6.6	43.56
O	14	7.4	54.76
P	16	8.7	49
Q	9	8.4	70.56
R	7	8.8	77.44
S	12	7.8	60.84
T	6	9	81
U	11	8	64
V	16	7	49
W	11	8	64
Σ :	418	151	1073.24

From the above data, we knew that the sum of experimental group scores is higher than the control group's

score. The scores are 25,8 higher than the control group. The X_1^2 will be used to find the variance of the experimental group (S_1^2) and the variance of control group (S_2^2).

From the computation of t-test on students' writing ability scores was found that the t-value is 2,235 (The complete computation can be seen in **Appendix C**). After this, the t-value was used to see whether there the difference between the experimental group and the control group is significant or not by consulted it to directional t-table.

6. The Hypothesis Verification

Based on the computation of t-test formula from the post test results on the students' writing ability it shows that the t-score is 2,235. The degrees of freedom (*df*) of this research is $n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 44$. This formula to find the degrees of freedom was stated that way because this study is independent t-test. The critical value of t-test with 5% significant level in directional test is 1,684. It means that computed t-score is higher than the critical t-value ($2,235 > 1,684$). This means that the hypothesis (H_i) which is formulated "the students of English Department who get indirect coded feedback in writing have better writing ability in writing than the students who get direct feedback" was accepted. This result is as the same as the result gotten from the SPSS calculation. The SPSS

calculation can be seen in the **appendix D**.

D. Discussion

Based on the research finding, the result of t-test score is higher than the critical value of t-test or t-table ($2,235 > 1,684$). It showed that the result of t-test was significant. It proved that the students whose writing was corrected by using indirect coded feedback have better writing ability than the students whose writing was corrected by using direct feedback. Indirect coded feedback is a form of giving correction on students' writing by providing the students' codes for their errors in writing. The codes given in this research were 13 specific codes which help students to revise their writings. And these 13 codes had been discussed in every meeting treatment to avoid misunderstanding when the students revised their writings.

Feedback considered very important for students to increase their writing quality. This is in line with the result of Ferris and Robert's research that showed the indirect feedback was considered helpful on students' long-term writing development.¹⁰

In their study, Ferris and Roberts¹¹ analyzed 72 university ESL students' ability in self editing was investigated. There were three kinds of feedback conditions (a) errors marked

¹⁰ Ferris and Roberts, "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes," 182.

¹¹ Ibid, 162.

with codes, (b) errors underlined but not marked or labeled, (c) no feedback at all. Although there were no significant differences between the groups' ability to edit their paper, the students who were given corrective feedback outperformed the no feedback group on self-editing task. The different thing here is the doer of the correction. Here The researcher gave the teacher's respond on correcting the students' writing while in the previous research the students got self correction. It was done so because the Indonesian teachers still believed that the teacher's correction is more effective than their peers' correction.

From the technique used for correcting students' writing, the researcher as the teacher believed that the students will be more careful in writing a composition. It was proven from the meeting treatments that had been done three times, the students of experimental group spent much more time to write the first draft in the second and third meetings than the students of control group. They thought that they need to be careful in writing the first draft because later on if the teacher found their errors it would be more confusing to revise it. This feeling could not be felt by the control group because they had already got the correct form of the words on their papers without thinking it any further. This feeling also showed that indirect coded feedback fulfilled the function of feedback itself. A good feedback is a correction which may lead

the students to betterment of their progress as stated by Spratt et.al that the purpose of feedback are to motivate learners and to help them understand what their problems are and how they can improve it.¹²

From the explanation above, it is assumed that the students whose writings were corrected using indirect coded feedback should think and understand their writing well. It is not strange when in the experimental group they spent much more time to write than the other group. It shows that their analytical and critical thinking was also working well. If their analytical and critical thinking was working, it will also make the students' grammatical sensitivity better. Grammatical sensitivity is to do with how aware you are of the working of your language. Carroll in Johnson states that grammatical sensitivity is the individual's ability to demonstrate his awareness of the syntactical patterns of sentences in a language.¹³ This indirect coded feedback may lead to a better grammatical sensitivity of the students so that they will get used to recognize the correct form of their foreign language's errors by themselves because their teacher gave only the codes only rather than the direct correction on the meeting treatment.

¹² Mary Spratt, Alan Pulverness, and Melanie Williams, *The TKT Course* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 156.

¹³ Keith Johnson, *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (London: Pearson Longman, 2008), 126.

The treatments were done to two writing classes, A class as the experimental group while the B class as the control group. The process of writing used in this research is the writing process suggested by Reid¹⁴ in his book "Teaching English Writing". The researcher chose the process approach rather than genre based approach because the researcher' concern is on the correction of the students' writings which is the main focus of the process writing.

As Brown stated in his book Teaching by Principles that:

"Process writing focused on the process of writing that leads to the final product, it also gives the students feedback through the composing process (not just on the final product) as they bring their expression closer and closer to intention, and also encourage feedback from both the instructor and the peers."¹⁵

In this research used the teacher's correction since this research did not give the direct correction, it used codes and it needed to think first what codes are suitable with the errors.

E. Conclusion

After analyzing the data, the researcher can draw a conclusion related to the hypothesis of the research. Regarding to the research question, the result of the analysis showed that the statistical value of t-test is higher than that of the t-test critics ($2,235 > 1,684$). It means that the students of English

Department whose writings were corrected using indirect coded feedback have better writing ability than the students whose writings were corrected using direct correction.

Although the mean difference of two groups is only 1.13 but after the researcher computed the t-test, it was proven that the difference is significant in 5% level of significance. So it means that the indirect coded feedback was proven to be effective in correcting the students' writing so that the students may have better writing ability.

References

- Ary, D. et.al. *Introduction to Research in Education*. Canada: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2002.
- Ashwell, T. *Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method?* *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 2000. 227-258.
- Brown, H. D. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman, 2004.
- Brown, H.D. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Prentice Hall, 2007.

¹⁴ Joy M Reid. *Teaching English Writing*. (New York: Prentice Hall Regents, 1993)

¹⁵ Brown. *Teaching by principles*, 392.

- Byrne, D. *Teaching Oral English*. London: Longman, 1986.
- Erel, S, Bulut, D. "Error treatment in L2 writing: a comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context". *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı : 22*, (2007), 397-415 s.
- Ferris, Dana, and Barrie Roberts. "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need to Be?" *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10, no. 3 (2001): 161–184.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. "Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications", *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(2), (1997) 155-182.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. "Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), (2001), 161-184.
- Johnson, Keith. *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Pearson Longman, 2008.
- Lee, Icy. "Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13, no. 4 (December 2004): 285–312. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001.
- Leki, I. "The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes". *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), (1991), 203-218.
- Lenneberg, E. *Biological Foundation of Language*. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- McMillan, J.H. *Educational Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1992.
- Mistar, J. *Handout Statistics for Language Teaching*. Universitas Islam Malang, 2011.
- Reid, Joy. *Teaching English Writing*. Englewood cliffs, New York: Prentice Hall Regents, 1993.
- Robb, Thomas, Steven Ross, and Ian Shortreed. "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." *TESOL Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (March 1986): 83. doi:10.2307/3586390.
- Spratt, Mary, Alan Pulverness, and Melanie Williams. *The TKT Course*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- White, R. and Arndt, V. *Process Writing*. New York: Longman, 1991.

APPENDIX A

Codes used in giving indirect coded feedback.

CODES	MEANING
Sp	Wrong spelling
WO	Wrong word order
VF	Wrong form of verb
WF	Wrong form of word
Pr	Wrong preposition
WW	Wrong word
C	Wrong collocation
A	Article error
/	Missing word
//	Start new paragraph here
?	Meaning or handwriting unclear
!!	You should know what is wrong here
P	Wrong punctuation

APPENDIX B

Analytic Scale for Rating Composition Tasks (scoring rubric)

Writing ability	Descriptors
8,2 – 10	1 – 10 errors are found in the students' writing
6,2 – 8	11 – 20 errors are found in the students' writings
4,2 – 6	21 – 30 errors are found in the students' writings
2,2 – 4	31 – 40 errors are found in the students' writings
0,2 – 2	41 – 50 errors are found in the students' writings

(Adapted from Brown, 2004)

APPENDIX C

The computation of t-test

1. Find the mean of the experimental group (\bar{X}_1) and the mean of the control group (\bar{X}_2).

$$\bar{X}_1 = \frac{\sum X_1}{n_1} = \frac{176,5}{23} = 7,687$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = \frac{\sum X_2}{n_2} = \frac{151}{23} = 6,565$$

2. Find the variance of the experimental group (S_1^2) and the variance of the control group (S_2^2)

$$S_1^2 = \frac{\sum X_1^2}{n_1} - \bar{X}_1^2$$

$$= \frac{1.404,08}{23} - (7,687)^2$$

$$= 61,046 - 59,136$$

$$= 1,91$$

$$S_2^2 = \frac{\sum X_2^2}{n_2} - \bar{X}_2^2$$

$$= \frac{1.073,24}{23} - (6,56)^2$$

$$= 46,663 - 43,034$$

$$= 3,629$$

3. Find the Standard Error of the difference between Mean ($SD_{\bar{X}}$)

$$SD_{\bar{X}} = \sqrt{\frac{N_1 S_1^2 + N_2 S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right)}$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{23 \cdot 1,91 + 23 \cdot 3,63}{23 + 23 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{23} + \frac{1}{23}\right)}$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{43,93 + 83,49}{44}} \quad (0,087)$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{127,42}{44}} \quad (0,087)$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{2,895} \quad (0,087)$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = \sqrt{0,252}$$

$$SD_{\bar{x}} = 0,502$$

4. Compute the observed t-value

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{SD_{\bar{x}}}$$

$$t = \frac{7,687 - 6,565}{0,502}$$

$$t = \frac{1,122}{0,502}$$

$$t = 2,235$$

APPENDIX D

SPSS Computation

T-Test (Statistical Computation)

Group Statistics

	x1	Group Statistics			
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
x2	1.00	23	7.6870	1.43061	.29830
	2.00	23	6.5652	1.92934	.40230

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
x2	Equal variances assumed	.676	.415	2.240	44	.030	1.12174	.50083	.11239	2.13109
	Equal variances not assumed			2.240	40.576	.031	1.12174	.50083	.10998	2.13350