

## The Effect of Indirect Feedback on Students' Recount Text Writing Ability at SMK Fatihul Ulum

Vicky Maulana<sup>1</sup>, Widya Oktarini<sup>2</sup>, Yeni Mardiyana Devanti<sup>3</sup>

English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember, Indonesia

---

### Article Info

#### Keywords:

Keyword 1; Indirect feedback

Keyword 2; Writing ability

Keyword 3; Recount text

---

#### Article History:

Received : 01/07/2025

Revised : 20/10/2025

Accepted : 23/11/2025

Available Online:

31/01/2026

---

### Abstract

*Writing skill is one of english skill besides of listening, reading, and speaking. This skill is important to students in study english but some students face challenges when produce it, especially in past tense. This research aims to investigate the effect of indirect feedback on students' writing ability in recount text. The method of research uses quantitative method using quasi-experimental as the design with sample of this research is students of SMK Fatihul Ulum grade X. The results show that indicates that indirect feedback can reduce the error of students' recount text writing ability. In addition, this strategy also engages the critical thinking of students, self-correction, and makes efficient time of learning. It is recommended that integrating indirect feedback as part of the writing learning strategy to encourage students to be more active in the process of revision. It also suggests for future research to exploring the combination of several types of indirect feedback like underlining, circling, etc or combination of other types of feedback like direct feedback to see which approaches are more effective in certain aspects of writing.*

---

### Introduction

Writing is a complex language ability because it involves various processes and aspects. According to Kane, (2000, p. 17), writing is a complex activity. The process of writing is not only an activity to express ideas in writing, but it also consists of a set of stages that are organized to get text quality. These stages include planning, drafting, editing, and final drafts. Harmer, (2007, p. 5) reveals that the writing process has four elements: planning, drafting, editing, and final draft. In planning, the writer will collect ideas, decide the purpose, and make an outline. In the drafting, the idea will express its purpose without

focusing on completeness. Next, in this stage, editing was carried out to revise the structure again, and writing was used to make it clear and organized. This stage is to improve grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc. This process is complex because stages make writers view the writing as requiring improvement and idea development.

The writing process involved stages relevant to the kurikulum merdeka belajar. In this curriculum, the implementation of relevant literation becomes positive in the development of writing skills in learning. Ningsih et al., (2024) assert that using or implementation literation in kurikulum merdeka belajar can give positive impact to students writing skills. In emphasizing learning of various projects and contextual, the student was given the flexibility to explore the ideas and relate to real experiences. One of the implementations is through writing recount text. Hanafi (2019, p. 26) reveals that recount text is a text which retells events or experiences in the past. Its purpose is to inform or entertain the events or experiences. This text aims to retell an experience or event that occurred, recount text perhaps students to practice conveying information by chronologies using relevant language. However, many students face challenges in writing recount text, like understanding grammar, lack of vocabulary, and organizing ideas. According to Al Hafizh (2020), the causes of students' problems in writing recount text were grammatical weakness, lack of knowledge and understanding, less practice, and lack of educational background. Other results studies also show the same cause. Saputra, and Suprpto (2022) assert that identified two categories of pupils' writing challenges in recount text are grammar and sentence structure. Fitria (2020) shows that students' errors in simple past tense writing compositions consist of grammar, punctuation, and spelling. Sinta & Astutik (2019) reveal that the students' difficulty in writing recount text is caused by two factors the internal factor is from the ability of students is incorrect to use of words, incorrect word patterns, grammatical errors, and punctuation. External factors such as the teacher, facility, or infrastructure influence this. These various factors require a strategy for teachers to help students in writing recount text. One of the strategies that can help students is teacher's guidance.

Teacher has a crucial role in helping students to face this challenge. One of the effective strategies is giving indirect feedback. Indirect feedback is how teachers correct the results of students' practices in learning. Harmer (2007, p. 108) reveals that correcting is a stage at which when something is not right. Indirect feedback refers to correcting mistakes without specific solutions so that students will find their solutions. It is a strategy for

correcting students' writing in which the teacher marks errors without providing clear corrections or specific solutions. Ferris (2012, p. 32) reveals that indirect feedback occurs when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but leaves it to the student writer to solve the problem and correct the error. Teachers can direct students to recognize and improve their writing skills through this. Devi and Raja (2023) reveal that the implementation of indirect written corrective feedback was effective in improving student's writing performance, especially in recount text writing. Similarly, Yuniarti (2022) shows that students' ability to write recount texts improves as a result of teachers providing indirect feedback. According Rahma et al. (2020) show that indirect corrective feedback improves their writing recount text ability. Some studies found that indirect feedback is less to use, and some teachers use direct feedback because it contributes more in learning. Lim and Renandya (2020) assert that direct feedback demonstrated a larger effect size than indirect feedback. According to Sary (2021), direct correcting feedback is more dominant than indirect feedback correcting feedback. Nusrat et al. (2019) reveal that direct teacher feedback significantly improves more than indirect teacher feedback. But, another study found that both direct and indirect feedback can be improved. Karim and Nassaji (2020) state that both direct and indirect feedback comprehensive WCF can improve learners' accuracy during the revisions of the same texts. Similarly, Luan & Ishak (2018) state that between of direct and indirect feedback had positive effects in improving students' writing ability, especially in the use of past tenses. But according to Jamalinesari et al. (2015) indirect corrective feedback performed better than direct feedback in improving writing skills. Therefore, indirect feedback is less effective in some contexts, particularly if students require more explanation or direct correction to understand their mistakes.

Considering the various findings, the problem in this research is, "Is there any significant effect of indirect feedback on student writing ability in recount text?". This study aims to investigate the effect of indirect feedback on students' recount text writing ability. However, the studies do not determine the type of indirect feedback used in this study, so it is unclear whether the indirect feedback includes strategies such as coded feedback, underlining errors, or other forms. Hence, this research also focus in emphasizing the use of codes as a correction tool. Knowing whether indirect feedback using correction codes can significantly improve students' writing ability will provide important insights for educators and help create more effective teaching strategies in the classroom, focusing on grade X

students of SMK Fatihul Ulum in Tamanan, Bondowoso. The study results are expected to provide practical implications for EFL students to improve writing instruction and optimize students' abilities.

## **Method**

This research uses a quantitative method to investigate the effect of indirect feedback on recount text writing ability at SMK Fatihul Ulum. In this research, quantitative data is collected and analyzed using statistical methods to identify significant differences. According to Ary et al., (2019), quantitative research is a research method that objective measurement in a controlled setting to gather numeric data that are used to answer questions or test predetermined hypotheses. In addition, it allows researchers to determine the cause and effect between the use of indirect feedback and improved writing ability. This research uses a quasi-experimental design involving two groups, namely an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group was given the treatment, while the control group did not get the treatment.

The population in SMK Fatihul Ulum is 67 including grade ten (X), eleven (XI), and twelve (XII). This research was conducted on students of class ten (X) SMK Fatihul Ulum with a total of 32 students 11 females and 21 males. Students were divided into two groups based on the name of the attendance list. The experimental group and the control group consisted of 16 students. The research subjects were selected based on the material being learned by the students. In this case, the students of SMK Fatihul Ulum are studying recount text. This research is conducted in Februari 2024 for 14 days at SMK Fatihul Ulum located in the Tamanan sub-district, Bondowoso City, East Java.

In this research, the instrument to collect data used writing tests and writing skill rubric assessments. Data collection techniques in the research use tests and documentation to obtain data relevant to the research objectives. Some steps began with preparing research instruments, such as the pre-test and post-test in the form of a recount text writing task, designing a writing rubric assessment, and preparing the indirect feedback code. Next, the pre-test is conducted to measure students' initial ability to write recount text, followed by collecting and analyzing. After that, both group is given practices to write recount text, but for the experiment group is implemented indirect feedback as treatment for the practices and the control group is only had a score. After treatment, a post-test is conducted to evaluate

writing ability development. Then, the post-test result is compared with the pre-test result to assess the effectiveness of indirect feedback. In addition, the documentation in the form of pre-test and post-test results, students' revision worksheets, and the process of giving indirect feedback is conducted to analyze. In this process, the researchers are the main facilitators in devising the test, giving indirect feedback, and analyzing data and an English teacher from that school just help to prepare students and class.

In this research, the T-test is used for dependent samples. This test aims to compare the pre-test and post-test scores in the experiment and control groups to determine whether there is a significant improvement after the treatment is given. Before conducting the T-test, a normality test is conducted first to ascertain whether the data will be normally distributed. If the data is normally distributed, the analysis will continue with paired samples test, but if the data is not normally distributed, the analysis will continue with the Wilcoxon signed-rank test as alternative. This process will be carried out using SPSS version 27.

**Findings and Discussion**

This research aims to investigate the effect of indirect feedback on students' recount text writing ability. Through giving a code as indirect feedback to correct the error, students were encouraged to find and fix their error in writing, which is expected to get deepest understanding in aspect of writing recount text.

Based on the results of the normality test with Shapiro-Wilk, it is known that the significance value for the pre-test in the experimental group is 0.014 and the post-test in the experimental group is 0.006, both group of which are smaller than 0.05. this indicates that the pre-test and post-test data in the experimental group are not normally distributed. Meanwhile, in the control group, the significance value for the pre-test is 0.119 that more than 0.05, so the pre-test data is normally distributed. However, in the post-test the significance value is 0.030, the data is smaller than 0.05, it indicates that the data is not normally distributed. Hence, there is data that is normally distributed, then the analysis data uses the Wilcoxon signed-rank test.

Table 1. The Data of Normality Test

Test of Normality				
Result	Class	Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
	Pre-test Experiment	0.850	16	0.014

Post-test Experiment	0.826	16	0.006
Pre-test Control	0.924	16	0.199
Post-test Control	0.873	16	0.030

Table 2. Ranks Data of Wilcoxon Signed-rank Test

		Ranks		
		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Post-test experiment – Pre-test experiment	Negatif Ranks	3	3.33	10.00
	Positive Ranks	10	8.10	81.00
	Ties	3		
	Total	16		
Post-test experiment – Pre-test experiment	Negatif Ranks	6	5.92	35.50
	Positive Ranks	5	6.10	30.50
	Ties	5		
	Total	16		

Based on the results of the Wilcoxon test to compare the results of the pre-test and post-test in the experimental group, it is found that there are 3 participants who experienced a decrease in scores ranks with an average rank 3.33 and an amount of 10.00 ranks. In contrast, 10 participants have improved scores ranks with an average rank of 8.10 and a total rank of 81.00, while 3 participants have the same scores between pre-test and post-test. The total sample size is 16 participants. Meanwhile for other group, there are 6 participants average rank 5.92 and sum of ranks 35.50 with decrease scores, 5 participants have average rank 6.10 and total rank 30.50 with improved scores, and 5 participants whose scores did not change.

Table 3. The Test Statistics Data of Wilcoxon Signed-rank Test

Test Statistics		
	Post-test experiment – Pre-test experiment	Post-test experiment – Pre-test experiment
Z	-2.503	-.237
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.012	0.813

Based on the results of table 3., it shows that Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in the experimental group is 0.012 which is smaller than 0.05 then H0 is rejected and Ha is not rejected which

means there is a significant different between pre-test and post-test scores after received the treatment in the experimental group. While in the control group, value Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.813 which is higher than 0.05 which means that  $H_0$  is not rejected and  $H_a$  is rejected, means there is no significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in the control group. Therefore, the results in the experimental group shows that there is a significant effect of indirect feedback on students' recount text writing ability.

Based on findings, indirect feedback that implement in experimental group as treatment can reduce the students' grammatical errors in recount text, which are similar with Devi and Raja (2023), Rahma et al. (2020), Yunianti (2022), and Kustina et al., (2020) state that indirect feedback is effective in reducing the error of grammatical in recount text. In addition, an aspect of grammar that had a significant improvement is verb tense. It supports the findings of Kustina et al., (2020), the most improvement to reduce in students' grammatical error is the verb tense aspect. Previously, in the results of both group tests (pre-test and post-test) found that students did not write verbs correctly, for example, the past form of the verb "go" is "went", but some students wrote it with "goed". Not only that, some students also wrote it into the present form of the verb. Then after the treatment was conducted in the experimental group, the students' grammatical errors can be decreased, especially in verb tense.

Besides, the indirect feedback also contributes to correcting spelling errors because problems also often occur in both groups. Then after the experimental group got treatment, in the results of the post-test, there are more student who can reduce their error in spelling. It is similar to Devi and Raja (2023), Indirect written corrective feedback could help students to be more aware of spelling. This shows that indirect feedback can make active involvement in the revision process, it can help students to be more reflective and try to fix their error with themselves.

This research also found that indirect feedback encourages students to develop their self-correction. Similarly, Yunianti (2022) , indirect feedback makes it easier for students to gradually improve their ability to correct their own writing. In this process, students are trained to identify, analyze, and correct with their error by understanding the indirect feedback using code. This also can train students to be more careful and detailed in the use of word structures. Moreover, indirect feedback can also encourage the development of critical thinking skills, as stated in the study Pham (2021) indirect feedback can stimulate

students to become critical thinkers. Hence, learning to evaluate and revise their own writing, students gradually improve the quality of their writing and develop effective revision strategies.

In addition, the correction code used as indirect feedback is flexible, namely the placement of errors in each wrong word. In addition, it was found that the use of indirect feedback with correction codes is better in terms of time because students can identify and correct their error more quickly without having to wait for direct explanations from the teacher. However, although this strategy saves time, its implementation requires a process that is not instant. Students need time to remember and understand the meaning of each correction code, especially if the number and type of codes are quite varied. This have similar findings with research by Luan & Ishak (2018), students need to be given longer period of training to enable them to understand what the error codes entail. Because of that, it is necessary to give students enough time to understand the code so that the impact of indirect feedback is efficient.

Thus, the implementation of indirect feedback using codes has proven to be an effective strategy in learning writing, especially in teaching recount texts. Through the process of continuous reflection and revision, students are not only helped in honing their writing skills, but also become more confident in expressing their ideas and experiences in writing more accurately and with quality. This strategy can be an important part of teaching practices that focus on developing holistic written communication skills.

### **Conclusions**

Based on the result of the data and discussion, it can be concluded that the indirect feedback using code is significantly giving a positive effect on students' recount text writing ability at SMK Fatihul Ulum in Bondowoso. The result of Wilcoxon signed-rank test indicates that value Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in the experimental group is 0,012 less than 0,05. Meanwhile in the control group with value Asymp. Sig. id 0,813 that is higher than 0,05, means that there is no significant effect on students' recount text writing ability. Students actively study to identify and fix their error; it can develop their self-correction and critical thinking. which contributes to improving their understanding about grammar, especially in verbs. In addition, this strategy can also reduce the error spelling, so that the quality of students' writing can be improved. Besides of those, the implementation of code as indirect feedback is flexible to simplify students in recognizing the location of their error and fixing

it themselves, which can save time in learning. Thus, this research confirms that indirect feedback using code is a beneficial strategy and can be implemented extensively in learning to write, especially in recount text. It also increases their confidence in expressing their idea through writing.

However, the effectiveness of this strategy requires an adaptation process, where students need time to understand and remember the meaning of each code. In addition, it needs giving students an explicit explanation and structure about code as indirect feedback, and giving intensive practice to make students get used to using it. It suggests for teacher to integrate indirect feedback as part of the writing learning strategy to encourage students more be active in the process of revision. For students, Developing the practice in evaluating writing self-correction after receiving feedback, with a focus on fixing the error repeatedly and also using this strategy as a facility to improve grammatical awareness, then expand understanding about the rules of grammar. For future research, examine the implementation of indirect feedback using code to other several types of text like descriptive, procedure, report, etc. and also exploring the combination of several types of indirect feedback like underlining, circling, etc or combination of other types of feedback like direct feedback to see which approaches are more effective in certain aspects of writing.

## REFERENCES

- Al Hafizh, M. (2020). An Analysis of Causes of Students' Problems in Writing Recount Text. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(3), 470–479. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v9i3.43717>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. A. (2019). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Boston: Cengage.
- Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Fitria, T. N. (2020). Error Analysis Found in Students' Writing Composition in Simple Past Tense of Recount Text. *ENGLISH FRANCA : Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 4(2), 141. <https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1154>
- Hanafi. (2019). *English Text Developing English Material*. Jember: CV. Pustaka Abadi.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-

- Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 116–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018>
- Kane, T. S. (2000). *Essential Guide to Writing*. Harlow: Berkley Books.
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519–539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Kustina, Y., Galuh Ciamis, U., Bunga Febriani, I. R., & Dedeh Rohayati, I. (2020). Indirect Teacher Feedback To Reduce Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing Recount Text. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy)*, 4(1). <https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/jall/index>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of written corrective feedback in writing instruction: A meta-analysis. *Tesl-Ej*, 24(3), 1–26.
- Luan, N. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's direct and indirect feedback: How do they impact learners' written performance? *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(3), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-08>
- Nida Friskila Devi, Paruan Raja, K. N. (2023). The effect of indirect written corrective feedback on students' recount writing performance at the First Grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. *Mathematical Linguistics.*, 16(5), 212–216.
- Ningsih, C. R., Sirait, G. A., & Harahap, S. H. (2024). Analisis Penerapan Literasi Dalam Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar Terhadap Keterampilan Menulis Siswa. *JAMPARING: Jurnal Akuntansi Manajemen Pariwisata Dan Pembelajaran Konseling*, 2(1), 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.57235/jamparing.v2i1.1809>
- Nusrat, A., Ashraf, F., & Narcy-Combes, M. F. (2019). Effect of direct and indirect teacher feedback on accuracy of english writing: A quasi-experimental study among Pakistani undergraduate students. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 25(4), 84–98. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2504-06>
- Okta I. S., & Irawan S. R. S. (2022). An Analysis of Students' Difficulties in Writing Recount Text at The Second Semester of University of Muhammadiyah Kotabumi Academic Year 2021/2022. *Jurnal Griya Cendikia*. 5(32), 261–269.
- Pham, A. L. (2021). the Effects of Indirect Feedback on Grammatical Errors in Efl Learner Writing. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 153–167. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i6.3971>
- Rahma, E. A., Fitriani, S. S., & Syafitri, R. (2020). Students' Perception to the Use of Indirect Corrective Feedback in Writing Recount Text. *International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, 2(1), 25. <https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v2i1.2222>
- Sary, H. A. (2021). Direct And Indirect Corrective Feedback And Students' Development

In Paragraph Writing At The Second Semester Of English Education Study Program Of Muhammadiyahuniversity Of Kotabumi Academic Year 2018/2019. *Jurnal Griya Cendikia*, 6(2), 215–224.

Sinta, N. A., & Astutik, Y. (2019). Difficulties in Writing Recount Text Faced by Senior High School Students in Indonesia. *Proceedings of The ICECRS*, 2(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.21070/picecrs.v2i1.2404>

Yunianti, E. P. (2022). Enhacing Students' Writing In Recount Text Through Indirect Feedback. *AIJELT: Aisyah Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1).