**CHAPTER IV**

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the research findings and discussion of the findings. The findings of this research reveal the effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback in improving the quality of students’ writing of the ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 36 Makassar. This reseach also investigates the possible effects of both feedbacks in decreasing the total number of errors on students’ writing. This discussion section deals with the descriptions and interpretations of the findings in this research. The findings that resarcher reported in this chapter was based on the analysis of data collection and the application of technique elaborated in the previous chapter.

1. Findings
2. Students’ writing improvement

This section describes the result of writing test on pre-test and post-test. Students’ writing was scored based on scoring classification on content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. It also reported the main score and standard deviation of pre-test and post-test of the experimental group A and experimental group B

1. The result of students’ writing in pre-test and post-test

In this section, researcher presents the result of students’ pretest and posttest scores in each component of writing profile. They are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

1. The students’ writing score in content

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ writing on content component of both experimental group A and experimental group B in pre-test can be seen in the table 4.1 as follows :

Table 4.1 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in Component of Content in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pretest

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 30 – 27 | 20 | 74.1 | 20 | 74.1 |
| Good to Average | 26 – 22 | 7 | 25.9 | 7 | 25.9 |
| Fair to Poor | 21 – 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 16 – 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

Table 4.1 shows that most of the students in experimental group Aand experimental group B of pretest were in the same category of Excellent to Very Good 20 (74.1%). Meanwhile, both experimental group A and experimental group B in pre-test were also in the same category, 7 students (25.9%) were categorized in Good to Average. Otherwise, none of the students were in Fair to Poor or Very Poor classification. The percentage in pretest above shows that both experimental group A and experimental group B already have excellent to very good ablity to write in the compenent of content especially to write recount text about their experience in the preceding day.

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ content in posttest both Experimental group A and Experimental group B can be seen in the table 4.2 as follows:

Table 4.2 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in Term of Content in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group A in Posttest

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 30 – 27 | 27 | 100 | 25 | 92.6 |
| Good to Average | 26 – 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7.4 |
| Fair to Poor | 21 – 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 16 – 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

Based on the data in table 4.2, the experimental group A shows that, all students gained excellent to very good classification (100%). In experimental group B, there were 25 (92.6%) yielded excellent to very good score, 2 (7.4%) of the students were classified good to average category. None of the students of experimental group A or experimental group B were in fair to poor and very poor classification.

The result of pre-test and post-test is tabulated to find the mean score and standard deviation of both experimeantal group A and experimental group B as in the following table:

Table 4.3 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest and Posttest in term of Content

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Experimental Group APretest | 27.11 | 27 | 1.577 | .304 |
| Posttest | 28.74 | 27 | .944 | .182 |
| Experimental Group BPretest | 27.41 | 27 | 1.083 | .209 |
| Posttest | 27.85 | 27 | .602 | .116 |

Based on the table 4.3, it shows a different mean score and standard deviation in pre-test and post-test. The table showed that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group A was 27.11 and standard deviation was 1.577 and in posttest was 28.74 and standard deviation was .944. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group B was 27.41 and standard deviation was 1.083; and in posttest the mean score was 27.85 and standard deviation was .602. The mean score of both pretest and posttest were different after the treatment executed. It means that the mean score of posttest is higher than pretest (28.74 >27.11 and 27.85 > 27.41).

1. The students’ writing score in organization

The following table is statiscal summary of frequency and percentage of students’ writing score in the component of organization for both experimental group A and experimental group B in pre-test.

Table 4.4 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Organization in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pretest

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 20 – 18 | 13 | 48.1 | 7 | 25.9 |
| Good to Average | 17–14 | 14 | 51.9 | 20 | 74.1 |
| Fair to Poor | 13 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 9 – 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

In term of organization, the score and rate percentage of experimental group A ilustrated in the table above that out of 27 students, 13 (48.1%) gained excellent to very good category, 14 (51.9%) students were in good to average classification and none of the bottom category, fair to poor and very poor, were employed by the students.

In experimental group B there were 7 (25.9%) students got excellent to very good classification, the students got score categorized as good to average classification were 20 (74.1%). Likewise in experimental group A, there was no students got fair to poor and very poor classification.

The score of student’s writing in organization for both experimental group A and experimental group B can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.5 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Organization in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 20 – 18 | 16 | 59.3 | 8 | 29.6 |
| Good to Average | 17–14 | 11 | 40.7 | 20 | 70.4 |
| Fair to Poor | 13 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 9 – 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

Based on the table above, experimental group A indicated that out of 27 students, 16 (59.3%) were in excellent to very good category, 11 (40.7%) were categorized in good to average classification and there were no students gained fair to poor and very poor category.

The result of post-test in experimental group B showed that there were 8 (29.6%) students categorized in excellent to very good classification and 20 (70.4%) students got good to average classification. The table also showed that none of the students were in faor to poor and very poor category.

The following table presents the mean score and standard deviation of the students’ pre-test and post-test in organization aspect.

Table 4.6 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest and Posttest in term of Organization

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Experimental Group APretest | 16.78 | 27 | 1.281 | .247 |
| Posttest | 18.00 | 27 | 1.038 | .200 |
| Experimental Group BPretest | 16.37 | 27 | 1.245 | .240 |
| Posttest | 16.44 | 27 | 1.251 | .241 |

The table above explains that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group A was 16.78 and standard deviation was 1.281; and in posttest was 18.00 for the mean score and standard deviation was 1.038. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group B was 16.37 and standard deviation was 1.245; and in posttest the mean score was 16.44 and standard deviation was 1.251. The mean score of both pretest and posttest were different after the treatment executed. It means that the mean score of posttest is higher than pretest (18.00 > 16.78 and 16.44> 16.44).

1. The students’ writing score in vocabulary

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ writing score on vocabulary component of both experimental group A and experimental group B can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.7 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Vocabulary in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 20 – 18 | 3 | 11.1 | 1 | 3.7 |
| Good to Average | 17–14 | 23 | 85.2 | 23 | 85.2 |
| Fair to Poor | 13 – 10 | 1 | 3.7 | 3 | 11.1 |
| Very Poor | 9 – 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The data in table above shows that in experimental group A, the students got scores categorized as excellent to very good classification were 3 (11.1%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 23 (85.2%), the students got score categorized as fair to poor were only 1(3.7%) and there was not any student got scores categorized as Fair to poor and very poor classification. Meanwhile, in experimental group B, the students got scores categorized as Excellent to very good classification was 1 (3.7%), the students got scores categorized as Good to average classification were 23 (85.2%), the students got scores categorized as Fair to poor classification were 3 (11.1%), and there were no students got vary poor classification.

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ score on vocabulary in posttest both experimental group A and experimental group B can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.8 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Vocabulary in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 20 – 18 | 14 | 51.9 | 6 | 22.2 |
| Good to Average | 17–14 | 13 | 48.1 | 21 | 77.8 |
| Fair to Poor | 13 – 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 9 – 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The data in table above reveals that in experimental group A, the students got scores categorized as Excellent to very good classification were 14 (51.9%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 13 (48.1%), and none of the students got scores categorized as fair to poor and very poor classification.

In experimental group A, the students got scores categorized as excellent to very good classification were 6 (22.2%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 21 (77.8%), the students got scores categorized as and there were no students gained scores categorized as fair to poor and very poor classification.

The mean score and standard deviation of the students’ pre-test and post-test in vocabulary were presented in the following table:

Table 4.9 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest and Posttest in term of Vocabulary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Experimental Group APretest | 15.89 | 27 | 1.219 | .235 |
| Posttest | 17.56 | 27 | .698 | .134 |
| Experimental Group BPretest | 15.33 | 27 | 1.569 | .302 |
| Posttest | 16.63 | 27 | 1.182 | .227 |

The table above explains that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group A was 15.89 and standard deviation was 1.219; and in posttest was 17.56 for the mean score and standard deviation was .698. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group B was 15.33 and standard deviation was 1.569; and in posttest the mean score was 16.63 and standard deviation was 1.182. The mean score of both pretest and posttest were different after the treatment executed. It means that the mean score of posttest is higher than pretest (17.56 > 15.89 and 16.63 > 15.33).

1. The students’ writing score in language use

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ writing score on language use component of both experimental group A and experimental group Bin pre-test can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.10 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Language Use in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 25 – 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good to Average | 21–18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.7 |
| Fair to Poor | 17 – 11 | 27 | 100 | 26 | 96.3 |
| Very Poor | 10 – 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The table above illustrates the result of students’ writing score on language use for both experimental group A and experimental group B. As can be seen in the table that in experimental group A, there were only one category employed by the students. It was Good to average classification reached by all students 27 (100%). There were no students in other classifications.

Data on experimental group B shows that there was 1 (3.7%) student got score in good to average category, fair to poor classification was reached by 26 (96.3%) students, and none of the students got score categorized in excellent to very good and very poor classification.

The following table summarizes the frequency and the percentage of the students’ writing score in term of language use in post-test.

Table 4.11 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Language Use in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 25 – 22 | 7 | 25.9 | 0 | 0 |
| Good to Average | 21–18 | 20 | 74.1 | 16 | 59.3 |
| Fair to Poor | 17 – 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 40.7 |
| Very Poor | 10 – 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The table above illustrates that in experimental group A, the students got score categorized as excellent to very good classification were 7 (25.9%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 20 (74.1%), and none of the students got scores that categorized as fair to poor and very poor classification.

Subsequenty, in experimental group B, there was no students got scores categorized as xcellent to very good classification, the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 16 (59.3%), the students got scores categorized as fair to poor classification were 11(40.7%), and none of students got scores categorized as very poor classification.

The mean score and standard deviation of the students’ pre-test and post-test in language use were presented in the following table:

Table 4.12 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest and Posttest in term of Language Use

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Experimental Group APretest | 14.19 | 27 | 1.642 | .316 |
| Posttest | 20.07 | 27 | 1.492 | .287 |
| Experimental Group BPretest | 14.78 | 27 | 1.783 | .343 |
| Posttest | 17.74 | 27 | 1.583 | .305 |

The table above explains that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group A was 14.19 and standard deviation was 1.642; and in posttest was 20.07 for the mean score and standard deviation was 1.492. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group B was 14.78 and standard deviation was 1.783; and in posttest the mean score was 17.74 and standard deviation was 1.583. The mean score of both pretest and posttest were different after the treatment executed. It means that the mean score of posttest is higher than pretest (20.07> 14.19 and 17.74 > 14.78).

1. The students’ writing score in mechanics

The frequency score and the percentage of the students’ writing score on mechanics component of both experimental group A and experimental group Bin pre-test can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.13 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of mechanics in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 5 | 8 | 29.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Good to Average | 4 | 15 | 55.6 | 20 | 74.1 |
| Fair to Poor | 3 | 4 | 14.8 | 5 | 18.5 |
| Very Poor | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7.4 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The table above presents that the students in experimental group A got score categorized as excellent to very good classification were 8 (29.6%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 15 (55.6%), the students got scores categorized as air to poor classification were 4 (14.8%), and nonw of the students got scores categorized as very poor.

Furthermore, in experimental group B, there was no students got score categorized as excellent to very good classification, the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 20 (74.1%), the students got scores categorized as fair to poor classification were 5 (18.5%), the students got scores categorized as very poor classification were 2 (7.4%).

The following table present the frequency and the percentage of the students’ writing score in term of mechanics in post-test.

Table 4.14 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score in term of Mechanics in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to very Good | 5 | 8 | 29.6 | 2 | 7.4 |
| Good to Average | 4 | 19 | 74.1 | 19 | 70.4 |
| Fair to Poor | 3 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 22.2 |
| Very Poor | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

The table above reveals that in experimental group A, the students gained scores categorized as excellent to very good classification were 8 (29.6%), the students got scores categorized as good to average classification were 19 (74.1%), and none of the students reached scores categorized as fair to poor and very poor classification.

Meanwhile, in experimental group B, the students achieved scores categorized as excellent to very good classification were 2 (7.4%), the students gained scores categorized as good to average classification were 19 (70.4%), the students got scores categorized as fair to poor classification were 7 (22.2%), and there was no students got scores categorized as very poor classification.

The mean score and standard deviation of the students’ pre-test and post-test in language use were presented in the following table:

Table 4.15 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Pretest and Posttest in term of Mechanics

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| Experimental Group APretest | 4.15 | 27 | .662 | .127 |
| Posttest | 4.30 | 27 | .465 | .090 |
| Experimental Group BPretest | 3.67 | 27 | .620 | .119 |
| Posttest | 3.70 | 27 | .609 | .117 |

 The table above describes that the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group A was 4.15 and standard deviation was .662 and in posttest was 4.30 for the mean score and standard deviation was 4.65. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students’ pretest in experimental group B was 3.67 and standard deviation was .620 and in posttest the mean score was 3.70 and standard deviation was .609. The mean score of both pretest and posttest were different after the treatment executed. It means that the mean score of posttest is higher than pretest (4.30>4.15 and 3.70>3.70).

1. Students’ writing score of all writing components in pre-test and post-test

The following table asserts the students’ writing score of all writing components gained by the students in experimental group A and experimental group B on pre-test and post-test.

1. The result of students’ writing score of all writing component in pre-test

The result of pre-test for both experimental group A and experimental group B can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.16 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score of all components in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to Very Good | 100 – 84 | 1 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 |
| Good to Average | 83 – 68 | 26 | 96.3 | 27 | 100 |
| Fair to Poor | 67 – 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 50 – 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

Based on the table above, it found that before having treatment, the students in experimental group A only 1 (3.7%) had scored excellent to very good classification, there were 26 (96.3%) students categorized as good to average classification and none of the students were in fair to poor and very poor classification.

The pre-test result in experimental group B showed that all students 27 (100%) gained score categorized as good to average classification. Therefore none of the students were in other three classification as excellent to very good, faair to poor and very poor.

1. The result of students’ writing score of all writing component in post-test

The following table presents the result of post -test for both experimental group A and experimental group B.

Table 4.17 The Frequency and Percentage of the Students’ Writing Score of all components in Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental group A | Experimental group B |
| F | % | F | % |
| Excellent to Very Good | 100 – 84 | 26 | 96.3 | 13 | 48.1 |
| Good to Average | 83 – 68 | 1 | 3.7 | 14 | 51.9 |
| Fair to Poor | 67 – 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Very Poor | 50 – 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total |  | 27 | 100 | 27 | 100 |

Based on the table above it maintains that, most students in post-test of experimental group A were in excellent to very good category 26 (96.3%), only 1 (3.7%) obtained scores categorized as good to average classification, and none of the students obtained scores categorized as two classification namely fair to poor and very poor classification.

In the post-test of experimental group B, the students gained scores categorized as excellent to very good classification were 13 (48.1%), the students had scores categorized as good to average classification were 14 (51.9%), and none of the students obtained scores categorized as very good, or very poor classification.

The mean score and standard deviation of students’ writing improvement in pre-test and post-test for experimental group A and experimental group B are presented in the following table:

Table 4.18 The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students’ Writing Achievement in Pretest and Posttest

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Group | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Pretest | Experimental Group A | 78.11 | 3.816 |
| Experimental Group B | 79.07 | 4.150 |
| Posttest | Experimental Group A | 89.63 | 3.307 |
| Experimental Group B | 82.74 | 4.545 |

The table above shows the mean score and standard deviation of both experimental group A and experimental group B in the pre-test and post-test. The mean score of experimental group A in the pre-test was 78.11 with standard deviation 3.816, while the mean score of experimental group B was 79.07 with standard deviation 4.150. The result of data analysis from the table above confirms that the mean score of both groups was almost the same before having treatment. Based on the scoring classification of writing those scores were in good to average classification. Meanwhile the mean score of the students’ post-test of experimental group A after the treatment was 89.63 with the standard deviation was 3.307, and it classified in excellent to very good classification. Whereas the mean score of the students’ post-test of experimental group B was 82.74 with the standard deviation was 4.545 and classified in good to average category. The table above also shows that the mean score of experimental group A is higher than experimental group B (89.63> 82.74).

1. Inferential analysis on pre-test and post-test

The following table shows the inferential analysis in pre-test between experimental group A and experimental group B

Table 4.19 Inferential Analysis Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Pre-test

| **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 |
| Writingpretest | Equal variances assumed | .060 | .807 | -.887 | 52 | .379 | -.963 | 1.085 | -3.140 | 1.214 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -.887 | 51.638 | .379 | -.963 | 1.085 | -3.141 | 1.215 |

The table above shows that the t-value was -0.887 with degree of freedom 52 and P-value was 0.379. From the degree of freedom we know that the t-table was 1.706. According to the hypothesis testing criteria, H0 is accepted if the t-value < t-table and P-value > α (0.05) and H1 is accepted if the t-value > t-table and P-value < α (0.05). Based on the data above H0 was accepted in pretest because t-value (-0.887) <t-table (1.706) and P-value (0.379) > α (0.05). In other word, there is no significant different between the students’ mean score between experimental group A and experimental group B.

The following table, the researcher presents the inferential analysis between experimental group A and experimental group B in Post-test

Table 4.20 Inferential Analysis Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B in Post-test

| **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 |
| writingpost | Equal variances assumed | .316 | .577 | 6.368 | 52 | .000 | 6.889 | 1.082 | 4.718 | 9.060 |
| Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 6.368 | 47.499 | .000 | 6.889 | 1.082 | 4.713 | 9.065 |

The table 4.20 above shows that the t-value was 6.368 with degree of freedom 52 and P-value was 0.000. From the degree of freedom we can know that the t-table was 1.706. Based on the data above H1 was accepted in post-test because t-value (6.368) > t-table (1.706) and P-value (0.00) < α (0.05). In other word, there is asignificant different between the students’ mean score between experimental group A and experimental group B.

1. Descriptive statistics on number of errors for direct and indirect group

In order to see the effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on different error types from an initial draft to a subsequent writing task, the researcher presents descriptive statisctics of 15 errors types made by students on their written work.

The following table presents the mean number of errors committed by the direct feedback group or experimental group A.

Table 4.21 Mean Number of Errors Committed by the Experimental Group A

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Error Type | Draft I | Draft II | Draft III | Draft IV | Draft V | Draft VI |
| S-V AgreementAdverbArticleSentence StructureTensePlural/Singular PrepositionPunctuationSpellingVerb FormWrong WordWord OrderCapitalizationPronounMissing Word | .04.04.19.152.26.22.11.26.632.44.52.41.33.30.19 | .07.00.04.302.07.11.22.22.441.85.56.11.11.15.22 | .07.04.04.441.37.22.33.26.371.59.44.37.15.07.33 | .07.11.00.371.56.07.11.22.371.78.44.15.11.11.15 | .07.07.11.301.30.04.15.19.371.78.56.30.11.07.11 | .04.00.04.261.44.11.19.19.481.07.67.26.11.11.15 |
| Total | 8.07 | 6.48 | 6.11 | 5.63 | 5.52 | 5.11 |

As can be seen in Table 4.21, for most of the error types committed by the direct feedback group or experimental group A, there is a steady decrease within the treatment. While number of errors increased for some of the error types during the treatment (as in sentence structure .30, .44, .37, .30, and .26, wrong word, .52, .56, .44, .44, .56, and .67, and preposition .11, .22, .33, .11, .15, and .19), the final result shows that by the last of the six topics there is a decrease for 11 error types which includes adverb (from .04 to .00), article (from .19 to .04), tense (from 2.26 to .84), plural/singular (from .22 to .11), punctuation (from .26 to .19), spelling (from .63 to .48), verb form (from .2.44 to 1.07), word order (from .41 to .26), capitalization (from .33 to .11), pronoun (from .30 to .11), and missing word (from .19 to .15). The total number of errors regardless of the error type also reveals that there was a steady decrease within the six topics(draft I: 8.07, draft II: 6.48, drfaft III: 6.11, draft IV: 5.63, draft V: 5.52 and draft VI: 5.11).

The following table presents the mean number of errors committed by the direct feedback group or experimental group A.

Table 4.22 Mean Number of Errors Committed by the Experimental Group B

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Error Type | Topic I | Topic II | Topic III | Topic IV | Topic V | Topic VI |
| S-V AgreementAdverbArticleSentence StructureTensePlural/Singular PrepositionPunctuationSpellingVerb FormWrong WordWord OrderCapitalizationPronounMissing Word | .00.11.071.002.78.07.07.15.263.07.48.41.19.19.30 | .00.00.11.852.19.11.19.15.192.52.74.33.15.26.33 | .04.00.11.561.85.15.07.00.302.33.48.37.07.11.37 | .04.07.07.521.52.11.33.07.301.89.44.33.22.19.07 | .11.15.00.481.74.04.22.07.191.96.48.11.15.19.07 | .07.07.00.191.44.07.11.07.151.96.48.15.04.07.15 |
| Total | 9.37 | 8.11 | 6.81 | 6.22 | 5.74 | 4.93 |

Based on the table above out of 15 types of errors , 11 types, including adverb (from .11 to .07, article (from .07 to .00), sentence structure (from 1.00 to .19), tense (from 2.78 to 1.44), puntuation (from .15 to .07), spelling (from .26 to .15), verb form (from 3.07 to 1.96), word order (from .41 to .15), capitalization (from .19 to 04), pronoun (from .19 to .07) and missing word (from .30 to .15) had a steady descrease in the number of errors within the six topics given (draft I: 9.37, draft II: 8.11, draft III: 6.81, draft IV: 6.22, draft V: 5.74 and draft VI: 4.93).

The following table presents the overall comparison between the direct and indirect coded feedback in the form of mean of each error type for the whole six topics given.

Table 4.23 Overall Comparison of Direct and Indirect Coded Feedback Groups

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Error Type | Group A | Group B |
| S-V AgreementAdverbArticleSentence StructureTensePlural/Singular PrepositionPunctuationSpellingVerb FormWrong WordWord OrderCapitalizationPronounMissing Word | 1.671.171.838.1745.003.505.006.0012.0047.3314.337.174.173.675.17 | 1.171.502.1716.1750.672.005.171.836.6762.5014.337.833.174.176.00 |
| Total | 11.08 | 12.36 |

 Based on the table above, the experimental group A who got direct corrective feedback and experimental group B who got indirect coded feedback had slightly different in number of errors. The direct corrective feedback group had fewer errors than the indirect error feedback group. For example the direct feedback group had fewer errors for 8 error types; adverb, article, sentence structure, tense, verb form, word order, pronoun and missing word.

 The total number of error for both groups shows that direct corrective feedback group perform slightly better than indirect feedback group. The direct corrective group had an average 11.08 errors while the indirect coded feedback group had an average 12.36 errors.

 The mean number of errors on six topics committed by experimental group A and experimental group B can be described in the following figure:

Figure 4.1 The Mean Number of Errors on Six Topics Committed by Experimental Group A and Experimental Group B

Figure 4.1 shows that for both groups, there was a gradual decrease on number of errors from the first topic to the sixth topic. The figure above also describes that from the sixs topic given, group A produced fewer errors in topic 1 to topic 5. Meanwhile group B produced fewer errors than group A in topic 6.

An independent *t*-test was used to see the different number of errors within the six topics given as the following table:

Table 4.24 The Result of Independent Samples t-test on Group Comparison within the Six Topics

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Writing | Group | Mean | SD | t-value | Sig |
| IIIIIIIVVVI | Grup AGrup BGrup AGrup BGrup AGrup BGrup AGrup BGrup AGrup BGrup AGrup B | 8.079.376.488.116.116.815.636.225.525.745.114.93 | 3.2922.1692.1372.7502.0061.7551.8842.3752.3591.5591.5531.412 | -1,708-2,431-1,372-1,016-0,4080,458 | 0,940,190,1760,3140,6850,649 |

As can be seen in the table, for both groups the average number of errors decreased within the six draft. However the average number of error is mostly smaller for the direct feedback group compared to the indirect coded feedback. While the t-test result was not significant.

1. Discussion

The discussion section reports the interpretation of the findings about students’ writing improvement resulted from writing test. This section also describes the result the error ratio among six topics of students’ writing.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the effects of direct and coded indirect feedback on students’ writing. This research is also intended to find out the possible effects of those two kinds of feedback in decreasing the number of students’ errors on subsequent draft. This study is also aimed to delve the most frequent errors on students’ writing.

1. Students’ writing improvement

Relating to the findings on students’ writing improvement in the previous section maintained that after the treatment the result of post-test for both experimental group A and experimental group B shows an improvement. The mean score gained by experimental group A has improved from 78.11 in pre-test to 89.63 in posts-test. Meanwhile the means score of experimental group B in pre-test was 79.07 becoming 82.74 in post-test. This data maintained that both experimental group A and experimental group B had an improvement after having corrective feedback on students’ writing. The post-test result shows that the experimental group A got higher mean score than experimental group B 89.63> 82.74. These figures claim that students in experimental group A who had direct corrective feedback performed slightly better than students in experimental group B who had indirect coded feedback.

As stated in the previous section that the students’ writing was analyzed using five component of writing by Jacobs et al (1981). The mean score gained by both groups are content (28,27), organization (17,16), vocabulary (17,09), language use (18,94) and mechanics (4,06). Out of these components, content got the highest score. In the component of content the students have already had the idea to write since the assigned topic was very knowledgeable for students and relevant to their own experience. Their sentence already has express supporting idea that related to the topic sentence

The next high score was in the component of organization. The given topics about students’ personal experience seems to help them in arrange their idea logically sequenced stages. Therefore supporting students to order their thoughts chronologically and develop circumstances will assist them to produce recount texts. Moreover Dewsbury ( 2008) describes the text organization of recounts that recounts generally begin with a *setting* or *orientation* that includes background information to assist the reader’s understanding of the recount. There are usually details about Who? When? Where? Why?

Then, the students’ writing component was vocabulary. Eventhough in this component the students have already used sophisticated range of vocabulary but still have limitation in the use of word choice and effectvie words.

Language use component had the lowest score since it needs the students to use certain kinds of tenses to describe the idea and their activities in the past. The students found difficulties in using the correct verb form and tense. The students also had few errors on word order, articles, pronouns and preposition.

The last components was mechanics. This component deals with the use of capitalization, punctuation and spelling appropriately. This aspect is very important since it leads readers to understand or recognize immediately what the writer means to express definitely. The use of favorable mechanics in writing will make readers easy to understand the conveying ideas or the messages stated in the writing.

1. Number and types of error

Referring to the use corrective feedback in this experimental study it can be said that the students performed better in revising their draft when they have direct corrective feedback. The researcher assumed that direct corrrection was indicated by the students as the easiest way to revise their writing since the correct forms were already provided. In line with the feedback Chandler (2003) claimed that the indirect approach might fail because indirect corrective feedback provides learners with insufficient information to resolve the errors . She furthermore argued that, whereas direct corrective feedback enables learners to instantly internalize the correct form as provided by their teacher, learners whose errors are corrected indirectly do not know if their own hypothesized corrections are already accurate. Supporting to the use of direct corrective feedback, Bitchener and Knock (2008) explained that those more in favour of direct feedback suggest that it is more helpful to students because it (1) reduces the type of confusion that they may experience when they fail to understand or remember, for example, the meaning of error codes used by teachers, (2) provides them with sufficient information to resolve more complex errors in, for example, syntactic structure and idiomatic usage, and (3) offers more immediate feedback on hypotheses that may have been made.