PESHUM : Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial dan Humaniora
Vol.5, No.6, Oktober 2026

The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing Skill at Tenth Grade of SMA Hidayatul Mubtadiin Sungai Ambawang

Farhan
Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia
E-mail : F2201221021@student.untan.ac.id

Article History:
Received: 25 Juni 2026
Revised: 21 September 2026
Accepted: 07 Oktober 2026

Keywords: *Indirect Corrective Feedback, Direct Corrective Feedback, Writing Skill.*

Abstract: *The aim of this article is to investigate the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students' writing skill at tenth grade of SMA Hidayatul Mubtadiin. The researcher used two classes as the sample. They were class X IPA and class X IPS that consist of 21 students in each class. Then the researcher divided them into two groups by using small paper. Class X IPA as experiment group taught by using indirect corrective feedback and class X IPS as control group taught using direct corrective feedback. The researcher applied quasi experimental research design. To collect the data, pre - test and post - test was used as the instrument. Then it was analysis through independent T test by using SPSS program. The findings of the study showed that there is significant difference score between students taught using indirect corrective feedback and students taught using direct corrective feedback.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the ways to deliver our thoughts to other people and it is the most crucial skill that should be mastered by the students in the process of learning foreign language. Rahayu (2014) claimed several points related to important of writing for students. First, it can be used to develop their intelligence and knowledge. Second, writing is an alternative way to communicate with other people. Third, it can be used to state idea, feeling, and emotion of the students. In addition, Huy (2015) claimed that writing is a skill which is not only helpful in writing to English but it is also useful to improve other skill. It means that writing also can be used by the students to increase the ability of speaking, reading or listening.

Unfortunately, writing is very difficult skill to learn. Hussaien et al. (2013) stated that writing is a complex skill because it is consisting with many interconnecting factors including mental effort, awareness and continuous practice on composing and developing the text. In addition, it also includes many aspects such as word arrangement in a sentence; organization of the idea in a paragraph, grammatical error and etc.

The other problem why writing is difficult to be mastered by the students is because of motivation of the students. Usually, students do not have any motivation to write. It is related to some factors: they feel bored with the teacher's style in teaching process, they confused to make

a text and they did not get any comments or feedback on their writing text. As the result, they are difficult to correct their errors and mistakes. In fact, feedback is the most important part in learning process. As stated by Sricahnyon (2012) "feedback is an essential component of any English language writing course".

By giving feedback to the student, they know which part of their text are errors, so they can revise and make it better in the next time. They can also able to minimize the mistake that usually made. So, their ability on writing text will be increase. In addition, giving feedback to the students also will give an impact on their confidence and motivation. It is really helpful for the students to improve their text.

Therefore, in this study, the researcher offered direct and indirect corrective feedback as the techniques to be used by the teacher to solve the problem. Direct corrective feedback is a technique that errors made by the students are corrected by the teacher. Lalande (1982) stated that direct corrective feedback is a process of giving feedback by providing the correct form on the errors and mistakes. Ferris (2006) claimed that it is a technique of giving the correct linguistic form to help the students in correcting their errors.

For example:

ate

- Jack eat banana yesterday.

The right sentence is Jack ate banana yesterday. By using direct corrective feedback, teacher directly gives the correct word on the wrong sentence "eat". So, the students only changed based on the feedback given by the researcher.

On the other hand, indirect corrective feedback is a technique of giving feedback through the code and symbol on student's errors and mistakes. Lee (2004) stated that indirect corrective feedback is a condition in which the learners identify and correct their error by themselves. In addition, Ellis (2009) stated indirect corrective feedback showing the errors without giving the way how to correct it. In this process, the students have to think what the error and how to change it.

For example:

SP

- I live in an apartement

The right sentence is I live in an apartment. By using indirect corrective feedback, teacher only needs to write the word SP upper the wrong sentence. It is indicated that the wrong sentence is the spelling.

Sayadmahaleh and Sayyad (2013) stated that "direct corrective feedback is effective since it provides learners with clear guidance about how to correct their errors". On the other hand, Sheen (2007) found that direct corrective feedback is useful to promote some specific grammatical aspect. In this case, it was really helpful for the students who couldn't correct the error by themselves or it was appropriate for low level students because it provide the students with clearly guidance on how to correct the text. Besides, Lalande (1982) stated that "indirect feedback is indeed more effective in enabling students to correct their errors". Ferris (1995) claimed that it is useful for the students since they have to participate in the process of correcting

their text. It is indicated that the students are train to analyze their own mistake. It will make them able to correct the mistake in the future. Therefore, the researcher used two kinds of this technique as alternative ways to solve the students' problem in writing class.

There are some previous studies investigating the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback. The results of their studies are debatable. Aridah (2016) found that indirect corrective feedback has better performance than direct corrective feedback. On the other hand, Septiana (2011) found that direct corrective feedback was effective for ninth grade students at public junior high school 5 Malang than indirect corrective feedback. The result of those studies indicated that direct and indirect corrective was effective to be implemented in writing process. In some cases, direct corrective feedback performance was better than indirect, but in other cases indirect corrective feedback was better than direct corrective feedback.

Therefore, the researcher is interested to conduct the similar study. In this case, the researcher wants to know which technique is effective to be implemented in writing process. However, the researcher used difference sample and type of the writing text with the previous studies. In this study, the researcher chose senior high school students as the sample and recount text as the writing text.

METHOD

The research design which was applied in this study was experimental research design. It was used because the researcher aimed is to investigated the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students writing skill. By using experimental design, the researcher can identify which technique is effective to be implemented in writing process. However, there are many types of experimental design such as pre-experiment, quasi and true experiment. In this study, the researcher focused on quasi experimental design. The researcher chose this design because the students had their own schedule in the school. So, they could not be randomized by the researcher. Therefore, the researcher thinks that quasi experimental design is suitable to be implemented in this study.

Participant

This research was conducted at SMA Hidayatul Mubtadiin Sungai Ambawang. In this case, the researcher chose tenth grade students of SMA Hidayatul Mubtadiin Sungai Ambawang as the population. Then, the researcher chose two classes that provide by the teacher as the sample. They were class X IPA and X IPS that consist of 21 students in each class. After that, the researcher divided them into two groups using small paper. Class X IPS, as experimental group was treated by using indirect corrective feedback. On the other hand, class X IPS, as the control group was treated by using direct corrective feedback.

Instrument

The instrument used by the researcher is test. In this case, the test is in form of pre – test and post – test. Pre – test was given before the students were taught by using direct and indirect corrective feedback. It was to investigate the ability of the students which was similar or not. On the other hand, post – test was given to the students after they taught using direct and indirect corrective feedback. The function of post - test was proving technique which was effective to be

implemented in writing process.

To collect the data, the researcher conducted four meeting in experiment and control group. Each meeting consisted of ninety minutes. In the first meeting, the researcher conducted pre - test. In this meeting, the researcher asked the students to write a recount text based on the topic that is given by the researcher. In the second meeting, the researcher asked the students to write a recount text. In this case, the researcher asked the students to write two recount text and one home work based on the topic given by the researcher.

In the third meeting, the researcher applied the techniques. Indirect corrective feedback for experiment group and direct corrective feedback applied in the control group. The material used in this meeting is the text that had been written by the students in second meeting. In this case, the researcher had been provided the feedback for the students on their writing text. So, the researcher asked them to revise the text based on the feedback given by the researcher. In the last meeting, the researcher conducted post - test. The test was also similar with the pre - test. The researcher asked the students to write a recount text based on the topic given.

After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed the data to investigate the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students writing skill. The score from pre – test and post – test was calculated and analyzed using independent T test formula in statistical analysis through SPSS program. The result of analyzes was used to determine which hypothesis was accepted and rejected.

FINDINGS

To find out the result of the study, the researcher analyzes the data by computing the scores of pre - test and post – test between two groups. In this case, the researcher used independent T test formula. The result could be seen as follows:

Table 1.1: The result of independent T – test of 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
Nilai	Equal variances assumed	.898	.349	1.546	40	.130	2.286	1.479	-.703	5.274
	Equal variances not assumed			1.546	37.282	.131	2.286	1.479	-.710	5.281

Table 1.1 showed that there is no significant difference between experiment and control group. The researcher found that significance value of pre - test is 0.130. In this case, the result showed that significant value is higher than level of significance 0.05 (0.130 > 0.05). Therefore, Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. It is indicated that indirect and direct corrective feedback

group are equal or have similar ability in pre - test.

After investigating the score of pre - test, the researcher then investigated the result of post – test. It is used to identify whether there is significant difference between students who were taught using indirect corrective feedback and students who were taught using direct corrective feedback or not. The analysis was also using independent T test formula through SPSS program. The result was explained on table 1.2 below:

Table 1.2: The result of independent T – test of 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
Nilai	Equal variances assumed	4.731	.036	2.522	40	.016	4.667	1.851	.926	8.407
	Equal variances not assumed			2.522	36.691	.016	4.667	1.851	.916	8.418

Table 4.4 indicated that significant value of post - test is 0.016. Here, significant value of independent t test lower than level of significance 0.05 (0.016<0.05). Therefore, Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. It is indicated that there was significant difference between students taught by using direct corrective feedback and students taught using indirect corrective feedback. In other word, it could be stated that indirect corrective was more effective than direct corrective feedback in improving students writing ability in recount text.

DISCUSSION

Based on the result of data analysis using SPSS program, it was found that there is significance difference between students who were taught using direct corrective feedback and students who were taught using indirect corrective feedback. In this case, the result showed that indirect corrective feedback performed better than direct corrective feedback.

The results of this research supported the previous study conducted by Aridah (2016) and Rahmawatih (2017) in which they found that indirect corrective feedback effective than indirect corrective feedback in writing process. On the other hand, it contrasts with the result of Septiana (2011) who found that direct corrective feedback was effective than indirect corrective feedback.

The indicator of indirect corrective feedback outperformed more than direct corrective could be seen from the score of pre - test and post - test. In this case, the students who were taught using indirect corrective feedback had some improvement on their post - test score after getting some treatments of indirect corrective feedback. In addition, it could also be seen from the writing accuracy of the students. In the pre - test, many students made mistakes and errors on their writing text. For example, they were using incorrect verb tense in which they had to write in past tense form, but they wrote it on simple present tense. But after implementing indirect

corrective feedback, the students had some improvement. The mistakes and error was not as many as at the pre - test.

By using this technique, the researcher also found that indirect corrective feedback supported the students in revising mistakes and errors. It is because the students were given a chance to explore their idea. It made them active during the learning process. If they didn't understand the meaning of symbols that was provided by the researcher, they actively asked the researcher or their friend about the mistake. It was significantly helpful for the students to improve their writing.

Finally, indirect corrective feedback motivated the students to write. During this study, most of the students were active and gave their attention on the treatment which was provided by the researcher. They also motivated to decrease the correction or the sign on their writing that was given by the researcher.

It was different with the condition of the control class taught using direct corrective feedback. Although some students had made some improvement, it did not significantly affect their writing ability because direct corrective feedback did not increase the students' knowledge and awareness of the error. They were easily forgetting what the mistakes of their text. So, when the teacher asked them to write recount text, they still did the same mistakes. It could be stated that the teacher solved the problem for the learners and the learners were under no compulsion to produce "pushed output".

Other factors why it was not effective related to the interest of the students. In direct corrective feedback, the student did not have any motivation to write and revise the recount text. They felt bored with the method which was applied by the teacher. Many of them were getting frustrated when they were asked to write. It made their writing was not maximal. Most of them were also passive during the learning process. As a consequence, their writing score was low.

CONCLUSION

The aimed of this study is to investigated whether there was a significant difference on writing ability between students at the tenth-grade students of SMA Hidayatul Mubtadiin Sungai Ambawang who were taught by using indirect feedback and who were taught by using direct feedback. According to the result and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher concluded that indirect corrective feedback was an effective strategy to be implemented in writing process, especially in case of teaching recount text which was founded by the researcher. In this case, indirect corrective was not only able to build the knowledge of the students, but it also gave the students such kind of awareness of error and mistake.

In addition, the researcher found that indirect corrective feedback was more interesting to be implemented in the class rather than direct corrective feedback. Through indirect corrective feedback, students felt enjoy, enthusiastic and focus with the treatment which was provided by the researcher. It made them active during the learning process. The last, indirect corrective feedback motivated the students to write and revise their text. It gave such as energy for the students to revise their mistake and error. It was also challenge them to identify what the mistake and error of their text and how to revise it.

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher provided some suggestions for English teacher and future researcher as follows;

First, the researcher suggests the English teacher implement indirect corrective feedback on writing process because it has significant impact on the writing achievement of the students as founded by researcher in this study. It was also challenging to be implemented in the class, especially on writing process.

Second, the researcher suggested that the future researchers who want to conduct similar study related to direct and indirect corrective feedback implement this technique to students in second grade of education. It is also possible to considering another variable such as motivation and learning style of the students. The researcher also suggests assessing the content and organization of student's writing because in this study the researcher focused on vocabulary, grammar and mechanics only.

REFERENCES

Aridah. 2016. The Effectiveness of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in EFL Writing Performance. *International seminar on English Language and teaching*. 4

Ellis, R. 2009. A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *English Language Teaching Journal*. 63

Ferris, D. R. 1995. Can Advance ESL Students Become Effective Self-Editor?. *The CATESOL Journal*, 8 (1): 41-62.

Ferris, D. R. 2006. '*Does Error Feedback Helps Student Writers? New Evidence on The Short and Long-Term Effects of Written Error Correction' in K. Hyland and F. Hyland (eds)*. Perspectives on Response: Cambridge University Press.

Hussain, Z. et.al. 2013. An Error Analysis of L2 Writing at Higher Secondary Level Unmultan, Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*; 4 (11)

Huy, N. T. 2015. Problem Affecting Learning Writing Skill of Grade 11 at Thong Linh High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*; 3(2). Pp 53 – 69

Lalande, J. F. 1982. Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *Modern Language Journal*: 66 (2): 140-149.

Lee, I. 2004. How do Hongkong English Teachers Correct Errors in Writing? *Educational Journal*, 31 (1): 153 -169

Rahayu, M. K. 2014. Teaching Narrative Text by Using Combining Number heads and Placement Strategies for VIII Grade Junior High School. http://download.portalgaruda.org/article.php?article

Rahmawati, S. M. 2017. Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on EFL Students Writing Skill: A Case Study in a Junior High School in Bandung, *Journal of English and Education*: 5 (1): 64 -71

Sayadmahaleh. M. M & Sayad. F.S. 2013. The Effect of Direct Corrective Feedback on Iranian Intermidiated EFL Learners' Writing Proficiency. *Asian Journal of Social Science & Humanities:* 2 (4). Pp. 164 – 173

Septiana, A. R. 2011. The Effect of the Use of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Ninth Grade Students' Writing at Public Junior High School 5 Malang. *Skripsi*. State University of Malang

Sheen, Y. 2007. The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learner's Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41 (2): 255 -283

Sricahnyachon, N. 2012. Teacher Written Feedback for L2 Learners' Writing Development. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts*, 12 (1): 7 -17