

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the researcher presents the findings and the discussion of the study. Four main topics which being discussed in this part are the result of descriptive statistics analysis, the result of Inferential statistics analysis, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

A. The Result of Descriptive Statistics Analysis

In this sub chapter, the researcher presents the descriptive statistics of the research such as mean score, standard deviation, frequencies scores, and so on. The result of students' writing recount text in term of pre-test and post-test, then those were calculated by using writing scoring rubric.

1. The Result of Descriptive Data Analysis of Pre-Test

After conducting pre-test, the researcher obtained the data. The data of students' scores were as follows:

Table 4.1 Students' scores of pre-test

No.	Students' Name	Score of Pre-Test
1.	A.R.A	21,5
2.	A.R. D.S	23
3.	F.A	31
4.	F.N.A.H	29,5
5.	H.H.	25
6.	I. S. A.	27,5
7.	I.S.W	25
8.	K.L	26, 5
9.	M.N.M	25
10.	M.R.O	17,5
11.	M.F. A	21,5
12.	N.A.R	29,5
13.	N.S	25

14.	N.I.S	28
15.	P.A.W	25
16.	R.R.M	29,5
17.	R.V	25
18.	S.H. R	27,5
19.	S.M.P	16
20.	S.N.H	27,5
21.	S.Q.N	22
22.	S.N. A.P	21,5
23.	S.D.R	21,5
24.	S.Z.R	22
25.	T.P	19,5
26.	T. S	25

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistics and the percentage of students' scores of pre-test. The percentage was divided into five criteria include excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. Moreover, the result of students' scores pre-test's computation was as follows:

Table 4.2 The descriptive statistics of pre-test

Statistics		
Pre-test		
N	Valid	26
	Missing	0
Mean		24.519
Median		25.000
Mode		25.0
Std. Deviation		3.7907
Minimum		16.0
Maximum		31.0

According to the table 4.2, it showed that the mean was 24.519, the median was 25.000, the mode was 25, the standard deviation was 3,7907, the minimum score of pre-test was 16, and the maximum score was 31.

Table 4.3 The frequency of pre-test

		Pre-test			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	16	1	3.8	3.8	3.8
	17.5	1	3.8	3.8	7.7
	19.5	1	3.8	3.8	11.5
	21.5	4	15.4	15.4	26.9
	22	2	7.7	7.7	34.6
	23	1	3.8	3.8	38.5
	25	7	26.9	26.9	65.4
	26.5	1	3.8	3.8	69.2
	27.5	3	11.5	11.5	80.8
	28	1	3.8	3.8	84.6
	29.5	3	11.5	11.5	96.2
	31	1	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	26	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.3 showed the numbers that described about the division and percentages of frequency distribution. The frequency of pre-test after being distributed were showed based on the score's criteria. Then, the data from the table could be elaborated as follows:

1. There was no student who got score between 10-15,5. It meant that there was no very poor score in students' pre-test
2. There were 7 students who got score between 16-21,5 which meant that their scores in writing recount text were poor.
3. There were 14 students who got score between 22-27,5 which meant that the students' scores were average.
4. There were 5 students who got score between 28-33,5, which meant that the students' scores were good.

5. There was no student who got score between 34-40. It meant that there was no excellent score in students' pre-test

2. The Result of Descriptive Data Analysis of Post-test

After conducting post-test, the researcher obtained the data of students' scores.

The data were as follows:

Table 4.4 Students' scores of post-test

No.	Students' Name	Score of Post-Test
1.	A.R.A	26
2.	A.R. D.S	25
3.	F.A	36,5
4.	F.N.A.H	35
5.	H.H.	28
6.	I. S. A.	32,5
7.	I.S.W	28
8.	K.L	28
9.	M.N.M	26,5
10.	M.R.O	24
11.	M.F. A	24
12.	N.A.R	31
13.	N.S	29
14.	N.I.S	32,5
15.	P.A.W	35
16.	R.R.M	32,5
17.	R.V	31
18.	S.H. R	32,5
19.	S.M.P	25
20.	S.N.H	29,5
21.	S.Q.N	25
22.	S.N. A.P	25
23.	S.D.R	26,5
24.	S.Z.R	22,5
25.	T.P	26,5
26.	T. S	32

The researcher used SPSS 16.0 version to know the descriptive statistics and the percentage of students' scores of post-test. The percentage was divided into five

criteria include excellent, good, average, poor, and very poor. Moreover, the result of students' scores post-test's computation was as follows:

Table 4.5 The descriptive statistics of post-test

Statistics		
Post-test		
N	Valid	26
	Missing	0
Mean		28.635
Median		28.000
Mode		25.0 ^a
Std. Deviation		3.8303
Minimum		22.5
Maximum		36.5

According to the table 4.5, it showed that the mean was 28.636, the median was 28.000, the mode was 25.0, the standard deviation was 3.8303, the minimum score of post-test was 22.5, and the maximum score of post-test was 36.5.

Table 4.6 The frequency of post-test

Post-test					
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	22.5	1	3.8	3.8	3.8
	24	2	7.7	7.7	11.5
	25	4	15.4	15.4	26.9
	26	1	3.8	3.8	30.8
	26.5	3	11.5	11.5	42.3
	28	4	15.4	15.4	57.7
	29	1	3.8	3.8	61.5
	29.5	1	3.8	3.8	65.4
	31	2	7.7	7.7	73.1
	32	1	3.8	3.8	76.9
	32.5	3	11.5	11.5	88.5
	35	2	7.7	7.7	96.2
	36.5	1	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total		26	100.0	100.0

The table 4.6 showed the numbers that described the categorizing based on frequency distribution by considering on qualification of the scoring rubric. Moreover, the data from the table could be interpreted as follows:

1. There was no student who got score between 10-15,5. It meant that there was no very poor score in students' post-test
2. There was no student who got score between 16-21,5. It meant that there was no poor score in students' post-test
3. There were 11 students who got score between 22-27,5 which meant that the students' scores were average.
4. There were 12 students who got score between 28-33,5, which meant that the students' scores were good.
5. There was 3 student who got score between 34-40, which meant that the students' scores were excellent.

B. The Result of Inferential Statistics Analysis

In this subchapter, the researcher presents the results of data analysis which are covering normality testing and t-Test.

1. Normality Testing Result

Normality testing is measured in knowing whether the data had normally distributed or not. If the data were normal, it could be considered to represent the population as the prerequisite of using t-test as the technique of hypothesis testing. In this study, the researcher computed the scores of pre-test and post-test by using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in SPSS 16.0 by significant level 0.05. Then, the result of normality testing in this study can be seen as in the table 4.7.

Table 4.7. The result of normality testing

		Pretest	Posttest
N		26	26
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	24.519	28.635
	Std. Deviation	3.7907	3.8303
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.166	.143
	Positive	.103	.143
	Negative	-.166	-.079
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.846	.728
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.472	.665

a. Test distribution is Normal.

According to the result of normality testing, it showed that the value of Asymp. Sig (2-tailed) in pre-test was 0.472 and post-test was 0.665. It was higher than $\alpha = 0.05$. So, it can be interpreted that all of those data had normal distribution

2. The Result of t-Test Analysis

This study is conducted to know whether there is significant difference score of 10th grade students at MA Darul Hikmah Tawang Sari Tulungagung in academic year 2019/2020 on writing recount text before and after being taught by using Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback. Because of the data of this study were normally distributed, it was appropriate to be analysed by using t-Test or parametric test. Moreover, the kind of t-test used by the researcher was Paired-Sample-Test because this study just involved one group of pre-test and post-test that was called as dependent or correlated sample. It meant that there were two data in each individual result of test. Hence, in this case Paired Sample t-Test was appropriate to be used in analyzing the data. The result could be seen in the tables as follows:

Table 4.8 The result of paired sample statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	24.519	26	3.7907	.7434
	Posttest	28.635	26	3.8303	.7512

Referring to the table 4.8, the mean score of pre-test was 24.519, while the mean score of post-test was 28.635. Based on the result, it could be seen that the mean scores between pre-test and post-test was different. The mean score of post-test was higher than the mean score of pre-test.

Table 4.9 The result of paired sample test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pretest - Posttest	-4.1154	2.4054	.4717	-5.0870	-3.1438	-8.724	25	.000

Based on the table 4.9, the t count was -8.724, with the df =25, the p-value (two-tailed) was 0.000. Given that the current test was one-tailed test, so the p-value 0.000 must be divided by 2 equals to 0. Since 0 is smaller than the $\alpha = 0.05$, it was significance different score on students' writing quality of recount text before and after being taught by Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback. Automatically, the mean after treatment was greater or bigger than the mean before treatment. The conclusion was the use of Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was effective for teaching writing of recount text in Senior High School.

C. Hypotesis Testing

From the previous data analysis, it could be identified that:

1. If $P\text{-value} \leq a$ (0.05), the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the alternative (H_a) is accepted. It means that the use of Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback is effective for teaching writing recount text at Senior High School.
2. If $P\text{value} > a$ (0.05), the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted and the alternative (H_a) is rejected. It means that the use of Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback is not effective for teaching writing recount text at Senior High School.

Based on the table 4.10, the P-value of this research was 0.000 and the significance level was 0.050. It meant that the significance value was smaller than significant level ($0.000 < 0.050$). The interpretation could be concluded that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. According to the evidence, it can answer the research question that there is significant difference score on students' writing quality of recount text before and after being taught by Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback of 10th grade students at MA Darul Hikmah Tawang Sari Tulungagung.

D. Discussion

In this last part of the chapter, the researcher would fully review the result of this study dealing with the finding of hypothesis testing. To know the result of this study, the researcher computed both of the tests into SPSS 16.0 version software. The result of computation between pre-test and post-test showed that the students' score in writing recount text was poor. It was proven when they were

taught before using written coded indirect corrective feedback. From the research findings, the students' score before being taught by using Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was poorer than students' score of post-test. It was proven by the calculation of the mean score on pre-test 24.519 and the mean score on post-test 28.635. In addition, the students' score of post-test was higher than students' score of pre-test. So, the researcher concluded that Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was very useful to make students more understand in writing recount text.

As the requirement of hypothesis, if the *p-value* was smaller than or equal to the α (0.05), it meant that the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. It could be said that the students' writing quality of recount text after being taught by using Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was greater than their writing quality in writing recount text before being taught by using Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback. In fact, based on the table of Paired- Sample-Test, the result showed that the number of the significant value was $0.000/2$ equals to 0 and it was smaller than the $\alpha = 0.05$. It meant that there was significant difference score before and after being taught by using Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback.

The finding of this study stated that Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was considered effective to improve students' writing quality of recount text. It could be seen in treatment process that the students were more interested when the teacher applied Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback. The teacher could be as helpful facilitator who were offering support and guidance for students.

Teacher could offer self-correction opportunity for their students by providing feedback on students' grammatical errors (Chandler, 2003).

Basically, the findings of this study supported the result of the existing previous studies. It matched with the findings of a study conducted by Farjadnasab and Khodashenas (2017) under the title "The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Writing Accuracy" that has been published in International Journal of Research in English Education. The study investigated the effect of Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing. The study used true-experimental research design which involved two group of learners as control and experimental group. The sample here was taken randomly. According to the finding of study, it indicated that Written Corrective Feedback indeed contributed to the learners' writings accuracy because the results showed that each type of feedback employed in the treatment groups could clearly bring about writing improvement at varying degrees.

Furthermore, the result of this study was also supported with the study which was written by Saukah et al (2017) entitled " The Effect of Coded and Non-coded Correction Feedback on The Quality of Indonesian EFL Students' Writing" that has been published in Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. The study involved the students of Senior High School as the sample. Moreover, based on the finding, the study revealed that Coded Correction Feedback had positive impact on students' writing quality.

Further, the previous study was conducted by Nurhayati (2017) entitled "The Effect of Indirect Coded Feedback on Students' Writing Ability" which has

been published in which investigated the effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback on students' writing ability. The study used true-experimental research design were involved 2 group of samples and it was taken randomly. The findings demonstrated that most of the students gained improvement in their writing of exposition essay after being taught using Indirect Coded Feedback.

This study also supported the finding that was found by Linh (2018) in his study that has been published in *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies* entitled “ The Effectiveness of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback as Perceived by Teachers and Students of a Public University in Vietnam”. The study used questionnaire and dept-interview to understand the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on students' writing. The findings demonstrated that teachers and students agreed in giving Written Corrective Feedback in teaching writing because it could improve the students' understandability.

Moreover, the other previous study was conducted by Novela (2019) entitled “The Effectiveness of Teacher's Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing Descriptive Text at Tenth Grade of MA Al Ma'arif Tulungagung” that shown Indirect Corrective Feedback was able to give statistically significant difference on students' writing score was also being supported by the result of the current study. There was the evidence which showed the effectiveness Of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the students' writing quality.

Likewise, the study that was conducted by Zuraida (2019) entitled “Indirect Corrective Feedback on Writing Accuracy of Students Across Different Level of Grammatical Sensitivity” was also in line with the result of this study. The findings

showed that Indirect Corrective Feedback was beneficial to improve the students' writing accuracy.

With a view to support by theories and empirical evidence, there were several factors that were assumed to cause the effectiveness of Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback in improving students' writing quality. First, according to Westmacott (2017), the students who were taught by Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback had strong autonomy in learning when they were being given a chance to repair or correct the errors that they made. It built their awareness to the errors and they could do better when they produced the next project writing. It was showed by the empirical data found in this study that after three meetings of the treatment, the students could achieve better on their writing score.

Second, Erlam (2013) revealed that students could do self-repair better when they were experiencing Indirect Corrective Feedback. The ability of the students in doing self-repair was due to the information given by the teachers. The information was also becoming the language input given to the students so that they could learn new vocabularies and proper structures in the text context (Latifah *et.al.*, 2014).

The last, Indirect Corrective Feedback could give strong motivation to students (Latifah, *et.al.*, 2014). Students were giving the indications on the location of the error on their writing by underlining, highlighting, or circling without providing the correct one. The students had a chance to check their own product. The indications that were given will push the students to find out the correct ones (Eslami, 2014).

From those explanations, it could be concluded that Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was effective to be used in teaching writing. In this study, the researcher used Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback to teach writing of recount text. The results of this study showed that Written Coded Indirect Corrective Feedback was effective to teach writing of recount text especially it could improve the students' writing quality of recount text for 10th graders of MA Darul Hikmah Tawang Sari Tulungagung.