

researcher showed that the quality of the students' writing receiving coded corrective feedback was better than that receiving non-coded corrective feedback. (Saukah,2017). There is the differences between this research and the previous study is from the subject. The subject of this research is senior high school in Indonesia and the subject of Shima's research is institute in Iran.

In this study, the students will get many advantages when teacher uses coded corrective feedback for checking their students' writing composition. The students will easily know what the errors on their writing text and they will improve writing skill especially in recount text.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents the conclusion to answer the research problem in the previous chapter and some suggestions to those who are in the educational field, such as the English teacher, students, and the last is further researcher to use coded corrective feedback in teaching writing skill in English.

A. Conclusion

The conclusion of the research is Coded corrective feedback gave positive outcome on the students' writing skill in the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Kediri. The researcher found that there was difference mean score between experimental group and control group. Students who were taught by using Coded corrective feedback got higher mean score than students who were taught by using

Non coded correctiver. This fact can be seen in the mean score of post-test, mean score of experimental group was 81.93 and mean score of control group was 79.56.

In this research, the result of Kolmogrov-Smirnov test showed that the significant value is $p (0.061) > \alpha (0.05)$. It means that the data distribution of this research is normal. In addition, to analyze the data, the researcher used ANCOVA by using SPSS 23.0 version for windows. The variance of the two groups is also equal. It is proven by the result of significant value of Lavene's is equal across groups. Furthermore, the interactions are not significant among independent variables with the covariate. It is proven by the result $p (0.761) > \alpha (0.05)$. In this result, there is relationship between covariate and dependent variable, that the significance value is $0.000 < 0.05$.

Based on the hypothesis testing result, the significant difference is at $p (0.004) < \alpha (0.05)$. The result indicates that the p value was lower than α . It can be concluded that the use of coded corrective feedback in teaching writing especially recount text is quite success. It can be seen on the table of post-test score of experimental and control group. It means that is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is significant difference on writing accuracy between the students who are taught by using coded corrective feedback and the students who are taught by using non-coded corrective feedback in writing accuracy at 11th MAN 1 kediri.

B. Suggestion

Based on the result of the result previously, some suggestions will be directed toward the teacher, the students, and the other researchers.

1. To the Teacher

The teacher gets new technique in teaching writing. Coded corrective can make students easier to revised their paraghrops in writing recount text. The English teacher is suggested to apply coded corrective feedback in the classroom. That is because, coded corrective feedback can also modify students' thinking or behavior toward their work and focus their attention on the purpose of writing.

2. To the Students

The students can ask the teacher to to give coded corrective feedback when they have a lesson about writing skill such as recount text. The researcher hopes that by using coded corrective feedback, the students will enjoy English lesson.

3. To the Other Researchers

Based on the result of the research, the other researcher can use this studyy as the reference to conduct the similar study. The next researcher should be able to be creative to something different in concluding the research.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, S. (2014). The Effect of Coded and Uncoded Written Corrective Feedback Types on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy; *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 5, Pp. 1001-1008.
- Baker, W., & Bricker, R. H. (2010). *The effects of direct and indirect speech acts on native English and ESL speakers' perception of teacher written feedback*. System, Pp. 75–84.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.007>.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, & Practice*, No.5, Pp.7–74.
- Boardman, C. (2008). *Writing to communicate*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Carless, D, (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, (Online), Vol. 31, No.2, Pp. 219-233.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. 2006. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. Vol. 28, No.2, Pp. 339-368.
- Hair JF. (2003). *Essentials of Business Research Methods*: Wiley.
- Harmer. J, (2004). *How to teach writing*. London: Longman.
- John. M. Echols and Hasan, S. (1996). *Kamus Inggris Indonesia*, Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Kamangar F, Islami F. (2013). Sample size calculation for epidemiologic studies: principles and methods. *Archives of Iranian Medicine (AIM)*. Vol.16, No.5
- Krashen, S.D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use: The Taipei lectures*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Langan. (1985). *College Writing Skill with Readings (Fifth Edition)*. McGraw Hill Companies. America.
- Majid U. (2018). Research fundamentals: Study design, population, and sample size. *URNCSJournal*. <https://urncst.com/index.php/urncst/article/view/16>
- Meyers, Alan. (2005). *Gateways to Academic Writing: Effective Sentences, Paragraphs, and Essay*, New York: Longman.
- Muth'im, A., & Latief, M. A. 2014. The effectiveness of indirect error correction feedback on the quality of students' writing. *Arab World English Journal*, Vol.5, No.2, Pp.244-257.
- Peter, K. (2005). *Genre, text, and grammar*. Sydney: University of New South Wales.
- Purnawarman, P. (2011). *Impacts of different types of teacher corrective feedback in reducing grammatical errors on ESL/EFL students' writing* (Doctoral Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, The United States of America).
- Sanggam & Shinoda. (2008). *Generic text structure*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

- Saukah, A. (2017). The Effect Of Coded And Non-Coded Correction Feedback On The Quality Of Indonesian Efl Students' Writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 7 No. 2, Pp. 247-252
- Skehan, P. (1998). *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds); Challenge and change in language teaching. Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching. Pp. 22
- Susanto, Leo, dkk. (2007). *essay writing*, Yogyakarta: Andi, P.1
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). *Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing*.
- Williams, M. & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.