

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter discusses several points related to the key of terms. This literature review deals with the discussion of writing skill, recount text, written corrective feedback, the notion of indirect written corrective feedback, teaching recount text writing using indirect written corrective feedback, and previous related studies.

#### **A. Writing Skill**

To comprehend the concept of writing skill, these following points discuss the definition of writing skill, the process of writing, and teaching writing in Indonesia.

##### **1. Definition of Writing Skill**

Writing is considered as one of the most significant cultural accomplishments of human beings. Rogers (2005: p.2) defines writing as the use of graphic marks to represent specific linguistic utterances. It is different from speaking; the graphic mark form allows us to communicate beyond the immediate moment. Wingersky, et.al (1992: p.3) state that writing is a process of discovering, organizing, and writing our thoughts on paper to communicate with a reader. It means that, unlike speaking which much easier getting the point across with tone of voice and facial expression, writing only has words and punctuations to form our message. But, we do have the opportunity to organize our thoughts and words through composing, drafting, rethinking, and redrafting to control the outcome of our product.

However, not all of writing activities promote writing as a skill. Although writing has always formed part of the syllabus in teaching of English, it can be used for a variety of purposes. Considering this, Harmer (2004) distinguishes the term of writing-for-learning and writing-for-writing. Once writing-for-learning is kind of writing when we do to help students learn language or to test them on that language, writing-for-writing is intended to build students' writing skill by building their writing habits or getting them to write for language practice (Harmer, 2004). In other words, when the writing activities require students to write primarily to teach their grammar and vocabulary learning, it doesn't promote writing as a skill, rather, it aims to give students opportunities to learn language better. Thus, writing-for-writing is involved when students are asked to write longer paragraphs or compositions to practice certain aspects of language or paragraph and text construction. Therefore, it can be concluded that writing skill is the process of developing, changing, and organizing our thoughts or ideas into written form by applying content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanic aspects.

## **2. The Process of Writing**

Writing is a process by which the writers find, organize, and write their ideas to communicate with the reader. Different from speaking, writing process gives the writer a chance to compose, draft, rethink, and redraft in order to have a good outcome. Langan (2010: p.12) states that writing is considered as a process of exploration and continuing discovery. In other words, it is done in steps; a writer never has to get it right all at once. According to Wingersky, et.al (1992), the general steps in the writing process include prewriting, organizing ideas, drafting,

revising, editing, and make a final draft. It is in line with Oshima and Hogue (2007), involving four steps the process of writing: prewriting, organizing, writing, and polishing (revising and editing).

#### **a. Prewriting**

Oshima and Hogue (2007: p.16) defines prewriting as a way to get ideas. It is a way of generating ideas, narrowing a topic, or finding a direction (Wingersky, et.al, 1992: p.3). In this step, writer choose a topic and collect ideas to explain the topic. For students, it is the first stage before they start their writing which helps them to generate ideas in their writing. It provides experiences and comprehensible input to help them build background to write (Kendall & Khuon, 2006: p.4). This stage is also called brainstorming; writing words or phrases that occur spontaneously. Students are free to write what they know about the topic chosen; they keep on writing until the flow of ideas stops. It can be done by making lists of ideas or taking detail notes on the topic. Through brainstorming, students learn to organize their writing by discussing and visualizing before they start.

#### **b. Organizing Ideas**

Organizing ideas involves sorting ideas in a logical manner to make a simple outline. After have made lists of ideas, before actually starting using those ideas from prewriting to compose the paragraph, students need to classify which one includes a main idea and supporting ideas. Thus, in this stage, the students organize their ideas by putting together the similar ideas into groups. By grouping the main idea and the supporting ideas, it makes the students easily and quickly to prepare to write a draft.

### **c. Writing**

This stage involves writing a rough draft (Oshima & Hogue, 2007: p.18). It is also called as drafting. Drafting is writing the paragraph or essay from start to finish (Zemach & Rumisek, 2005: p.3). In this stage, students use their outline which have been organized in the previous section as a guide to start the writing. During the drafting stage, students should consciously start with the main ideas followed by supporting ideas that flow as smooth as possible. Thus, they have to concentrate on getting their ideas on paper, organizing their information logically, and developing their topic with enough details. In drafting, students have to write as quickly as they can without stopping to think about grammar, spelling, or punctuation (Oshima & Hogue, 2007: p.18). It is perfectly usual and acceptable to see many errors in the rough draft because they will be fixed later.

### **d. Polishing**

This stage is also called revising and editing. Oshima and Hogue (2007: p.18) state that polishing is most successful if it is done in two steps: revising and editing. Revising refers to make changes to clarify the big issues of content and organization. While, editing focuses on the smaller issues of grammar, punctuation, and mechanics. It is often helped by other reader, teacher, or friends. This stages can be done in several times until the students are satisfied that their writing is the best they can do to produce their final draft.

## **3. Teaching Writing in Indonesia**

Writing skill is becoming increasingly important in both second- and foreign- language education. Based on Curriculum 2013 revision edition released

in 2018 as the regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture in Indonesia No. 37, Indonesian students are required to be able to write various kinds of text. It shows that writing is one of the most important skills that should be mastered by the students. One of the kinds of text that should be taught in the first grade of senior high school is recount text. It is stated in the basic competency 4.7.2: “*Menyusun teks recount lisan dan tulis, pendek dan sederhana, terkait peristiwa bersejarah, dengan memperhatikan fungsi sosial, struktur teks, dan unsur kebahasaan, secara benar dan sesuai konteks*” (Permendikbud, 2018: p.380). It means that the students of tenth grade senior high school are expected to be able to write recount text effectively by comprehending its social functions, text structures, and language features.

Moreover, Harmer (2004: p.9) points out that the level of correctness and the issue of well-formedness becomes noticeable dissimilarities between speaking and writing. It makes certain particular consideration in teaching writing to concern in the sentence organization, paragraph arrangement, and coherence. In other words, teaching writing should guide the students not only to write sentences but also to organize those sentences delivering the ideas into written form. Then, the teacher must give the appropriate guidance in which the students are able to express their ideas properly. Moreover, in order to achieve the goals in writing, the material should be relevant to their needs, interest, capacities, and ages in order to be able to make composition with their view even without errors. Thus, the topic provided is must be in accordance with the basic competency regulated. To conclude, the writing skill and the recount text are things that essential to be learned by Indonesian

students, especially for the tenth grade of senior high school students. Therefore, the teacher should find an effective strategy to guide the students' work without decreasing their motivation to learn.

## **B. Recount Text**

Recount text is one of kind of text that should be mastered by senior high school students. These following points will discuss the definition and the purpose of recount text, the generic structure of recount text, and the language features of recount text.

### **1. Definition and Purpose of Recount Text**

Knapp and Wattkins (2005: p.223) state that formally, recount texts are sequential texts which do little more than sequence a series of events. Then, Knapp and Wattkins (2005: p.223) said that they are the simplest text type of narrative genre. According to Anker (2010: p.121), narration refers to writing which tells the story of an event or an experience. It means that, no matter how short and simple the story is, it needs an orientation and characters set up in a particular time and place. Thus, this kind of text aims to retell events for the purpose of informing or entertaining the reader (Doddy, Sugeng, and Effendi, 2008: p.24). While according to Clouse (2008: p.186), beside to inform and to entertain, it purposes to express feelings, relate experience, and to persuade. In other words, trough retelling a sequence of events, they can show us how the world works, how people behave, and how events unfold. To conclude, recount text is a kind of texts which is used to tell a sequence of events of an experience that already happened in the past.

## 2. Generic Structure of Recount Text

According to Anker (2010: p.121), this kind of text has four basic things: main point, primary support, secondary support, and presents the events. The main point refers to revealing something of importance to the writer and reader. It followed by primary support that must include all of the major events. While, secondary support give details about those events. Both these supports should be able to demonstrate the main point. Thus, the way in describing events create a story with a certain point of view.

According to Doddy et. al (2008: p.15), the generic structure of recount text is divided into three parts: orientation, events, and re-orientation. Orientation provides the setting of place and time and it introduces participants. While, events tell what happened in sequences. Finally, the re-orientation views the optional-closure of events.

**Table 2.1 The Generic Structure of Recount Text**

<b>My Experience Met Taufik Hidayat</b>	
<b>Orientation</b>	Last sunday, there was Thomas cup badminton championship between Indonesia and China. It was held on Istora Gelora Bung Karno. I went to Istora Gelora Bung Karno with my Brother, Andi.
<b>Events</b>	Before entering Istora Gelora Bung Karno, we looked the bus that took Indonesian badminton team players. I saw taufik Hidayat, and the other Indonesian badminton players in that bus. Then, we followed that bus to main-entrance. When we wanted to get close to Taufik Hidayat, a security guard held me back. But, I thought that security guard was familiar because he was my old friend when I was senior high school, he was Andre. After that, he let me in, finally I could meet Taufik Hidayat and got his signature.
<b>Re-orientation</b>	Then, I went back to my seat at the Istora stadium to support Indonesian team. The supporter was very crowded. They shouted "IN-DO-NE-SI-A" during the match.

### **3. Language Feature(s) in Recount Text**

Same as any other texts, recount text has certain language features. According to Knapp and Watkins (2005: p.98), the language features of a recount text involves the using of action verbs, temporal connectives, past tense, and mental verbs. Action verbs and temporal connectives are used when sequencing people and events in time and space, for example “*After* lunch, we *walked* up to the Sydney Morning Herald”. Then, past tense is used unless in quoting direct speech. Last, in reflections or evaluations, mental verbs are used, for example “I *didn’t* know what to *do* next”.

### **C. Written Corrective Feedback**

Written corrective feedback is usually provided by teacher in such a way to mark the types of errors which occur in the process of writing. to understand the concept of written corrective feedback, these following points discuss the notion of written corrective feedback and types of written corrective feedback.

#### **1. The Notion of Written Corrective Feedback**

In the context of teaching, feedback refers to the teachers’ input for the students’ task. According to Ur (1996: p.242), feedback is information given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, with the objective of improving the performance. Brookhart (2008) states that feedback refers to an important component of the formative assessment process which gives information to the teachers and students about how students are doing relative to classroom learning goals and how to formulate new goals for themselves. From the students’ point of view, the feedback given is considered as the requirement for them about



what they need to do next to have better goals. Some examples of feedback in language teaching can be the words “Yes, right!”; a raised eyebrow in response to a mistake in grammar; and comments written in the margin of an essay. Thus, it can be said that feedback is information given by teacher as the reaction to the students’ task to enhance them to reach better learning objectives.

A feedback type commonly used in classroom is corrective feedback. The term of corrective feedback in writing skill describes the information that comes back from the reader to the writer. Bitchener and Ferris (2012: p.125) define written corrective feedback as a response to errors that students have made in their written output. Its role is to help students identify where their errors have been made and to provide them with information about why their output was incorrect and on how they can correct it. Thus, as a form of instruction, written corrective feedback is considered to be effective because it is provided at a time when learners are most likely to notice, understand, and internalize (uptake) it. Furthermore, after receiving feedback, students will tend to be more encouraged in revising their work because they know which part that they need to revise.

The primary purpose of providing feedback on students’ written production is to help them to have better quality of writing. Wahyuni (2017: p.40) states that the feedback given is as a source of information about the students’ strengths and weaknesses on their written production to have better work. Irons (2008: p.7) also added that feedback is also a very powerful tool which has a formative feature and potentially constructive learning tools. It means that feedback has a formative function to make the students learn more through the tasks given

during the learning process. Some researchers (e.g. Bitchener, 2008, Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, & Chandler, 2003) claim that students who received written corrective feedback outperformed those who did not receive written corrective feedback. Thus, written corrective feedback has a strong impact in the writing learning process because the students who get a feedback from the teacher will tend to be more motivated and confident in revising which errors that they need to fix.

## **2. Types of Written Corrective Feedback**

Providing feedback in the process of writing is considered that it is beneficial. However, Wahyuni (2017: p.39) states that different strategies of providing feedback might have different effects on students' writing quality. Brookhart (2008: p.2) also believes that feedback can be very powerful if it done well. Thus, realizing the necessity of written corrective feedback, both second- and foreign- teachers have put great endeavor into finding how to employ feedback to enhance its efficiency. As mentioned by Ellis (2009a, p. 98-104), there are six fruitful strategies of written corrective feedback that can be implemented in the classroom, namely, direct and indirect corrective feedback, focused versus unfocused corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, electronic corrective feedback, and reformulation. All types of feedback will be discussed more in the following part.

### **a. Direct WCF**

Direct WCF refers to the teacher marks the errors and provides students with the correct form. It may involve the crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form

above or near to the erroneous form. Bitchener (2008: p.105) adds the additional forms of direct WCF that may involve the written meta-linguistic explanation and/or oral meta-linguistic explanation. Written meta-linguistic explanation provides grammar rules and examples at the end of a student’s script with a reference back to places in the text where the error has occurred). While, oral meta-linguistic explanation refers to a mini-lesson where the rules and examples are presented, practiced, and discussed; one-on-one individual conferences between teacher and student or conferences between teacher and small groups of students). Example 1 illustrates direct WCF.

**Example. 1**

a	a	
A dog stole $\wedge$ bone from $\wedge$ butcher. He escaped with		
the		
having $\wedge$ bone.		
	over	a
When the dog was going <del>through</del> $\wedge$ bridge over <del>the</del> river		
saw a		
he <del>found</del> dog in the river.		

However, Ferris (2011: p.95) believes that there are at least three distinct conditions in which teachers should consider when they employ direct WCF: (1) when students are at beginning levels of English language proficiency; (2) when errors are “untreatable,” and (3) when the teacher requires student to focus on particular error patterns but not others. To conclude, direct WCF provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors.

**b. Indirect WCF**

Indirect WCF involves indicating the errors that student has made without providing the correct form. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), this can be

provided in one of four ways: underlining or circling the error; recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line; or using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is. Example 2 illustrates indirect WCF.

**Example 2.**

A dog stole X bone from X butcher. He escaped with having X bone. When the dog was going XthroughX X bridge over XtheX river he XfoundX X dog in the river.

X = missing word

X \_\_X = wrong word

Indirect WCF is often preferred to direct feedback on the grounds that it employs “guided learning and problem solving” and enhances students to reflect about linguistic forms (Lalande, 1982). Ellis (2009a: 100) also adds that indirect WCF where the exact location of errors is not shown might be more effective than indirect feedback where the location of the errors is shown as students would have to engage in deeper processing. Thus, in indirect WCF the teachers only provide explicit correction on students’ writing. Then, students are left to resolve and correct the error that has been drawn to their attention.

**c. Metalinguistic WCF**

Metalinguistic WCF involves providing learners with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors they have made (Ellis, 2009a: p.100). The explicit comment includes providing a linguistic clue that can take into two forms: 1) using error codes that consist of abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors, (it can be placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin); 2) providing a brief metalinguistic explanation. The second form is much more time

consuming than using error codes because it calls for the teacher to possess sufficient metalinguistic knowledge to be able to write clear and accurate explanations for a variety of errors. Examples of both are provided below.

**Example 3.**

art.	art.	WW art.
A dog stole	bone from	butcher. He escaped with
When the dog was going	through	bridge over the river
he found	dog in	the river.

**Example 4.**

Art. x 3; WW	A dog stole	bone from	butcher. He escaped with	having	bone.
Prep.;	art.	When the dog was going	through	bridge over the	
Art.		river he found	dog in	the river	

**Example 5**

(1)	(2)	(3)
A dog stole	bone from	butcher. He escaped with
When the dog	was going	through
bridge over the river	he found	dog in the river.
(4)	(5)	(6)

(1), (2), (5), and (6) = you need ‘a’ before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.  
 (3)—you need ‘the’ before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously.  
 (4)—you need ‘over’ when you go across the surface of something; you use ‘through’ when you go inside something (e.g. ‘go through the forest’).

**d. Focused versus Unfocused WCF**

Unfocused WCF refers to when teachers elect to correct all of the students’ errors. Alternatively, they can select particular error types for correction called focused WCF. For example, in the examples above, the teacher may choose to

correct just the article errors. Ellis (2009a: p.102) argues that focused WCF may prove more effective as the students are able to examine multiple corrections of a single error and obtain the rich understanding both why what they wrote was erroneous and how to acquire the correct form. This is because processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the students are required to attend to a variety of errors and unlikely to be able to reflect much on each error. However, unfocused WCF is beneficial to address a range of errors, so while it might not be as effective in assisting students to acquire specific features of errors as focused WCF in the short term, it may prove superior in the long run.

**e. Electronic WCF**

Electronic WCF is given by involving computer based as means to draw attention to written errors. Through this strategy, the teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of the correct usage (Ellis, 2009a: 98). This type of feedback can appropriate the usage of more experienced writers. It also encourages the use of technology in the language class to continue to grow. However, once the key to effective error correction is identifying the learner's textual intention, this strategy still lays the responsibility of the teacher to identify errors; or it allows the learners to locate the corrections that are most appropriate for their own textual intentions and so encourages student to be independent.

**f. Reformulation**

This type of strategy consists of a native speaker's reworking of the students' entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while

keeping the content of the original intact (Ellis, 2009a: p98). Thus, the second language writer is required to learn from the correct model written by native speaker with proper syntax, lexical choices, and grammatical structure and applied their understanding into their own work.

#### **D. The Notion of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback**

Indirect corrective feedback is provided by the teacher by underlining, circling or highlighting the errors on students' writing, to indicate the location of these errors without correcting them (Aghajanloo, 2016: 29). It occurs when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but leaves it to the students to solve the problem and correct the error (Ferris, 2011: p.32). Thus, students are asked to study their error and correct it by themselves. Indirect corrective feedback is commonly presented by giving indicators. Ferris and Roberts (2001) states that the indicators may be in one of four ways: recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line, using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type or error it is or underlining or circling the errors. In providing the feedback, Poorebrahim (2017) find that more explicit feedback options are more profitable when teachers intend to help students edit and revise their written work; in contrast, if the purpose is to help students in comprehending knowledge, more implicit types of feedback are more helpful. From the researcher's viewpoint, all the definitions given, considered that they all share one common feature of withholding the correction to trigger students' self-correction.

Moreover, Lalande (1982) argues that indirect feedback is more preferable because it encourages students in a guided learning and problem solving. Ferris

(2011: p.33) also adds that students' error frequency ratios are reduced after received indirect feedback in comparing with students who received direct feedback. Given all the definitions in consideration, it can be concluded that giving the indirect corrective feedback to the student means the teacher gives the students a guided instruction on how they should revise their writing. The teacher only points out which part of the students' mistakes and errors. The way of giving feedback can take any form ranging from underlining or circling the error, indication at the margin, and written correction using error codes. This definition also provides the theoretical basis for the research when conducting the actual study.

#### **E. Teaching Writing Recount Text Using Indirect Written Corrective**

##### **Feedback**

Writing defines as process rather than only a single step. To pass those process, students need guidance to produce better writing. Thus, to write a recount text, the students need someone to check the error that they made in order to produce better writing. Indeed, the existence of feedback is essential in writing teaching and learning process. To make indirect feedback becomes more effective, Ferris and Roberts (2001: p.177) argues that using a consistent system of marking and coding errors might yield more long-term growth in students' accuracy, and it can be paired with mini-lessons which can build students' knowledge about the error types being marked, rather than simply underlining or highlighting errors. It is intended to reduce students' confusion through consistently using a standard set of symbols or markings to indicate place and type of error and train the students in what kinds of corrections need to be considered based on each symbol.



Furthermore, the patterns of feedback given by the teacher surely depend on the teachers' conception of the composing process and their understanding of students' errors. On the one hand, teachers may present themselves as helpful facilitators offering support and guidance; on the other hand, they may act as an authority imposing critical judgment on students' writing products. In providing the feedback, Salimi and Valizadeh (2015) found that in both short term and the long run, coded type of corrective feedback is beneficial improving students' accuracy in selecting grammatical structures and punctuation. Thus, teachers should familiarize students with the system of codes used. The symbols or codes that can be used to indicate error in indirect feedback can be seen in Appendix 4. Codes of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.

Therefore, according to Ellis (2009b: p.14) there are several guidelines in giving feedback to the students; these guidelines is a set of explicit principles that can be reflected by teachers when determining their own policies for feedback. First, teachers should ensure their students' attitudes towards indirect WCF given, appraise them of the value of feedback, and negotiate agreed goals of feedback with them. The teacher also needs to provide students with topics to write and they can choose the interesting topic that had been given by the teacher. Second, after the students asked to do writing assignment, teachers should not be afraid to correct students' errors to make sure the feedback works. Third, giving focused feedback might be more effective than unfocused feedback. The teachers may identify specific linguistic targets for correction in different lessons.

Fourth, Teachers should ensure that learners know they are being corrected. Fifth, Teachers need to be able to implement a variety of written CF strategies and to adapt the specific one they use to the particular learner they are correcting. Sixth, written CF is almost given invariably delayed. Seventh, teachers need to create space following the corrective move for students to uptake the correction. Thus, students need the opportunity to attend to the corrections and revise their writing. Eighth, teachers should be prepared to vary who, when, and how they give feedback in accordance with the cognitive and affective needs of the individual students. Ninth, teachers should be ready to correct a specific error on several occasions to enable the students to achieve full self-regulation. The last is that teachers should monitor the extent to which feedback leads students in anxiety and should adapt the strategies they use to cover the anxiety.

#### **F. Previous Related Study**

In the recent time, many researchers conducted the research to find out the advantages of teachers' feedback in the process of teaching writing. There is some research that try to find out evidence to indicate that indirect written corrective feedback brings more benefits to students' long-term writing development. Wahyuni (2017) conducted an experimental study through a factorial research design aiming to investigate the effect of different feedback, direct and indirect corrective feedback, on the students' writing quality that have different cognitive styles. It involves fifty-five of the fourth semester English students of STAIN Kediri that randomly selected and assigned into different treatments. The findings revealed that the effect of feedback given does not depend on the students' cognitive styles.

Then, the main effect analysis revealed that there was no significant difference on writing quality of students getting direct corrective feedback and those getting indirect corrective feedback.

Another study conducted by Aghajanloo, Mobini, and Khosravi (2016) investigate the effects of four types of written corrective feedback, direct, indirect, focused, and unfocused written corrective feedback, on intermediate EFL learners' writing performance, find out the most effective type, and determine learners' attitudes toward the effectiveness of using WCF and the types which they had received. 120 intermediate learners aging from 14-18 were selected from 140 male and female Iranian EFL learners and assigned randomly to four homogeneous groups (each group including 30 participants). The results indicate that in all of the four groups, learners outperformed validating the four types of WCF as an effective technique which can be used in EFL classes with a clear implication that WCF types given should be emphasized as an essential tool for developing writing ability of intermediate EFL learners.

With regard examining indirect WCF, Bobrova (2017) investigated whether indirect WCF can enable 45 ESL writers with intermediate language proficiency to self-edit word choice errors classified as conceptual. This study compares the indirect WCF under two conditions: errors are marked and coded without (1) and with metalinguistic explanation and (2) with two types of metalinguistic explanation: traditional and cognitive. The findings indicate that indirect WCF with metalinguistic explanation is more useful than that without explanation (the control group) and cognitive explanation (the cognitive group)

appears to be significantly more effective than the traditional account of language (the traditional group).

In investigating the effectiveness of indirect written corrective feedback, a qualitative study is also employed by Linh (2018). This study aims to provide an insight teachers and English-major sophomores perception regarding the effectiveness of WCF on five different aspects of writing (grammar, language use, mechanic use, content and organization) by utilizing questionnaire and in-depth interview. Based on the findings, both teachers and students agree that given feedback suits students' understandability, but somewhat exceeds their self-correction ability. In the aspect of grammar and content, both teachers and students' perceptions match on the efficacy of indirect WCF for the treatment of grammatical errors, but it is inefficacy for the betterment of content. Both parties also have neutral perception about the correction efficiency of this feedback pattern regarding lexical and mechanical errors. Finally, organization is the aspect on which the perceptions of both sides mismatch the most. Thus, these findings implicate that changes should be made to the practices of providing feedback of teacher and feedback-handling of students to enhance the effectiveness of indirect WCF.

The results of those previous studies indicated each types of written corrective feedback have its own benefit in teaching students' writing skill. This current study is interested to find out the effectiveness of indirect feedback in teaching writing recount text of tenth grade students of senior high school. Further, this study focused on giving indirect WCF to students' writing and comparing it to the direct WCF.