

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology of the study. It consists of research design, data collection technique, research procedures, and data analysis technique.

#### 3.1 Research Methods

##### 3.1.1 Research Design

This study used a quasi- experimental design by assigning one class as the experimental group and the other class as the control group. Hatch and Farhady (1982) reveal that:

By using a quasi-experimental design, we control as many variables as we can and also limit the kinds of interpretations we make about cause-effect relationship and hedge the power of our generalization statements.

A quasi experimental design was used in this study, due the limited time and cost. A true experimental design would not be feasible because of long time period. In addition, Hatch and Farhady (1982) affirm that this design is a comparison group design. The experimental group was treated by providing teacher written feedback by using indirect feedback strategy. In addition, students were asked to write a recount text and revise their text based on indirect feedback from the teacher. Meanwhile, in the control group which is students were asked to write a recount text and revise their text based on their understanding.

##### 3.1.2 Variables

There were two variables in this study, namely an independent variable and a dependent variable. According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), independent variable is used to make a change in the value of one variable and dependent variable

Lutfia Putrinurani, 2014

*The Effectiveness of Teacher Indirect Feedback to Improve Students' Ability in Writing Recount Text*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

is the effect that changes on another variable. In this study, the independent variable was teacher written feedback by using indirect feedback strategy. Indirect feedback from the teacher was applied to change and improve students' score in writing recount text. Meanwhile, students' score in writing recount text was the dependent variable that was observed and measured so as to determine the effect of teacher indirect feedback towards students' score, especially in writing a recount text.

### 3.1.3 Hypothesis

Hatch and Farhady (1982) assert that "The null hypothesis is the most common hypothesis". The null hypothesis of this study is that there is no significant difference between students' writing score in the first draft and the last draft score. It means that teacher indirect feedback is not effective in improving students' writing of recount text. Meanwhile, the alternative hypothesis of this study is there is significant difference between students' writing score in the first draft and the last draft that means that teacher indirect feedback is effective in improving students' ability in writing recount text.

### 3.2 Population and Sample

This study was conducted in a Junior High School in Garut. The population of this study was eighth graders in a Junior High School in Garut. They were in the 2013/2014 academic year. The study used two classes as samples. One class as the experimental group that received teacher indirect feedback treatments and consisting of 38 students. The other class acted as the control group that did not receive experimental treatments, they only were asked to revise their text based on their understanding. This group also had 38 students. The samples were chosen because both groups have similar ability.

### 3.3 Data Collection

To gain the data, this study used two instruments. The first instrument was writing practices in which students were asked to write recount text based on the theme that was determined by the teacher. The second instrument was questionnaires which were distributed to all students in the experimental group.

#### 3.3.1 Writing Practices

In this study, writing practices were used to measure students' writing of recount text. Writing practices were employed to the experimental group and the control group. At the beginning, students were given a diagnostic writing to collect the data about their writing ability in recount text before teacher indirect feedback was applied. In the diagnostic writing (first draft), students were asked to write a recount text based on their holiday experience in the previous semester as long as one hundred words in forty minutes. Then, in every meeting students in both groups were asked to make a recount text based on the theme that was determined by the teacher. They were also asked to make revision. For the experimental group, their text got indirect feedback from the teacher and they were asked to revise their text based on indirect feedback that they received from the teacher. Meanwhile, the control group did not receive feedback from the teacher so they were asked to revise their text based on their understanding. In the last meeting, students in both groups were submitted their last draft to measure students' writing of recount text after teacher indirect feedback treatment was applied.

Feedback that was used in this study was indirect feedback in form of minimal marking and written commentary from the teacher.

#### a. Minimal Marking

There were three kinds of mark that were used in indicating students' errors in writing. First, the teacher used a color circle mark. There were a pink color circle mark, a green color circle mark, a red color circle mark, and a blue color circle mark. A pink color circle mark indicated inappropriate vocabularies. A green color circle mark indicated errors in using preposition or article. A red color circle mark indicated tenses errors. A blue color circle mark indicated there are sentences that cannot be understood.

Second, the teacher used an arrow mark. An arrow mark indicated errors in sentence structures. Third, the teacher used a cross mark. A cross mark indicated there are words or sentences that should be omitted.

#### b. Commentary

The teacher gave written comment related to the content, generic structures, language features, the good point and the bad point that exist on students' writing and what should be done next by students. For example: 1. your story is good, but there are still errors in using tenses, 2. there are some sentences that cannot be understood by the teacher as the reader, 3. orientation: yes, sequence of events: incomplete, re-orientation: no, 4. Please revise and complete your text. In addition, the teacher gives a motivation comment, for instance: I believe that you can write better than this.

### 3.3.2 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were administered to get the information about students' responses toward the use of teacher indirect feedback. Questionnaires were distributed merely to the experimental group after the final writing was submitted. Questionnaires consisted of ten statements related to students' responses toward

writing skill and the implementation of teacher indirect feedback in writing, especially in writing a recount text (see Appendix C).

### **3.4 Research Procedures**

#### **3.4.1 Administering the Pilot Test**

The pilot test was given to six students in the similar level which were not included in the experimental group and the control group but has already learned recount text. In the pilot test students were asked to write a recount text based on the theme that given by the teacher. The result of pilot test can be seen in Appendix E.

#### **3.4.2 Preparing the Lesson Plan**

The lesson plan (see Appendix A) was designed to be implemented during treatment sections. The lesson plan related to recount text. The teacher designed the lesson plan for six meetings.

#### **3.4.3 Preparing the Materials**

The materials given were about recount texts taken from some resources such as some books and internet. Recount texts that were used in this study can be found in Appendix A.

#### **3.4.4 Teaching Procedures**

The teacher used indirect feedback strategy from the teacher in teaching recount texts to the experimental group. Meanwhile, students of the control group were asked to self assess. The lesson plan can be seen in Appendix A. The steps were below:



- **Step 1: Class Presentation**

In the class presentation step, the teacher delivered the material through lecturing (Aljanian, 2012, p.1). The class presentation was conducted to build students' knowledge to write a recount text. The material given in this study was about recount text. Recount text was chosen as the material of this study because it was appropriate with the SKKD. The class presentation was conducted in the second until seventh meeting in 40 minutes. The success of the class presentation steps can be seen from the students' in Chapter IV.

- **Step 2: Write a recount text based on the theme from the teacher**

Writing practice was useful to improve students' ability in writing (Alwasilah and Alwasilah (2005). In this step, the teacher used the process approach. As confirmed by Brown (2001) that focus on the process of writing can lead students to a better final paper. In line with this, Harmer (2007) asserts through a process of writing, students can have a good piece of work. By focusing on the writing process, students can evaluate their writing, According to Keh (1990), the process approach in writing consists of generating ideas (pre-writing); writing a first draft with an emphasis on content (to 'discover' meaning/author's ideas); second and third (and possibly more) drafts to revise ideas. The research schedule can be seen as follows:

Table 2. Research Schedule

No.	Experimental Group	Control Group
	Material	Material
1.	The Diagnostic Writing (First Draft)	The Diagnostic Writing (First Draft)
2.	Draft 2	Draft 2
3.	Revision based on feedback from the teacher	Revision based on students' understanding (self assessment)
4.	Draft 3	Draft 3
5.	Revision based on feedback from the teacher	Revision based on students' understanding (self assessment)
6.	Draft 4	Draft 4
7.	Revision 3 based on feedback from the teacher	Revision 3 based on students' understanding (self assessment)
8.	Last Draft	Last Draft

In the first meeting the teacher conducted the diagnostic writing to find out students' writing ability in writing recount text before the treatment applied. In the diagnostic writing, students were asked to write a recount text about their holiday experience in the previous semester (first draft). The result of the diagnostic writing (first draft) can be seen in Appendix E. After conducting the diagnostic writing, students of the experimental group were given treatment which was teacher feedback by using indirect feedback strategies that is believed can help students in developing their writing (Keh, 1990; Purnawarman, 2011; Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad, 2012; Zaman and Azad, 2012; Tabasi, Khodabandehlou and Jahandar, 2013).

Lutfia Putrinurani, 2014

*The Effectiveness of Teacher Indirect Feedback to Improve Students' Ability in Writing Recount Text*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

Meanwhile students of the control group were asked to self assess because self assessment in writing can improve students' writing ability (Javaherbakhsh, 2010; Lam, 2010).

In addition, for the experimental group, their text received indirect feedback from the teacher and they were asked to revise their text based on feedback that they got from the teacher. Meanwhile, the control group did not receive feedback from the teacher so they were asked to revise their text based on their understanding. In the last meeting, students were asked to write the final writing to find out students' writing ability in writing recount text after treatments were applied. Students' writing can be seen in Appendix B. Furthermore, the explanation below describes generally about the improvement of students' writing in both groups in every meeting.

- **Diagnostic Writing (First Draft)**

In the first meeting, teacher conducted the diagnostic writing to find out students' writing ability in writing recount text. In the diagnostic writing students were asked to write their holiday experience (first draft). Students' writing were analyzed by using numeric and rubric scoring guide adopted from Coffin (2003) and Hyland (2004) in Emilia (2011) as follows:

Table 3. Numeric and Rubric Scoring Guide

(Adopted from Coffin, 2003 and Hyland, 2004, in Emilia, 2011)

Scores	Content	Organization of Structure	Language
31-14	- Events are stated explicitly. - Events are recorded clearly and properly. - The significance of	- The orientation provides all the important information. - There are all the necessary backgrounds.	- The language used is very well controlled. - The use of vocabulary is



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>events can be evaluated.</li> <li>- There is a personal comments of the event.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Story is writer in order.</li> <li>- The re-orientation “closes” the chain of events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>well used.</li> <li>- The selection of good grammar is well considered.</li> </ul>
21-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Event is written clearly.</li> <li>- The story includes the sequential events.</li> <li>- It provides evaluation of the event.</li> <li>- It provides personal comment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The orientation is well developed.</li> <li>- Most of characters are mentioned in the story.</li> <li>- Most of events are well sequenced and coherent.</li> <li>- The orientation closes the chain of events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The choice of vocabulary is quite appropriate.</li> <li>- The use of grammar is varied.</li> <li>- Most of the tone used is quite appropriate.</li> </ul>
11-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Event is written broadly.</li> <li>- Event is recorded clearly.</li> <li>- Evaluation is still little or weak.</li> <li>- Personal comments are not sufficient.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The orientation provides some information.</li> <li>- Some unimportant backgrounds should be omitted.</li> <li>- Some parts of the story are written coherent, some are not.</li> <li>- There is an attempt to write to the re-orientation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The language mastery is inconsistent.</li> <li>- There is less variation in the choice of good grammar and vocabulary.</li> <li>- The use of tone and style is inconsistent.</li> </ul>
1-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Event is not written.</li> <li>- Events cannot be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The orientation is still less.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mastery of a language is still</li> </ul>

identified.	- There is no any	low.
- The evaluation is still	background.	- The reader is
confusing.	- Sequence of events	really annoyed
- There is no any	is written haphazardly	by grammatical
personal comment.	and incoherent.	errors.
	- There is no part of	- The use of
	re-orientation.	vocabulary is
		still low.

There are three parts of generic structure of recount text, namely orientation, series of events, and re-orientation (Emilia, 2011). The first part is orientation. It is an introduction of events which provide main information, such as participants, what happened, where the place is, when the events happen (Emilia, 2011). In the first draft, students' writing in the experimental and control groups were not enough good. Most of them was not be explained the orientation clearly.

The second part is series of events which can be called body of text. This part includes how character within the text feels about events; events are told specifically (Emilia, 2011). Almost all of the students in both groups did not explain the events that faced by them clearly. They only mention some events without explain it in detail.

The third part is re-orientation that explains about personal comments and opinions of the writer related to events that the writer faces (Emilia, 2011). In this part, the writer also can tell how the experience ends. There were some students in both groups who did not write comment or their feeling related to the events that was faced by them.

As asserted by Derewianka (2004), Martin (2006), and Emilia (2011) that there are some language features of recount text. First, personal participant is introduced. Second, it uses chronological connection to connect sentences or

paragraphs. Third, it includes linking verb. Fourth, it uses action verb. Fifth, simple past tense is written by using the first or the third person. All of the students in both groups did not use past tense in retelling events; they used present tense in their recount text. They also did not use first, then, after that in explaining events that they faced. Their writing was not still understandable by the teacher. There were some vocabularies that were inappropriate to be used in their text. In addition, there was some unimportant information that should be omitted in their text.

- Second Draft

In the second draft, students in both groups were asked to write their experience in celebrating their birthday. Almost all of students still did not write well. As affirmed by Emilia (2011) that there are three parts of generic structures of recount text, such as: orientation, series of events, and re-orientation. In the orientation, almost all of the students in both groups still did not write this part clearly. In telling the events, almost all of the students write the events briefly. They did not write it in detail. Some parts of the story were not written coherent. In the re-orientation part, most of them did not tell what they feel after events happened explicitly.

There are some language features of recount text (Derewianka, 2004; Martin, 2006, and Emilia, 2011). First, personal participant is introduced. Second, it uses chronological connection to connect sentences or paragraphs. Third, it includes linking verb. Fourth, it uses action verb. Fifth, simple past tense is written by using the first or the third person. Almost all of the students in both groups use present tense. It should not be used.

- Revision

Students in both groups were asked to revise their second draft. Students in the experimental group were asked to revise their text based on indirect feedback from the teacher. Teacher feedback by using indirect feedback strategies is believed can help students in developing their writing (Keh, 1990; Purnawarman, 2011; Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad, 2012; Zaman and Azad, 2012; Tabasi, Khodabandehlou and Jahandar, 2013). Meanwhile students of the control group were asked to self assess because self assessment in writing can improve students' writing ability (Javaherbakhsh, 2010; Lam, 2010).

There are three parts of generic structure of recount text, namely orientation, series of events, and re-orientation (Emilia, 2011). The first part is orientation. It is an introduction of events which provide main information, such as participants, what happened, where the place is, when the events happen (Emilia, 2011). In the orientation, most students in the experimental group could revise this part well. They added some information and also omitted unimportant information. Meanwhile, most students in the control group did not revise well. They seemed confused about what they should revise in their text but they tried hardly to write better. In telling events, some students in the experimental group elaborated the events that they faced. Their writing was coherent. They tried to write what they felt after facing the events. In addition, students in the control group added some information related to the events that they faced. They also tried to explain the events clearly. In the re-orientation, they added some personal comments related to the events that they faced.

There are some language features of recount text (Derewianka, 2004; Martin, 2006, and Emilia, 2011). First, personal participant is introduced. Second, it uses chronological connection to connect sentences or paragraphs. Third, it includes linking verb. Fourth, it uses action verb. Fifth, simple past tense is written by using the first or the third person. Some students in both groups used past tense and

chronological connection to connect sentences or paragraphs, some of them were not. In addition, students' writing of the experimental group more coherent and understandable rather than the control group.

- Third Draft

In the third draft, students in both groups were asked to write a recount text about their experience in celebrating Eid Al-Fitri. There were some improvements of students' writing in both groups. In the orientation, most students in the experimental group mentioned some important information, such as mention participants, what happened, where the place is, when the events happen. Meanwhile, some students in the control group still did not write this part clearly, they only mentioned what happened. In telling the events, most students in the experimental group explained the events in detail and understandable while some students in the control group did not write this part clearly. In the re-orientation, most students in both groups mention their personal comments related to the events that they faced. Most students in both group were understand about generic structure of recount text that was evidenced in their writing they wrote three parts of generic structure of recount text completely. It is in line with Emilia (2011) who reveals that there are three parts of generic structure of recount text, namely orientation, series of events, and re-orientation.

There are some language features of recount text (Derewianka, 2004; Martin, 2006, and Emilia, 2011). First, personal participant is introduced. Second, it uses chronological connection to connect sentences or paragraphs. Third, it includes linking verb. Fourth, it uses action verb. Fifth, simple past tense is written by using the first or the third person. Almost all of the students in the experimental group used past tense, action verb, linking verb, and chronological connection to connect sentences or paragraphs. Meanwhile, there were some students in both groups who still used present tense and past tense which means that inconsistency in using tenses.



- Revision

Students in both groups were asked to revise their third draft. Almost all of the students in the experimental group were able to revise their text and make their text better than before. They revised the text based on indirect feedback from the teacher. Indirect feedback from the teacher was understandable by them that were proved by their improvement in writing in every meeting. Meanwhile, some students in the control group revised their text well, some of them did not. It means that some students in the control group can assess their writing successfully, while some of them got confused in assessing their writing that was conducted by themselves (Lam, 2010).

- Fourth Draft

In the fourth draft, students in both groups were asked to write a recount text about their experience in celebrating Indonesia's Independence Day. In the fourth draft, most students in both groups wrote the text well, especially students in the experimental group. Almost all of the students were able to minimize their errors in writing a recount text. It means that indirect feedback from the teacher was understandable by them although there were still inconsistency in using tenses that was conducted by some students. Meanwhile, some students of control group were able to write a good text which means that they could assess their text successfully by themselves. So, they were able to write better. On the other hand, there were some students in the control group who still could not assess their text, so they were not able to write better (Lam, 2010).

- Revision

Students in both groups were asked to revise their fourth draft. All students in the experimental group were able to revise their text well based on indirect feedback

from the teacher. They understood about their errors in writing and they knew the correct form (Lalande, 1982; Purnawarman, 2011). In addition, some students in the control group were able to decrease their errors in writing but there were some texts that were categorized into a bad text. It happens because some students in the control group were not able to assess their text well, so they did not know what they should be improved by them in writing (Lam, 2010).

- Last Draft

In the last meeting, students in both groups were asked to write last draft about their holiday experience. In the last draft almost all of the students in the experimental group were able to write very well. Meanwhile, there were some students in the control group who still did many errors in their writing.

From the general explanation above related to the students' writing in both groups, it can be concluded that almost all of the students in the experimental group were able to improve their writing in every meeting. Meanwhile, there were some students in the control group that could not improve their writing successfully, their text was not better than before. Furthermore, students' writing can be seen in Appendix B, while students' score in every meeting can be seen in Appendix E. In addition, students' score was analyzed by using the statistical computation in SPSS 16 for Windows. The description of research findings from the statistical computation in SPSS 16 for Windows and from questionnaires were discussed in the chapter IV.

### 3.5. Data Analysis

#### 3.5.1. Scoring Sheet for Writing Analysis

Students' writing were analyzed by using numeric and rubric scoring guide adopted from Coffin (2003) and Hyland (2004) in Emilia (2011). The first aspect that

was examined was the content. The second aspect was structure organization. The last aspect was language. In detail, it can be seen in Appendix D.

The guiding score describes that those who got the range of score 31-40 as having achieved the excellent score, those who got the range of score 21-30 as having achieved the good score, those who got the range of score 11-20 as having average score (this range of scores is minimum score that should be acquired by students in order to the instrument is valid to be used), and those who got the range of 1-10 did not fulfill the requirement of the standard score.

### **3.5.2. Data Analysis in the Pilot Test**

The aim of the pilot test is to check the validity and reliability of the instrument. The pilot test was carried out to six students at the same grade who were not included in both groups.

### **3.5.3. Data Analysis in the First Draft and the Last Draft**

According to Coolidge (2000), there are three criteria before presenting the independent t-test. First, the participant must be different in each group. Second, the data should have a normal distribution. Third, the variance of two groups must be homogenous. Therefore, it is important to check whether the data are normally distributed and the variance in two groups is homogenous or not before calculating the independent t-test. If it is not, non parametric statistic is used.

#### **3.5.3.1. Normality Distribution Test**

Normality distribution test is aimed to check whether the distribution in the first draft and the last draft of the experimental group and the control group were normally distributed or not (Coolidge, 2000). The statistical calculation of normality test used Kolmogorov Smirnov in SPSS 16 for Windows. The steps are as follows:

1. Setting the hypothesis:
  - $H_0$ : the scores of the experimental group and the control group are normally distributed.
  - $H_a$ : the scores of the experimental group and the control group are not normally distributed.
2. Setting  $\alpha = 0.05$ .
3. Analyzing the normality distribution by using Kolmogorov Smirnov test in SPSS 16 for Windows.
  - The null hypothesis is accepted if Asymp. Sig > 0.05 which means that the scores of the experimental and the control groups are normally distributed.
  - The null hypothesis is rejected if Asymp. Sig < 0.05 which means that the scores of the experimental and the control groups are normally distributed.

### 3.5.3.2. Non Parametric Statistic Test: Mann Whitney U test

Since the first draft scores of the experimental and the control groups were not normally distributed so the next step was conducting non parametric statistic test (Coolidge, 2000). Mann-Whitney U test in SPSS 16 for Windows was used. The steps are as follows:

1. Setting the hypothesis:
  - $H_0$ : there is no difference in the first draft scores in the experimental group and the control group.
  - $H_a$ : there is a difference in the first draft scores in the experimental group and the control group.
2. Setting  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

3. Analyzing data by using Mann-Whitney U test in SPSS 16 for Windows.
  - The null hypothesis is not rejected if the test result is higher than 0.05.
  - The null hypothesis is rejected if the test result is lower than 0.05.

### 3.5.3.3. Homogeneity of Variance Test

Homogeneity of Variance Test was conducted by using Levene test in SPSS 16 for Windows because the last draft scores of the experimental and the control group were normally distributed. It was aimed to check whether the last draft scores were homogenous or not (Coolidge, 2000). The steps are as below:

1. Setting the hypothesis:
  - $H_0$ : The variance of the experimental group and the control group is homogenous.
  - $H_a$ : The variance of the experimental group and control group is not homogenous.
2. Setting  $\alpha = 0.05$ .
3. Analyzing the homogeneity variance by using Levene test.
  - The null hypothesis is accepted if Asymp. Sig > 0.05
  - The null hypothesis is rejected if Asymp. Sig < 0.05

### 3.5.3.4. Independent T-test

Independent T-test was only conducted in analyzing the last draft scores because the last draft scores were normally distributed and homogenous (Coolidge, 2000). It was calculated by using computation of SPSS 16 for Windows. The steps are as follows:



1. Setting the hypothesis.
  - $H_0$ : there is no significant difference between students' last draft scores in the experimental group and the control group.
  - $H_a$ : there is a significant difference between students' last draft scores in the experimental group and the control group.
2. Setting  $\alpha = 0.05$ .
3. Analyzing data by using t-test in SPSS 16 for Windows.
4. Comparing  $t_{obtained}$  and  $t_{critical}$ . If  $t_{obtained}$  is higher than  $t_{critical}$ , the null hypothesis is rejected which means that there is a significant difference between the students' last draft scores of the experimental group and the control group. Meanwhile, if  $t_{obtained}$  is lower than  $t_{critical}$ , the null hypothesis is accepted which means that there is no significant difference between the students' last draft scores of the experimental and the control groups.

#### 3.5.3.5. Non Parametric Statistic Test: Wilcoxon Test

The first draft scores were not normally distributed and not homogenous so non parametric statistic test for dependent (matched) samples was used (Coolidge, 2000). It was aimed to see whether or not there was a significant difference in the mean of the first draft and the last draft scores of each group (Coolidge, 2000). The steps are below:

1. Setting the hypothesis:
  - $H_0$ = there is no significant difference between the first draft score and the last draft score.
  - $H_a$ = there is a significant difference between the first draft score and the last draft score.
2. Setting  $\alpha = 0.05$ .
3. Analyzing data by using Wilcoxon test in 16 for Windows.

- The null hypothesis is accepted if Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)  $> 0.05$  or  $Z_{\text{obtained}} > -Z_{\text{critical}}$
- The null hypothesis is rejected if Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)  $< 0.05$  or  $Z_{\text{obtained}} < -Z_{\text{critical}}$

### 3.5.3.6. Normalized Gain

Normalized gain is aimed to measure the level of improvement in the means from the first draft score and the last draft score of each group after (Meltzer, 2002). According to Meltzer (2002), normalized gain ( $g$ ) is categorized into three categories, namely low, medium, and high. If value of  $g$  is smaller than 0.3, it is categorized as low gain. If value of  $g$  is smaller than 0.7, it is categorized as medium gain. Furthermore, if value of  $g$  is equal or bigger than 0.7 so it is categorized as high gain. The formula of normalized gain can be seen in Appendix F.

### 3.5.3.7. Effect Size

The calculation of the effect size was conducted by using  $t_{\text{obtained}}$  from the sample independent t-test of last draft. The effect size formula by Coolidge (2000) that can be found in Appendix F was used to determine the effect significance of the treatments to the experimental group.

In addition, Coolidge (2000) interprets the magnitude of the effect size into three categories, namely, small, medium, and large. The effect size is small if value of effect size is equal or smaller than 0.100. The effect size is medium if value of effect size is equal or smaller than 0.243. In addition, the effect size can be called large if value of effect size is equal or bigger than 0.371.

### 3.5.4. Data Analysis on Questionnaires

Data analysis on questionnaires was aimed to discover students' responses toward the use of teacher indirect feedback in improving students' recount writing. The data from questionnaires were analyzed based on the frequency of students' answer. The result would be calculated and interpreted into percentage by using formula from Sudijono (2008) as in Appendix F.

### 3.6 Concluding Remark

This chapter has presented a brief discussion of methodology related aspects of the study, including samples of the study, research method, data collection, data analysis, and research procedure. The next chapter focuses on description of the research findings from the statistical computation in SPSS 16 for Windows and from questionnaires. It also presents discussions of research findings.