

Improving Students' Discussion Text Writing Through the Teacher's Indirect Feedback Technique at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong MAS

Annisa Rizkika Ala'la^{1*}, Lilik Purwaningsih², Endang Kurniati³

¹⁻³ Universitas Doktor Nugroho Magetan

*Corresponding email: rizkikaanisa253@gmail.com^{1*}, lilikpurwaningsih@udn.ac.id²,
endahkurtianti@udn.ac.id³

Abstract: This study aimed to describe the implementation of the teacher's indirect feedback technique and examine its effectiveness in improving ninth-grade students' discussion text writing skills at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas. This Classroom Action Research (CAR) was conducted in two cycles involving 14 students. Data were collected through writing tests, classroom observations, interviews, and documentation. The findings showed that the mean writing score improved from 57.6 in the preliminary study to 68.9 in Cycle I and 80.3 in Cycle II, with most students achieving the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC). Observations revealed that students became more active, confident, and independent in identifying and correcting writing errors. Interviews confirmed that students relied less on direct correction and effectively used feedback symbols to revise their work. Overall, the teacher's indirect feedback technique effectively improved students' discussion text writing skills while fostering learner autonomy, active participation, and confidence during the revision process.

Keywords: Indirect Feedback, Writing, Discussion Text, CAR

INTRODUCTION

In today's digital era, English has moved from being a foreign language to a key tool for digital literacy and global information access. As a world language, English has become a crucial medium for the exchange of knowledge and technology at the international level. English proficiency gives individuals a competitive advantage in participating in global discourse, where effective communication skills are a standard competency in the 21st century. Therefore, the Indonesian education curriculum makes English a compulsory subject, aiming to equip students with comprehensive communication skills.

In the language teaching process, there are four language skills that are integrated with each other, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These four skills are categorized into receptive and productive skills. The integration of these four skills is very important because mastery of one aspect will support the other aspects reciprocally (Janzakovna, 2025). However, among these four skills, writing remains the biggest challenge for students. Writing is not just a linguistic activity but also involves complex neuro-cognitive processes to produce meaningful and structured texts in accordance with applicable rhetorical norms.

Writing is one of the most complex language skills in English language learning. Ideally, writing should not be taught by merely emphasizing theory and memorization, but should be contextualized practically (Yarmi, 2017).

At the junior high school level, one type of text that students must master based on the curriculum is the discussion text. A discussion text is a type of text that provides two contrasting arguments on a topic and allows readers to have two contrasting points of view (Putra, 2021). This text trains students to think critically by presenting two different perspectives (pros and cons) on a particular issue. However, the reality in the field shows that writing discussion texts is often a burden for students at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas. Based on initial observations, many students struggle to construct coherent arguments, select appropriate vocabulary, and apply correct grammar.

This problem is further exacerbated by the feedback strategies commonly applied in classroom practice. Teachers tend to employ direct feedback, in which students' errors are corrected immediately by the teacher. Although this approach is efficient in terms of time, it often leads to student passivity, as learners tend to copy the corrections without fully

understanding the nature of their mistakes. Consequently, similar errors are likely to recur in subsequent writing tasks.

Previous studies have generally examined feedback strategies in writing instruction. However, limited attention has been given to the implementation of teacher indirect feedback in improving students' discussion text writing at the junior secondary school level, particularly within the framework of Classroom Action Research. Therefore, this study focuses on improving students' ability to write discussion texts through the application of teacher indirect feedback at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas.

To address this issue, an approach that enhances students' linguistic awareness is required, namely the indirect feedback technique. Indirect feedback refers to feedback provided after the completion of a task or test, in which errors are not corrected directly but are indicated using symbols or codes (Slamet, 2020). In this technique, teachers do not provide the correct answers directly but instead mark the incorrect parts with symbols or codes. This forces students to engage cognitively in identifying, thinking about, and correcting their own mistakes independently.

The application of indirect feedback is expected to create a more student-centered learning process. By finding solutions to their own mistakes, students' understanding of the structure of discussion texts and linguistic rules was more deeply ingrained in the long term.

Based on this urgency, the researcher is interested in conducting classroom action research with the title: "Improving Students' Discussion Text Writing Through the Teacher's Indirect Feedback Technique at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas."

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Writing Skills

Language skills are divided into two categories: written and spoken language. The study of written language, whose components consist of reading and writing skills, is a basic skill taught from the early grades of elementary school. Writing skills are one type of language skills that students must master. Many experts have expressed their understanding of writing.

According to Saleh Abbas, writing skills are the ability to express ideas, opinions, and feelings to others in writing. The accuracy of the language must support the accuracy of expressing ideas used, vocabulary, grammar, and spelling. Basically, writing is a complex and challenging task, requiring a considerable amount of instructional time to master (Graham, 2019).

Writing is the act of creating letters with a pen, or it can also be interpreted as giving birth to thoughts and feelings through writing. In this writing activity, the writer must be skilled in utilizing graphology, language structure, and vocabulary. Writing is influenced by other productive skills, such as speaking and receptive skills, namely reading and listening, as well as understanding vocabulary, diction, sentence effectiveness, spelling, and punctuation (Mayrita & Darma, 2020).

Writing skills are a prerequisite for engaging in various fields or activities. This implies the importance of writing skills and abilities in everyday life. Writing is also one of the language skills used in indirect communication. Through writing activities, students are guided to be able to communicate using written language.

Writing is a complex activity because writers are required to be able to organize and group the content of their writing and express it in written language. However, only a few students enjoy writing. Writing is an important activity in learning after reading, because when someone writes, they have a message to convey (Sidabutar, 2021).

Writing proficiency is a crucial skill for EFL learners because effective writing facilitates clear communication, enabling readers to grasp concepts and justifications accurately (Wati & Trisusana, 2024). Furthermore, teaching English writing at the junior high school level presents

specific challenges, including students' poor grammatical competence, insufficient vocabulary knowledge, and limited engagement in writing tasks (Amalia et al., 2021). In the EFL context, writing instruction requires not only attention to linguistic accuracy but also to the development of students' critical thinking and self-expression through structured text types (Phetsangkhad et al., 2022). Additionally, research highlights that improving writing skills requires consistent practice, appropriate instructional strategies, and meaningful feedback from teachers to help students become more independent and confident writers (Moses & Mohamad, 2019).

Writing is recognized as a multicomponent skill encompassing grammar, vocabulary, coherence, cohesion, and genre awareness, all of which must be explicitly taught and consistently practiced in the EFL classroom (Mutiaraningrum & Nugroho, 2020). Moreover, the process-genre approach to writing instruction shows significant promise in helping students internalize the structural and linguistic features of different text types, including discussion texts, while simultaneously promoting revision skills and metacognitive awareness (Nurfaidah et al., 2017). Additionally, research confirms that self-regulated writing strategies, when combined with meaningful teacher feedback, significantly enhance students' writing autonomy and accuracy across successive drafts (Umamah et al., 2022).

Discussion Text

In the learning process, students' understanding of the material being discussed is very important, as understanding the content of the material makes it easier for students to absorb the information being conveyed. However, students do not always understand the learning material immediately, as comprehension develops gradually through the learning process. Sometimes students face several obstacles, which is where discussion texts play an important role in making it easier for teachers to deliver lessons.

The selection of discussion texts is based on the understanding that in learning discussion texts, students become familiar with issues in discussion texts that discuss a topic from two arguments, namely the pro argument and the con argument. A discussion text is defined as a collection of paragraphs containing issues or agendas to be discussed in a meeting or conference in order to find solutions (Indariawan, 2022).

Feedback Strategy

There is one thing in the process of education or learning at school that is one of the most important aspects for obtaining maximum results from student learning achievements and fostering a positive attitude towards the learning process, namely, the issue of feedback in learning. Feedback in the learning process is a form of communication between teachers and students, as well as between students and themselves, which is integrated.

In relation to learning, Imroni said that feedback is any information, process, or activity carried out to accelerate student learning based on comments related to the results of student development assessments.

Tulgan argues that feedback is a form of reactive communication, which is a response to various types of actions or input. Feedback is described as a process of identifying the gap between desired and actual performance, providing ways for students to resolve or eliminate that gap (Haryoko, 2015). Teachers usually provide feedback on assignments, exercises, daily tests, learning efforts, mastery of a skill, and so on, which have been attempted by students. Feedback can be in the form of rewards for learning outcomes that they have done/achieved well. It can also be in the form of criticism that builds motivation to learn and improves the process or achievement of learning outcomes.

The benefits of providing feedback can boost students' self-confidence. They can realize their strengths and weaknesses because of the feedback they receive. Bloxham and Boy argue that the key principle of feedback is that it is useful when it informs students about ways to improve their performance. Meaningful feedback can develop confidence and increase student motivation (Haryoko, 2015).

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on problems found among students at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas, where their ability to write discussion texts is still relatively low. The main issues are students' difficulty in organizing balanced arguments that weigh the pros and cons, as well as numerous grammatical errors and repeated vocabulary. Until now, the feedback approach has tended to be direct, with teachers correcting students' mistakes immediately. This causes students to become passive and prevents them from thinking critically to understand their own mistakes, thereby hindering the transfer of knowledge in writing.

To address this problem, the researcher proposes using the Teacher's Indirect Feedback technique. In this technique, teachers do not directly provide corrections; instead, they mark, symbolize, or code the parts of students' writing that are incorrect. This process serves as a stimulus for students to actively engage in more in-depth cognitive activities. When students encounter these codes, they are required to recall the grammatical rules and discussion text structures they have learned and to make corrections themselves (self-correction).

Through the consistent application of indirect feedback techniques, it is hoped that there was significant changes in the quality of students' writing at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas. By being directly involved in the revision process, students will not only improve their linguistic accuracy but also better understand how to construct a coherent discussion text structure.

METHOD

This study employed Classroom Action Research (CAR) using both qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative data were used to describe students' responses, classroom interactions, and the implementation process of the teacher's indirect feedback technique, while the quantitative data were obtained from students' writing scores to measure the improvement in their discussion text writing ability. Classroom Action Research was selected because it focuses on solving practical problems in the classroom through systematic actions conducted in repeated cycles consisting of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting (Mekarisce, 2019).

The research was conducted at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas, East Lepak, East Sakra District, from April 2026 to May 2026. The subjects of this study were ninth-grade students, consisting of 14 students in one class.

This study was conducted collaboratively and participatively by following the Classroom Action Research cycle model developed by Kemmis and McTaggart, which consists of four stages: planning, acting, observing, and reflecting (Machali, 2017). Through these repeated cycles, the researcher was able to identify students' writing difficulties, evaluate the implementation of the teacher's indirect feedback technique, and measure the improvement of students' ability in writing discussion texts.

The data collection technique in this study was carried out systematically through several procedures to ensure the accuracy of the information obtained, including: (1) written test consisting of a pre-test and a post-test to measure students' initial abilities and improvements in their ability to compose discussion texts after the indirect feedback technique is applied; (2) observation conducted directly in the classroom using observation sheets to record all student activities and teacher behavior during the teaching and learning process; (3) interview with students to explore their subjective perceptions, the difficulties they face in interpreting feedback codes, and the psychological impact of these techniques on their confidence in writing; and (4) documentation by collecting students' written work from the initial draft to the final draft, as well as field notes.

The writing assessment in this study employed an analytical rubric as the main scoring instrument. An analytical rubric is a scoring framework that evaluates students' writing performance by dividing it into several distinct components, allowing each aspect to be

assessed separately (Phetsangkhad et al., 2022). This type of rubric is widely used in second language writing assessments because it provides more detailed diagnostic information compared to a holistic assessment.

The rubric used in this study consisted of five key components, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. These components are widely recognized as fundamental indicators of writing quality and have been consistently applied in recent studies on EFL writing assessment (Phetsangkhad et al., 2022). The use of an analytical rubric enables more comprehensive feedback on students' writing performance and ensures a more objective scoring process than holistic assessment methods.

The data analysis technique in this study was conducted using qualitative data analysis to obtain comprehensive conclusions. Qualitative data analysis was conducted using an interactive model consisting of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing (Widiyanti & Irsyad, 2025). In the data reduction stage, researchers sort and summarize the results of observations, interviews, and field notes to focus on important aspects related to student responses to teacher feedback. Next, the data is presented in the form of a logical descriptive narrative to illustrate the development of the student writing revision process and the effectiveness of the correction codes used. Finally, conclusions are drawn based on consistent patterns in the data to assess the effectiveness of the indirect feedback technique in improving students' writing skills.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study was conducted at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas. The school was established in 2021 and is classified as a newly developing educational institution. Although relatively new, the school already has several facilities that support the teaching and learning process, such as classrooms, a teachers' lounge, the principal's office, a library, and other supporting facilities.

The subjects of this study were ninth-grade students, consisting of 14 students in one class. Based on preliminary observations conducted before the intervention, the researcher found that students still struggled with writing discussion texts. Most students had difficulty organizing their ideas, using proper grammar, selecting vocabulary, and applying correct punctuation and spelling. Additionally, students tended to rely on the teacher's corrections and showed low participation during the revision process.

English teachers generally use direct feedback when correcting students' writing. In this technique, teachers immediately correct students' errors without giving them the opportunity to identify and revise their own mistakes. As a result, students become passive during the writing process and repeatedly make similar mistakes in subsequent writing assignments. Therefore, the researcher applied a technique of indirect feedback from the teacher to improve students' ability to write discussion texts.

To identify students' initial writing abilities, the researcher administered a pre-intervention writing test. The results indicated that most students had not yet reached the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC).

Table 1. Students' Preliminary Writing Scores

No	Students	Score	Category
1	AF	55	Poor
2	AA	58	Poor
3	IG	52	Poor
4	IH	60	Fair
5	MH	57	Poor
6	MA	54	Poor

7	NH	61	Fair
8	SK	56	Poor
9	SA	59	Fair
10	MD	53	Poor
11	IA	62	Fair
12	MI	58	Poor
13	AD	55	Poor
14	SL	57	Poor
Mean		57.6	

Based on the preliminary study, the students' average score was 57.6. Most students struggled with grammar, vocabulary, organization, and writing mechanics. Only a few students achieved the minimum passing score. Therefore, the researcher implemented Cycle I by applying indirect feedback techniques from the teacher.

Based on these findings, the researcher concluded that students need alternative feedback techniques that can encourage them to revise and evaluate their own writing independently. Therefore, Classroom Action Research was conducted through the application of indirect feedback techniques by the teacher.

Cycle I

Planning. During the planning phase, the researcher prepared various teaching materials and research instruments needed during the implementation of the intervention. The researcher developed a teaching module related to teaching students how to write discussion texts, prepared teaching materials, writing assignments, observation sheets, and assessment rubrics. In addition, the researcher also prepared indirect feedback symbols to be used to mark students' writing errors. The researchers also coordinated with English teachers regarding the implementation of learning activities in Cycle I

Table 2. Feedback Symbols

Symbol	Meaning
Gr	Grammar
V	Vocabulary
Sp	Spelling
P	Punctuation
Org	Organization (Text Structure)

Acting. The activities in Cycle I were conducted over two sessions. In the first session, the researcher explained the concept, social function, generic structure, and linguistic elements of discussion texts. Next, students were asked to identify the structure of several discussion texts provided by the researcher. In the second session, students were asked to write a discussion text based on a given topic. After the students finished their writing, the researcher provided indirect feedback by marking the students' errors using correction symbols without correcting the errors directly. Students were then asked to identify and revise their errors independently based on the feedback provided. During the implementation of the intervention, most students showed interest in the learning process. However, some students still had difficulty interpreting the feedback symbols and revising their writing independently.

Observing. Based on the observations, some students still have difficulty understanding the teacher's feedback symbols, so they are not yet fully able to identify grammatical errors on their own. Nevertheless, the students continued to respond positively to the use of indirect feedback in writing activities, especially after receiving further explanation of these symbols.

Table 3. Students' Writing Scores in Cycle I

No	Students	Score	Category
1	AF	67	Fair
2	AA	70	Good
3	IG	65	Fair
4	IH	72	Good
5	MH	68	Fair
6	MA	66	Fair
7	NH	74	Good
8	SK	69	Fair
9	SA	71	Good
10	MD	67	Fair
11	IA	73	Good
12	MI	68	Fair
13	AD	66	Fair
14	SL	69	Fair
	Mean	68.9	

The students' writing scores in Cycle I improved compared to the preliminary study. The average score rose from 57.6 to 68.9. Although some students still struggled with grammar and text organization, their participation and ability to revise their writing independently showed improvement.

This finding is supported by the results of an interview with an English teacher who stated: "During the revision process, students become more active because they try to identify their own mistakes before asking the teacher for the correct answer." (Interview with Ms. M, April 27, 2026)

This statement aligns with the experience of one student who shared: "At first I was confused by the feedback symbols, but after the teacher explained them, I was able to revise my own writing." (Interview with student ZW, April 27, 2026)

The results of the observations also showed that student participation in class increased compared to the preliminary study. Students became more active in discussing errors and revising their drafts after receiving indirect feedback from the teacher.

Furthermore, students' writing skills scores in Cycle I showed an improvement compared to the initial conditions. However, there were still some students who had not yet met the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC). Therefore, the researcher decided to proceed to Cycle II.

Reflecting. Based on the reflection conducted after Cycle I, the researcher concluded that the implementation of indirect feedback had a positive impact on students' writing skills. Students began to recognize their own mistakes and made efforts to correct them independently. However, several weaknesses were identified during Cycle I, such as some students still having difficulty understanding the feedback symbols, students' grammatical accuracy remains low, some students lack the vocabulary to develop arguments in discussion texts, and some students remain passive during class discussions. Therefore, in Cycle II, the researcher plans to provide clearer explanations of the feedback symbols, provide more examples of discussion texts, and increase students' writing practice activities.

Cycle II

Planning. In Cycle II, the researcher revised the lesson plan based on reflections from Cycle I. The researcher prepared additional examples of discussion texts and provided more detailed explanations regarding the use of indirect feedback symbols. The researcher also designed more interactive classroom activities to increase student participation during the learning process.

Acting. At this stage, the researcher reviewed the materials related to the discussion text and re-explained the meaning of each feedback symbol. The students were then asked to write another discussion text on their own. After collecting the students' writings, the researcher

again provided indirect feedback by marking errors using specific symbols. Compared to Cycle I, the students demonstrated a better understanding in identifying and correcting their own errors. The students appeared more confident in revising their writing and actively discussed the corrections with their classmates and the teacher.

Observing. Based on the results of interviews conducted after the implementation of Cycle II, teachers stated that the use of the indirect feedback technique had a positive impact on students' writing skills, particularly in writing discussion texts.

Table 4. Students' Writing Scores in Cycle II

No	Students	Score	Category
1	AF	80	Good
2	AA	82	Good
3	IG	78	Good
4	IH	84	Excellent
5	MH	79	Good
6	MA	77	Good
7	NH	86	Excellent
8	SK	81	Good
9	SA	83	Excellent
10	MD	78	Good
11	IA	85	Excellent
12	MI	80	Good
13	AD	79	Good
14	SL	82	Good
	Mean	80.3	

The quantitative findings indicate that the implementation of the teacher's indirect feedback technique successfully improved students' discussion text writing skills. The mean score increased from 68.9 in Cycle I to 80.3 in Cycle II, and almost all students achieved the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC). This improvement demonstrates that the second research problem regarding the effectiveness of the indirect feedback technique in improving students' discussion text writing skills was successfully addressed.

The teacher explained that students began to understand the types of mistakes they made without the teacher having to immediately provide the correct answers. Additionally, the teacher observed an increase in student participation during the learning process.

The English teacher stated:

"In Cycle II, students appeared more active when revising their writing. They no longer simply waited for answers from the teacher but tried to identify and correct errors on their own. Students' understanding of feedback symbols was also much better compared to Cycle I." (Interview with Ms. M, May 4, 2026)

This interview finding confirms the observation results that the teacher implemented the indirect feedback technique systematically by providing coded feedback, encouraging students to identify their own errors, facilitating peer discussion, and guiding students during the revision process instead of providing direct corrections. These findings answer the first research problem concerning how the teacher applied the indirect feedback technique in the classroom.

The teacher's statement was reinforced by the results of interviews with several students. Most students stated that indirect feedback helped them identify errors in their own writing. Students found it easier to correct grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation after receiving a review of the feedback symbols in Cycle II.

One student said:

"Now I better understand the meaning of the teacher's correction symbols, so I can find mistakes in my writing on my own and correct them." (Interview with student AF, May 4, 2026)

Another student also said:

"I've become more confident when writing because I can discuss with my peers and revise my own writing before submitting it again." (Interview with student LT, May 4, 2026)

Additionally, several students noted that learning activities in Cycle II were more engaging and less monotonous due to the inclusion of group discussions and collaborative revision activities. This made students more active throughout the learning process.

The interview findings are consistent with the classroom observation results. During the revision activities, students independently identified grammatical, vocabulary, organizational, and mechanical errors before consulting the teacher. This behavioral change demonstrates that the indirect feedback technique encouraged greater autonomy of learners while improving the quality of discussion text writing. Therefore, both the qualitative evidence (interviews and observations) and the quantitative evidence (writing scores) consistently support the effectiveness of the intervention in answering the second research problem.

Reflecting

Based on the quantitative and qualitative findings obtained in Cycle II, the researcher concluded that both research problems had been successfully solved. First, classroom observations and interview data demonstrated that the teacher implemented the indirect feedback technique through a systematic sequence of providing coded feedback, encouraging self-correction, facilitating classroom discussion, and guiding students during the revision process. Second, the improvement in students' writing scores, as supported by interview and observation findings, confirmed that the indirect feedback technique effectively enhanced students' writing skills in discussion texts. Students demonstrated better grammatical accuracy, richer vocabulary, improved text organization, and greater confidence in revising their own work. Since the research objectives had been achieved and most students met the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC), the Classroom Action Research was concluded after Cycle II.

Discussion

The Implementation of the Teacher's Indirect Feedback Technique in Teaching Discussion Text Writing

The findings of this study indicate that the implementation of the teacher's indirect feedback technique followed a systematic Classroom Action Research (CAR) procedure consisting of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. During the planning stage, the teacher prepared lesson plans, discussion text materials, writing assessment rubrics, and correction symbols representing grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, and organization. These preparations ensured that the feedback process could be implemented consistently throughout the learning activities.

During the acting stage, students were introduced to the structure and language features of discussion texts before completing an individual writing task. Instead of directly correcting students' errors, the teacher marked mistakes using correction symbols. Students were then required to identify and revise their own mistakes based on the codes provided. Classroom observations showed that students initially had trouble interpreting several correction symbols. However, after receiving additional explanations and examples in Cycle II, students became more familiar with the feedback system and demonstrated greater independence during revision activities.

Interview findings also confirmed the observation results. The English teacher explained that students gradually became more active in identifying their own mistakes rather than waiting for direct corrections. Likewise, students stated that the feedback symbols helped them understand their writing errors and encouraged them to revise independently. These qualitative

findings demonstrate that the indirect feedback technique was implemented not merely as an error-marking strategy but as a student-centered learning approach that actively involved learners in the revision process.

These findings answer the first research problem, namely how the teacher applied the indirect feedback technique in teaching discussion text writing. The implementation was characterized by the systematic use of coded feedback, guided self-correction, classroom discussion, and teacher facilitation throughout the writing process.

The findings are consistent with Ferris's theory, which argues that indirect feedback encourages learners to become actively involved in identifying and correcting their own errors, thereby promoting greater learner autonomy in writing (Cho, 2020). (Ekanayaka & Ellis, 2020) explain that corrective feedback contributes significantly to second-language writing development when learners actively engage in the revision process rather than simply receiving ready-made corrections.

The Improvement of Students' Discussion Text Writing Skills through the Teacher's Indirect Feedback Technique

The second research problem examined the extent to which the indirect feedback technique improved students' discussion text writing skills. Quantitative findings demonstrated continuous improvement across each research cycle. The students' mean score increased from 57.6 in the preliminary study to 68.9 in Cycle I and reached 80.3 in Cycle II. By the end of Cycle II, almost all students had achieved the Minimum Passing Criteria (MPC), indicating that the intervention successfully improved students' writing performance.

The improvement was not only reflected in students' scores but also in qualitative changes observed during the learning process. Classroom observations showed that students became increasingly active during revision activities, discussed grammatical problems with their classmates, and showed greater confidence when revising their own work. Students were able to recognize grammatical errors, improve vocabulary selection, organize discussion text structures more effectively, and reduce spelling and punctuation mistakes.

Interview data strengthened these findings. The English teacher reported that students no longer depended on direct corrections but attempted to analyze their own writing before asking for assistance. Students also stated that they had become more confident because they understood the meaning of the correction symbols and could revise their own writing independently. These findings indicate that the indirect feedback technique not only improved students' writing achievement but also enhanced learner autonomy, critical thinking, and active participation throughout the writing process.

The improvement observed in this study covered the five assessment aspects used in the analytical writing rubric, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. As students repeatedly revised their drafts based on coded feedback, they gradually developed greater awareness of linguistic accuracy and discussion text organization, resulting in higher-quality writing products.

These findings answer the second research problem, demonstrating that the teacher's indirect feedback technique effectively improved students' discussion text writing skills both quantitatively and qualitatively.

The findings support Ferris's view that indirect feedback facilitates long-term writing accuracy because students actively participate in identifying and correcting their own mistakes. (Ekanayaka & Ellis, 2020) argue that corrective feedback is most effective when learners engage cognitively in the revision process. Therefore, the results of this Classroom Action Research reinforce previous studies indicating that indirect feedback improves not only writing accuracy but also students' independence during the writing process.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the application of indirect feedback techniques by teachers is effective in improving students' ability to write discussion texts at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas. These techniques were implemented through several stages, namely planning, implementation, observation, and reflection, over two cycles of Classroom Action Research.

During the implementation process, the teacher provided indirect feedback by marking students' errors using symbols and correction codes without directly providing the correct answers. Through this technique, students were encouraged to independently identify, analyze, and revise their own writing errors. As a result, students became more active and engaged during the writing and revision process.

The improvement in students' writing skills is reflected in the increase in their average scores from the preliminary study to Cycle II. In the preliminary study, students' average scores were still low because many students struggled with grammar, vocabulary, organization, and writing mechanics. After the implementation of indirect feedback techniques by the teacher in Cycle I and Cycle II, students showed significant improvement in organizing ideas, using appropriate vocabulary, applying grammatical structures, and revising their writing independently.

In addition, the use of indirect feedback techniques also enhances students' participation, self-confidence, and critical thinking during the learning process. Students become more aware of their writing errors and can make self-corrections more effectively. Therefore, it can be concluded that the teacher's use of indirect feedback techniques successfully improved students' ability to write discussion texts at SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express gratitude to Mrs. Lilik Purwaningsih, M.Pd. as Supervisor I and Mrs. Endang Kurniati, M.Pd. as Supervisor II for their guidance, direction, and support during the research and writing of this article. The author also would like to thank the principal, English teachers, and students of SMP Islam Mahmudi NW Montong Mas who participated in this study.

REFERENCES

- Amalia, H., Abdullah, F., & Fatimah, A. S. (2021). Teaching writing to junior high school students: A focus on challenges and solutions. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 794–810. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.904066>
- Cho, K. Y. (2020). Direct and indirect feedback on accuracy and the effect on complexity and fluency. *The Journal of Mirae English Language and Literature*, 25(4), 121–138. <https://doi.org/10.46449/MJELL.2020.11.25.4.121>
- Ekanayaka, W. I., & Ellis, R. (2020). Does asking learners to revise add to the effect of written corrective feedback on L2 acquisition? *System*, 94, 102341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102341>
- Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 277–303. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821125>
- Haryoko, S. (2015). Efektivitas strategi pemberian umpan balik terhadap kinerja praktikum mahasiswa D-3 jurusan teknik elektronika. *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 1(1), 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v1i1.4194>
- Indariawan, A. (2022). Peningkatan keterampilan membaca teks diskusi berbasis bahan ajar alternatif di kelas IX MTs. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*, 1(2), 203–214. <https://doi.org/10.55909/jpbs.v1i2.28>
- Janzakovna, R. M. (2025). Integrating the four language skills for conducting effective language teaching process. *American Academic Publishers*, 5(2).
- Machali, I. (2017). Bagaimana melakukan penelitian tindakan kelas bagi guru? *Indonesian Journal of Action Research*, 1(2), 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.14421/ijar.2022.12-21>
- Mayrita, H., & Darma, U. B. (2020). Pembelajaran menulis karangan deskripsi siswa sekolah dasar melalui teknik objek langsung. *Jurnal Ilmiah BINA EDUKASI*, 10(1), 23–32.
- Mekarisce, A. A. (2019). Teknik pemeriksaan keabsahan data pada penelitian kualitatif di bidang kesehatan masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan Masyarakat*, 12(3), 145–151.

- <https://doi.org/10.52022/jikm.v12i3.102>
- Moses, R. N., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Challenges faced by students and teachers on writing skills in ESL contexts: A literature review. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2(1), 1–27.
- Mutiaraningrum, I., & Nugroho, A. (2020). Social construction of knowledge in synchronous text-based discussion during English language learning. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 10(2), 315–336. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jeft.v10i2.1934>
- Nurfaidah, S., Lengkanawati, N. S., & Sukyadi, D. (2017). Levels of reflection in EFL pre-service teachers' teaching journal. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 80. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v7i1.6861>
- Phetsangkha, P. K., Phisaiphun, K., Sunanta, P., Wongpakdee, C., Munta, C., & Purnamasari, C. P. (2022). Scoring rubric development of writing assessment for EFL students. *ASEAN Journal of Religious and Cultural Research*, 5(3), 8–12.
- Putra, D. (2021). Penggunaan Google Docs dalam pembelajaran bahasa Inggris materi teks diskusi berkelompok. *LENTERA KARYA: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, Sejarah, dan Humaniora*, 5(2), 125–134.
- Sidabutar, Y. A. (2021). Pengaruh kemampuan berpikir kreatif terhadap kemampuan menulis karangan deskripsi siswa sekolah dasar. *Journal Basicedu*, 5(6), 5379–5385. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v5i6.1658>
- Slamet, S. S. (2020). Hubungan strategi umpan balik (feedback), motivasi berprestasi dan hasil belajar dalam pembelajaran PPKn di SMK. *PINUS: Jurnal Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 5(2), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.29407/pn.v5i2.14539>
- Umamah, A., Khoiri, N. E., Widiati, U., & Wulyani, A. N. (2022). EFL university students' self-regulated writing strategies: The role of individual differences. *Journal of Language and Education*, 8(4), 182–193. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.13339>
- Wati, L. K., & Trisusana, A. (2024). Empowering junior high school students' narrative writing skills through Google Sites. *PANYONARA: Journal of English Education*, 6(1), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.19105/panyonara.v6i1.12470>
- Widiyanti, D., & Irsyad, M. (2025). Implementasi program literasi dalam meningkatkan minat baca siswa kelas 3 Upt Spf Sd Inpres Kantisang Makassar. *FAI UIM*, 6(2), 213–227. <https://doi.org/10.59638/Ninestars.V6i2.695>
- Yarmi, G. (2017). Pembelajaran menulis di sekolah dasar. *Perspektif Ilmu Pendidikan*, 31(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.21009/PIP.311.1>