International Journal of Social Science And Human Research

ISSN (print): 2644-0679, ISSN (online): 2644-0695

Volume 06 Issue 11 November 2023

DOI: 10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i11-02, Impact factor- 6.686

Page No: 6584-6600

The Influence of Formative Feedback and Learning Style Towards the Students' Ability in Narrative Writing an Experimental Study to the Students of Sma Negeri 1 Tibawa



Hasanuddin Fatsah¹, Ester Yunginger², Rasuna Talib³, Sartin Miolo⁴

1,2,3,471. Jenleral sudirman No.6 Kotn Gorontalo 96123, 4NG Gorontalo Indonesia

ABSTRACT: This research investigated the influence of formative feedback strategy and learning style on the narrative writing ability of the Tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa. This research is an experimental study using factorial design, the data were analyzed by using Two-Factor Anova at significance level α 0,05. There were 84 students under investigation, which were determined randomly through multi-stage random sampling. The result of the research indicate that: (1) the narrative writing ability of the students who learned with written feedback formative strategy is higher than those who learned with spoken feedback formative strategy, (2) the narrative writing ability of the students whose visual learning style is higher than those whose auditory learning style, (3) there's influence interaction between formative feedback and learning style toward the students' ability in narrative writing, (4) the narrative writing ability of the students with visual learning style, and learned with written feedback strategy is higher than those who learned with spoken feedback strategy, (5) the narrative writing ability of the students who learned with written feedback strategy, the visual is higher than auditory, (6) the narrative writing ability of the students who learned with spoken feedback strategy, the visual is lower than the auditory.

KEYWORDS: writing ability, formative feedback, learning style.

- Maintained before the Senate Session of Jakarta State University in the context of Doctoral Promotion
- 2 Headmaster of SMAN 1 Tibawa

INTRODUCTION

Background

One of the basic competencies (BCs) of writing that is given at the earlyhigh school education is expressing information in various forms of paragraphs consisting of narrative, descriptive, and expository (Permendiknas No.22, 2006: 261).

Narrative writing is one of the most important parts of the basic competence of narrative writing. This is due to the following factors: (1) narrative writing is the initial material of writing ability in senior high school, (2) knowledge of narrative writing is the basis for writing short stories, essays and criticisms, and reviews, (3) Narrative writers must also be able to describe the actors, events, and settings of the story, (4) the ability to write narration is basic knowledge to understand other types of writing, and (5) BCof narrative writing given in class X is the basis for students to develop advanced writing skills which will be learned in class XI and class XII.

Expected results through learning to write narration, so students are capable to think and understand life, understand the secrets of life, live a wise life, and sharpen new experiences. Writing narrative essays will lead students to have a sense of experience (Marahaimin, 2005: 96).

The explanation above illustrates the importance of narrative writing skills for senior high school students. However, BC of narrative writing is a difficult and complicated material for SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa students. Based on data obtained from Indonesian language teachers in SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa about the grades of students in BC Writing Narration, Description, and Exposition of class X in the 2010/2011: (1) the grade of students for writing narration is at an average value of 67 while for writing descriptions and expositions are at an average value of 70 and 75, (2) students who are incomplete in BC of writing narratives above 50% so that it requires re-learning, whereas students who are incomplete in BC of writing description and exposition under 20% so that it requires only participate in remedial learning individually, (3) the frequency of remedial tests for BC of writing narration up to three times, while in BC of writing description and exposition only once,, (4) Minimal Completeness Criteria (MCC) of BC in writing narration since the last two years did not experience an increase and remained at the standard 67, while MCC in writing the description and exposition at the standard 75.

Based on the results of interviews with Indonesian language teacher in class X, about the difficulties students have in BC of narrative writing skills caused by the following factors:(1)Students do not understand the characteristics of the narrative paragraphs; (2) Students difficult to produced sentences. (3)Students are not enthusiastic and do not have a keenness to write both during learning and doing exercises at home.

Besides that, the low ability to write narration who experienced by students is also caused by teacher factors. According to the results of interviews with Indonesian language teachers in SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa, it is revealed these following. *First*, the teacher does not consistently check the assignments and exercises that students have done. *Second*, The teacher does not return the results of student work. *Third*, The teacher does not provide feedback on students' work, assignments and exercises.

The three things that are explained above are very related to giving feedback to students. Feedback is the provision of information from tests and other measuring instruments to students to improve or improve the achievement of their learning outcomes (Silverius, 1991: 148). Accordingly, the results from Bellon and Blank's research show, compared to a variety of other teaching behaviors, giving feedback turns out to be more correlated with student learning achievement. When feedback is given correctly, it turns out that some students can improve their learning achievement above 20% (Khofifi, 2011: 1).

The description above explains the importance of teacher knowledge about feedback and the importance of feedback applied in learning. In reality, the Indonesian language teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa have implemented feedback in learning.

Applications of feedback that have been implemented by teachers are: (1) feedback is carried out when ending learning that is concluding learning material, (2) feedback is implemented by oral formative, namely providing information after the learning process, (3) teachers are not implementing feedback related to the discussion of assignments and exercises produced by students.

The explanation above explains that the feedback implemented by the teacher is more on oral feedback. In other words, the teacher has not applied verbal feedback in learning. The application of oral feedback in learning has not affected on increasing students' enthusiasm for learning to write. This happens because the feedback given is not by following the characteristics of students and it only uses one type of feedback. Feedback should be adjusted according to the needs of students. Student needs are related to the level of psychological development of students. The teacher must be careful to give feedback for improvement or correction of mistakes made by students.

The application of feedback types that are not adjusted to student characteristics affect feelings of discomfort, pessimism, lack of motivation, or lack of self-esteem because they always get a warning from the teacher. For this reason, student characteristics must receive important attention when the teacher will provide feedback (Khofifi, 2011: 1).

One of the characteristics of students who need to be considered by teachers in providing feedback is student learning styles. Teachers' understanding of student learning styles is very important to determine the *teaching style* or style that is in line with *student learning styles*. Learning styles are the preferred way of carrying out activities of thinking, processing and understanding information(Gunawan, 2003:141).DePorter states that learning styles are a combination of how to absorb, organize, and process information(DePorter, 2009:112).

The above opinion explains the ability of students to understand and absorb the different levels of learning. Some are fast, moderate, but some are very slow. Students often use different ways to understand the same information or lessons. This phenomenon explains that not everyone has the same learning style. Although, students go to school or study at the same grade level.

Some studies show an increase in student academic achievement when learning styles match the learning methods and strategies. *First*, explained by Taufik (2010: 45) learning styles can determine student achievement. If given a strategy following the learning style, students can developed well. *Second*, explained by Amir (2008: 114) students who learn by using learning styles they like will achieve significantly higher grades than if students learn in ways that are not appropriate to their learning styles. *Third*, explained by Gunawan (2003:141) if students use their dominant learning style while working on tests, they will score far higher than if they learn in ways that are not in line with their learning styles. *Fourth*, explained by Prashnig (2007: 153) students have the strength of their learning style which directly influences their achievement. Students' learning abilities will produce performance in the classroom when they understand each other's learning styles.

Following up on the explanation, Arends argues that teachers must realize that their students have different ways of processing information and different learning preferences. Teachers should try to adapt their teaching styles to student learning styles. Students must be helped to develop their learning styles. Students who recognize their learning style will be able to help understand the learning material so that it can improve their learning abilities. Therefore, the teacher must design learning activities that are compatible with various learning styles(Arends, 2008:51).

Different learning styles show the fastest and best way for each individual to absorb information from outside himself. If the teachers understand how the different learning styles of each student, it will easier for the teacher to guide students to find the right learning style and provide maximum results for themselves.

Experts in the science of education try to develop theories about learning styles as a way to find ways to make learning easy and fun. As has been explained that learning requires concentration. Situations and conditions for concentration are closely related to

learning styles. In this case, Deporter categorizes learning styles consisting of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles (DePorter, 2009:112).

Students who have visual learning styles learn through sight, students who have auditory learning styles learn through the sense of hearing, while students who have kinesthetic learning styles learn by moving, working, and touching. Based on Brown (2008: 138) the most successful learners are those who utilize visual and auditory input.

In connection with language learning, Dornyei argues, in general, the learning style used by language teachers in language learning is related to sensory preferences namely visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learning styles (Dornyei, 2005: 139).

Based on the explanation above, the researcher examines the learning style of the DePoter & Hernacki model, which focuses on the dimensions of the visual and auditory learning styles. This is based on the learning treatment that will be given to students who condition the environment using a written formative feedback strategy and an oral formative feedback strateg. This research was formulated with the title "The Influence of Formative Feedback and Learning Style Towards The Students' Ability In Narrative Writing (An Experimental Study to the Students of SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa Academic Year 2011/2012¹)."

PROBLEM FORMULATION

Based on the background, the following problems can be formulated.

- 1. Is there a difference in the ability to write narratives between groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategies and groups of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies?
- 2. Are there differences in narrative writing skills between groups of students who have visual learning styles and groups of students who have auditory learning styles?
- 3. Is there an interaction effect between formative feedback strategies and learning styles on the ability to write narration?
- 4. In the group of students who have a visual learning style, is there a difference in the ability to write narratives between students learning with written formative feedback strategies and students learning with oral formative feedback strategies?
- 5. In the group of students who have an auditory learning style, is there a difference in the ability to write narratives between students learning with written formative feedback strategies and students learning with oral formative feedback strategies?
- 6. In groups of students learning with written formative feedback strategies, are there differences in narrative writing skills between students who have visual learning styles and students who have auditory learning styles?
- 7. In the group of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies, are there differences in narrative writing skills between students who have a visual learning style and students who have an auditory learning style?

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Definition of Narrative Writing Ability

Ability is the capability or capacity of a person to master a skill that is innate from birth, the result of practice, and is used to do something that is demonstrated through his actions. Writing ability is also influenced by intellectual abilities and physical abilities. In this case, Akhadiah (1991: 1) argues, the basic requirements of writing are knowledge of the contents of the essay, and aspects of language and writing techniques. This is reinforced by Rofiudin (1996: 17) who explains the ability to write involves aspects of the use of spelling, the ability to use vocabulary (diction), sentences and composition

Djago Tarigan and Nugriyantoro focus more on the ability to write on aspects of visual symbols and aspects of writing. Based on this opinion it is concluded, the ability to write requires 2 (two) important things, namely:(1) linguistic aspects; (2) aspects of knowledge about the characteristics of writing. The linguistic aspect is related to spelling and paragraph breaking. Aspects of knowledge about the contents of the writing related to the characteristics and features of the writing to be written. One of the goals of writing as expressed above is to tell what happened as narrative writing. The term narration is often also called a narrative derived from the English words narration (story) and narrative (storyteller).. (Brockmeier, 2001: 41).

Thahar (2008: 51) explains narration is a story based on the sequence of events or occurrences experienced by a character and the setting of the place, time, and atmosphere. According to this opinion, perfect narratives have events, figures, settings, and conflicts. The opinion above explains that the main elements in a narrative are the character of the story, the setting of the story, and the time sequence (plot).

Based on the description above, it is concluded that the ability to write narration is the ability of students to express messages, ideas, opinions, and feelings through written language by including aspects of events experienced by characters, settings, storylines, supported by the use of spelling, vocabulary, and cohesion and coherent which is the potential that is brought from birth or the result of training or practice.

1. Formative Feedback Strategy

According to Senjaya (2008: 23), learning strategy is a learning activity that must be done by teachers and students so that educational goals can be achieved effectively and efficiently. Learning strategies are plans and ways to bring learning so that all basic principles can be implemented and all learning objectives can be achieved effectively.

One learning strategy is giving feedback. Siverius argues feedback is the provision of information obtained from tests or other measuring instruments to students to improve or enhance the achievement of learning outcomes (1991: 9). Silverius provides examples of measuring feedback tools such as homework and other questions and assignments given by the teacher in class. Feedback like this is called formative feedback.

Based on these explanations, it was concluded that feedback is the behavior of the teacher to help each student who has difficulty learning individually by responding to the work of students so that they are more masterful of the material delivered by the teacher.

In this research, the formative feedback strategies used by teachers to improve narrative writing skills are written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies. The written formative feedback strategy is the giving of explanations to student learning outcomes by the teacher by writing to the notes of student work on formative tests. The verbal formative feedback strategy is giving comments on learning outcomes through oral explanations to students based on student work on formative tests.

2. The Nature of Learning Styles

Each student has different learning styles in terms of strengths, characteristics, and preferences in receiving information. Learning style is a consistent way carried out by students in capturing information, how to remember, think, and solve problems (Nasution, 2003: 94). Gunawan explained, learning style is the preferred way by everyone in carrying out activities of thinking, processing, and understanding information (2003: 139). Meanwhile, Brown explained that learning styles are the way students interact, respond, and capture information from the learning environment. The process of absorption of information can be through cognitive, physical, and affective (2008: 182).

Based on the explanation above, it is concluded that learning styles are preferences (individual choices) regarding the most efficient way of receiving information, processing information, and remembering information obtained from the learning environment.

Some students who are visually oriented are inclined to like tables, pictures, and graphic information. they remember the best thing by seeing something. Auditory students are those who generally learn best by listening. They usually want to learn through lectures, discussions, and reading aloud. They remember well through hearing or say loud things. Meanwhile, kinesthetic students learn best through touching, feeling, and experiencing what they are trying to learn. They remember best by writing or physically manipulating information (Areands, 2008: 51). A detailed explanation of the three learning styles above will be presented by DePorter, Malahayati, Taufik, Windura, and Brown.

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Groups of Students Learning with Written Formative Feedback Strategies and Groups of Students Learning with Oral Formative Feedback Strategies

Quality narrative writing must meet the narrative structure. To produce quality narrative writing, interaction between the teacher and students is needed. One form of interaction is to provide feedback on writing exercises conducted by students. Feedback functions to stimulate students to improve their writing so that their writing skills will be better.

Giving feedback is done in two ways, namely (1) oral formative feedback, and (2) written formative feedback. The verbal formative feedback strategy does not provide an increase in student academic achievement for several reasons. *First*, teachers are limited by time. Providing verbal feedback with direct contact between students and teachers will take quite a lot of time. Meanwhile, if implemented outside of school hours requires an agreement between the teacher and students about when and where writing learning activities take place. *Second*, psychological factors of students. Formative oral feedback classically by pointing out students' mistakes in front of other students, creates student psychological pressure. This needs to be avoided in the learning process. *Third*, the conducive situation in the classroom determines the effectiveness of verbal formative feedback. Therefore, verbal formative feedback strategies are not responded to optimally by students. This resulted in students not knowing the progress of their writing skills.

The written formative feedback strategy is one alternative to overcome the deficiencies in the oral formative feedback strategy as described above. The advantages of written formative feedback strategies are supported by the following factors *First*, the written formative feedback strategy is more suitable for high school students. At the Middle School level, students can already understand the purpose of information through reading. The power of writing feedback strategies is to guide students to become independent individuals. With written formative feedback students can assess their weaknesses and abilities, while simultaneously being able to gradually assess their learning outcomes. This happens because students individually correct errors and confirm the superiority of their writing. The intensity of the frequency of writing feedback makes students trained and further reduces errors made. *Second*, written formative feedback strategies can make time effective. Teachers can provide corrections and confirmations in classics that

are done together with corrections to the assignments of each student. Individual guidance is even more effective in written feedback because the teacher can provide detailed feedback on the writing of each student and be returned simultaneously. The written formative feedback strategy provided by the teacher can be used as a guide by students to improve their writing during the learning process or outside of learning hours. *Third*, what is very important in written formative feedback strategies is the psychological factors of students. Students do not need to feel pressured because the teacher calls his name in front of the class by pointing out mistakes that have been made on an assignment. Thus, students are better protected from shame if they make mistakes in doing assignments. By protecting the psychological factors of students, they are expected to learn comfortably without feeling depressed.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between students who learn with written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies. Thus, it can be assumed that the writing ability of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies.

2. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Groups of Students Who Have Visual Learning Styles and Groups of Students Who Have Auditory Learning Styles

The writing ability of students will be honed if intensive training is done. One factor that teachers must pay attention to in providing training is the characteristics of student learning styles. This is very necessary because the learning process that pays attention to student learning styles will increase student learning achievement. Learning styles are preferences (individual choices) regarding the most efficient way of receiving, processing, and remembering information obtained from the learning environment. Learning style arises in someone, because of the potential or dominant impulse in him that is influenced by environmental factors, habits, science, and technology.

For students who have an auditory learning style, they tend to learn better by listening. They enjoy listening to what other people say. The characteristics of learning models such as these place hearing as the primary means of obtaining information or knowledge. In this case, students must listen, can remember, and understand the information received. The characteristics of auditory students are that when they work they like to talk to themselves, are easily distracted by noise, learn by listening, and remember what is discussed rather than seen. Therefore, for students who have an auditory learning style, it is better to learn by learning by using verbal formative feedback strategies. With the ability to listen to verbal instructions, the ability to write narrative auditory students will improve well, when compared with giving written feedback.

Meanwhile, students who have visual learning styles tend to receive the best and most effective information when using the sense of sight. Students who have a visual learning style obtain information better when given in the visual form. Therefore, students with this learning style tend to choose to learn to read and use schemes to make information more interesting. Visual students can practice writing narration through written guidance and feedback. With the details explained by the teacher in written formative feedback, students can visually determine narrative writing competence.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between groups of students who have visual learning styles and groups of students who have auditory learning styles. So, it is suspected that the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style.

3. Effect of Interaction between Formative Feedback Strategies and Learning Styles on Students' Ability to Write

Formative feedback can be given in writing and verbally. Written formative feedback strategies are provided by providing rubric cover sheet notes or assignments. There are some advantages of written formative feedback strategies. *First*, students can check directly the results of written notes given by the teacher on any feedback that is on student work. *Second*, students can reconfirm written formative feedback when things are unclear. *Third*, written formative feedback can help students choose and use specific vocabulary based on the written formative feedback provided by the teacher. *Fourth*, there is an emphasis on words prioritized in each written formative feedback that helps students develop their main ideas further. *Fifth*, written formative feedback is done directly to the work of students who have problems making it easier for them to make improvements.

Oral formative feedback can be given by: (1) on the student's learning bench during learning, (2) on the teacher's desk, by calling on students who are given feedback, (3) scheduling outside the classroom after school. The advantages of an oral formative feedback strategy include the following. First, there is direct oral formative feedback where students must be prepared to be directly listening to the feedback from the teacher. If there is anything unclear, it can be immediately asked directly to the teacher who provided feedback. Second, oral formative feedback can be done directly when observing students. If somethings are unclear and need help, the teacher can directly provide oral formative feedback to students. Third, oral formative feedback can be immediately

completed while working on assignments at the student's desk. *Fourth*, students can immediately receive feedback during the process of carrying out assignments or work in class.

In terms of student learning styles, written formative feedback is better used for students who have a visual learning style. Students who have a visual learning style tend to receive the best and most effective information using the sense of sight. Students who have a visual learning style obtain information better when given in the visual form. Therefore, students with this learning style tend to choose to learn to read and use schemes to make information more interesting. Visual students can practice writing narration through written guidance and feedback. With the details explained by the teacher in written formative feedback students can visually determine narrative writing competence. With written formative feedback, visual students can improve their learning achievement.

Meanwhile, oral formative feedback is better used for students who have an auditory learning style. Students who have an auditory learning style tend to learn better by listening. They like listening to what other people say. The characteristics of learning models such as these place hearing as the primary means of obtaining information or knowledge. In this case the child must listen, then he can remember and understand the information received. The characteristics of auditory students are like talking to themselves, being easily distracted by noise, learning by listening and remembering what is discussed rather than being seen. With oral formative feedback, auditory students can improve their learning achievement.

The interaction between formative feedback that is tailored to students' continuous and consistent learning styles can improve students' writing abilities. Writing ability is not just obtained by students but requires knowledge and intensive training processes. In the learning process, the teacher needs to use methods and tactics that are appropriate to the student's characteristics. Learning tricks and tactics can be in the form of consistent formative feedback. For that, the teacher needs to know about student learning styles. By knowing students' learning styles, teachers can receive and determine the learning strategies used.

Based on the explanation above, it can be stated that there is an influence of interaction between formative feedback strategies and learning styles on students' narrative writing abilities.

4. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Students Who Learn with Written Formative Feedback Strategies and Students Who Learn with Oral Formative Feedback Strategies in Groups of Students Who Have Visual Learning Styles

Students who have a visual learning style tend to be used to analyzing information if explained in writing. In learning, visual students easily learn information by reading. That is, the information given to visual students is easier for students to understand if the teacher explains through words that are specified in writing by the teacher.

Characteristics of students who have a visual learning style are very suitable if in learning using formative feedback in writing. That is, with written formative feedback, visual participants are strong enough to improve their writing skills. To implement written formative feedback strategies, the teacher is tasked with explaining in writing things that are not clear and have been well implemented by students.

Another case of the verbal formative feedback strategy. This activity emphasizes the ability of students to discover in detail the weaknesses and strengths of their writing through the verbal engraving of the teacher. The verbal formative feedback strategy requires students to be ready to listen to the feedback in detail and concentration. Therefore, for students who do not have a good concentration to listen to verbal explanations, giving feedback does not affect improving their learning achievement.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between students who learn with written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies on groups of students who have visual learning styles. That is, it is suspected that the ability to write narratives of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies, on groups of students who have a visual learning style.

5. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Students Who Learn with Written Formative Feedback Strategies and Students Who Learn with Oral Formative Feedback Strategies in Groups of Students Who Have an Auditory Learning Style

Auditory students have characteristics that tend to receive information verbally. Auditory students prefer to receive information through speech and through hearing in the form of lectures and oral. Auditory students are easier to remember what is heard than what is read.

Characteristics of students who have an auditory learning style are very suitable if in learning using oral formative feedback. That is, with oral formative feedback, auditory students can improve their writing skills. Oral formative feedback has the characteristics that teacher comments are more dominant through oral explanations.

Meanwhile, written feedback has the characteristics that students can directly check the written notes given by the teacher for any feedback that is on the student's work. Written formative feedback requires students' ability to read in detail the explanations given by the teacher. If the details of the teacher's explanation are not found by students, then giving feedback does not function optimally. Written formative feedback requires a high understanding of students who like getting information by reading. Therefore,

for students who are not concentrated on obtaining information by reading, written formative feedback does not give a good influence on improving their learning achievement.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between students who study with written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies on groups of students who have auditory learning styles. So that, it is suspected that the ability to write narratives of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is lower than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies, on groups of students who have auditory learning styles.

6. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Students who Have a Visual Learning Style and Students who Have an Auditory Learning Style in a Group of Students Learning with a Written Formative Feedback Strategy

The written formative feedback strategy has the characteristic that students can check directly the written notes given by the teacher for any feedback available on students' work. Written formative feedback strategies require students' ability to read in detail the explanations given by the teacher. Written formative feedback strategies require a high understanding of students who like getting information by reading. Therefore, for students who are not concentrated on obtaining information by reading, written formative feedback does not give a good influence on improving their learning achievement.

Characteristics of students who have a visual learning style are very suitable if in learning using written formative feedback strategies. Students who have a visual learning style tend to be used to analyzing information if explained in writing. This can happen because the characteristics of students who have a visual learning style easily learn information by reading. That is, the information given to visual students is easier for students to understand if the teacher explains through words that are specified in writing by the teacher.

Therefore, to improve the ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style, learning can be given by using written feedback strategies. That is, with a written formative feedback strategy, students who have a visual learning style are strong enough to improve their ability to write narration. By giving formative feedback in writing, the teacher is in charge of giving written comments about things that are not clear and things that have been well implemented by students.

For students who have an auditory learning style, it is suitable if in learning using an oral formative feedback strategy. That is, with oral formative feedback strategies, the auditory students' writing skills are already strong enough to improve their writing skills. This is because the oral formative feedback strategy has the characteristics that teacher comments are more dominant through verbal explanations.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between students who have visual learning styles and auditory learning styles, on groups of students who learn by using written feedback strategies. That is, it is thought that the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style, on groups of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies.

7. Differences in Narrative Writing Ability between Students who Have a Visual Learning Style and Students who Have an Auditory Learning Style, on Groups of Students who Learn with Oral Formative Feedback Strategies

Formative feedback strategies that are given orally emphasize the ability of students to find details of the strengths and weaknesses in their writing through the teacher's verbal explanation. Oral formative feedback requires students to be ready to listen to the feedback in detail and with full concentration. Therefore, for students who do not have the concentration to listen to verbal explanations, then giving verbal feedback does not affect the improvement in their learning achievement.

Auditory students have characteristics that tend to receive information verbally. Auditory students prefer to receive information through speech and through hearing in the form of lectures and oral. Auditory students are easier to remember what is heard than what is read.

Characteristics of students who have an auditory learning style are very suitable if in learning using an oral formative feedback strategy. That is, with formative feedback given verbally, the auditory students' writing ability is strong enough to improve their writing skills. Oral formative feedback has the characteristics that teacher comments are more dominant through oral explanations.

Meanwhile, students who have a visual learning style are very suitable if in learning using written formative feedback strategies. Students who have a visual learning style tend to analyze information if explained in writing. In learning, visual students easily learn information by reading. That is, the information given to visual students is easier for students to understand if the teacher explains through words that are specified in writing by the teacher.

Based on the description above, it is suspected that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives between groups of students who have visual learning styles and auditory learning styles, on groups of students who learn by using oral formative feedback strategies. That is, it is thought that the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is lower than students who have an auditory learning style, on groups of students who learn by oral formative feedback strategies.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Based on the study of the theory and framework of thinking above, the following research hypotheses can be proposed.

- 1. The ability to write narrative groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategies is higher than groups of students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies.
- 2. The ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style is higher than the group of students who have an auditory learning style.
- 3. There is an interaction effect between providing formative feedback and student learning styles on the ability to write narratives.
- 4. In groups of students who have a visual learning style, the ability to write narrative students who study with written formative feedback strategies is higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies.
- 5. In groups of students who have auditory learning styles, the ability to write narratives of students who learn with a formative written feedback strategy is lower than students who learn with an oral formative feedback strategy.
- 6. In groups of students learning with written formative feedback strategies, the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style.
- 7. In groups of students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies, the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is lower than students who have an auditory learning style.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa Gorontalo Regency in the 2011/2012 Academic Year. This treatment was carried out in the first semester for 12 meetings. The research method used is an experimental method, with the designation of "Factorial Group Design" two categories or factorial 2 x 2. In this design, each independent variable has two levels. Independent variable formative feedback consists of written formative feedback and oral formative feedback. Variable attributes to learning styles consist of visual and auditory learning styles.

The affordable population is class X students of SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa, amounting to 272 people spread over 8 (eight) classes, each class consisting of 34 people. A sampling of this study was carried out by Multistage Random Sampling. Based on the sampling technique, 42 people learned using the written formative feedback strategy, and 42 people learned with the oral formative feedback strategy.

Data collection techniques for narrative writing ability variable measure aspects of (a) the character of the story, (b) the background of the story, (c) the storyline, (d) spelling, and (e) cohesion and coherence. The way of evaluating narrative writing ability is determined by a score of 1 - 5. Data collection techniques for learning style variables are obtained from the questionnaire results to measure aspects of dimensions (1), receive (2), process, and (3) remember information. Statements and scale levels in the form of questionnaires were prepared using the Litkerts scale. To give a score of each statement answered by the respondent with a positive statement, when answering, Always = 4, often = 3, rarely = 2, and never = 1.

Data Analysis Techniques are done in two ways, namely by analyzing the description and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis is carried out by finding the average value, standard deviation, frequency distribution, median, mode, and making a bar histogram from the ability to write narration.

The inferential analysis aims so that the research results can be drawn from testing conclusions and generalizations.

The inferential analysis used is the normality test, the population variance homogeneity test, the two-way (2 x 2) variance analysis (ANAVA) test, and the F test at a significant level of 0.05, and the follow-up test using the Tuckey test.

Testing the hypothesis in this study, using the 2-way Variance Analysis (ANAVA 2×2) strategy with the F test at a significance level of α 0.05. Anava is used to find out whether or not there are differences between the two independent variables, while each independent variable is divided into several groups. If the analysis found that there is an interaction effect, then proceed with the Tuckey Test. Tuckey's test aims to test the generalization ability (significance) of research results in the form of a comparison of the two variables.

Before using ANAVA, the analysis requirements test must first be done which includes the normality test and homogeneity variance test. Testing the normality of the data using the Lilliefors test while testing the homogeneity of the variance used the Bartlett test (Sudjana, 1989: 450).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Description

No	Group	Max Score	Min Score	Mean	Мо	Me	S	Si
1.	$\mathbf{A_1}$	24	06	14,640	14,500	14,590	4,236	17,942
2.	\mathbf{A}_2	19	07	12,640	12,100	12,330	3,159	9,977
3.	B ₁	24	07	15,930	17,500	15,700	4,113	16,918
4.	\mathbf{B}_2	19	06	12,600	12,270	12,420	3,222	10,382

5.	A_1B_1	24	11	17,860	18,650	18,330	3,355	11,257
6.	A_1B_2	17	06	11,930	12,000	12,000	2,991	8,948
7.	A_2B_1	18	07	12,450	12,000	12,330	2,914	8,490
8.	A_2B_2	19	09	13,261	14,390	15,071	3,367	11,333

Test Data Analysis Requirements Normality test

Testing the normality of this data is done through the Liliefors Test with α 0.01. The testing criterion is, reject the null hypothesis (that the population is normally distributed) if the L₀ obtained from observational data is greater than the L_{table}, in other cases, the null hypothesis is accepted. In this case, eight data groups were tested for distribution normality using the Liliefors test at a significance level $\alpha = 0.01$.

Group ofData	n	L_0	L _{tabel} 0,01	Conclusion
A_1	42	0,0794	0,591	Normal
A_2	42	0,1396	0,591	Normal
B_1	42	0,0907	0,591	Normal
B_2	42	0,1225	0,591	Normal
A_1B_1	21	0,1635	0,225	Normal
A_1B_2	21	0,0774	0,225	Normal
A_2B_1	21	0,1407	0,225	Normal
A_2B_2	21	0,1585	0,225	Normal

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the eight data groups used in this study tend to be normally distributed. This is evident from the results of tests that show that $L_0 < L_{table}$ at $\alpha = 0.05$.

Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity of the Four Data Group Cells

Homogeneity testing of the four treatment groups of this study was carried out through the Bartlett Test, as in the following table.

Table 4.10: Standard Deviation of Data Narrative Writing Capability 4 Cell Groups

Component Count	A ₁ B ₁	A_2B_1	A ₁ B ₂	A_2B_2	Total
Jlh	369	257	251	280	1157
dk = (ni-1)	20	20	20	20	80
1/dk	0,050	0,050	0,050	0,050	0,200
Average	17,571	12,238	11,952	13,333	
Std. Deviation. $=$ (s)	3,355	2,914	2,991	3,367	
Varians = (Si)	11,257	8,490	8,948	11,333	
Log Varians = Log Si	1,051	0,929	0,952	1,054	
dk x Si	225,143	169,810	178,952	226,667	800,571
dk x Log Si	21,029	18,579	19,034	21,087	79,729

The calculation results show that with dk = 80 and alpha = 0.01 obtained $X^2 = 88,379$. Thus X^2 count $< X^2$ table or 0.682 < 88.379 so that it can be concluded that the data variance is homogeneous.

Homogeneity of the Two Data Group Cells

Homogeneity testing of the four treatment groups of 2 groups of data in this study was carried out through the Bartlett Test, which begins with the calculation of the standard deviation of each group as in the following table.

Table 4.11: Standard Deviation of Data Narrative Writing Capability 2 Cell Groups

Componenet Count	Data A ₁	Data A ₂	Data B ₁	Data B ₂
Jlh	620	537	626	531
dk = (ni-1)	41	23	41	23
1/dk11/dk = (ni-1)	0,024	0,043	0,024	0,043
Average	14,762	12,786	14,905	12,643
Std. Deviation = (s)	4,236	3,159	4,113	3,222
Varians = (Si)	17,942	9,977	16,918	10,382
F _{count}	1,789		1,629	

F _{table}	$F_{0,01}(41,41)=2,39$	$F_{0,01}(41,41) = 2,39$
Conclusion	Homogen	Homogen

Because Fcount <Ftable, H0 is accepted, meaning that the data has a homogeneous variance. Furthermore, based on the results of the requirements test, the normality test and the homogeneity test have been proven to meet the requirements, then testing the hypothesis can be done.

Research Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis testing of this study was carried out with the Two Path Variance Analysis strategy (ANAVA 2 x 2). Furthermore, if there is an interaction, then proceed with further tests using the Tuckey test. The reason for the advanced test using the Tuckey test is that the data of the group are as many.

Analysis of two-way variance is a technical calculation (parametric statistics) which aims to investigate two effects, namely the main effect (main effect) and the effect of interaction (interaction effect). The main effect in question is the effect of providing formative feedback (written formative feedback and oral formative feedback) on the ability to write narration, and also the effect of differences in learning styles (visual and auditory) on the ability of students to write narration. The effect of the interaction in question is the effect of the interaction of formative feedback and learning styles on the ability to write narration. The results of the Anava 2 calculation are briefly summarized in the following table.

Table 4.12: Summary of Anava 2 x 2 Calculation Results

Source of	JK	Dk	RJK	F _{count}	F _{table}	
Varians	JIX	DK	NJIX	1 count	$\alpha_{0.05}$	$\alpha_{0.01}$
Between A	82,012	1	82,012	8,195	4,00	7,08
Between B	107,44	1	107,44	10,736	4,00	7.08
Between AB	236,68	1	236,68	23,651	4,00	7,08
Inside (D)	800,57	80	10,007	Inf. H_0 : A, B & AB = rejected;		
Total(T)	1226,7	83		because $F_{count} > F_{table}$ on ($\alpha = 0.01$)		

Based on the Anava 2 path calculation above, it can be explained below.

1. First Hypothesis

The ability to write narratives of groups of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than groups of students who learn with formative oral feedback strategies

In the Anava table, the F_{count} value between A is 8,195, which turns out to be greater than F_{table} at 0.01 = 7.08 (Fh = 8.19> Ft = 7.08).

These results indicate that the null hypothesis (H₀) **is rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is a difference** in the ability to write narratives between groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategies and groups of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies. Meanwhile, the average score of the ability to write narrative groups of students who studied with written formative feedback strategy (A1) was 14.64 higher than the group of students who studied with oral formative feedback strategies (A2) by 12.64.

This shows that the ability to write narrative groups of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than groups of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies.

2. Second Hypothesis

The ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style is higher than a group of students who have an auditory learning style

In the Anava table, the value of Fcount between B is 10.736 which turns out to be greater than Ftable at 0.01 = 7.08 (Fh = 10.736> Ft = 7.08). This shows that the null hypothesis (H₀) **is rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is a difference** in the ability to write narratives between groups of students who have a visual learning style (B1) and groups of students who have an auditory learning style (B2). Meanwhile, the average score of the ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style (B1) is 15.930 higher than the group of students who have an auditory learning style (B2), amounting to 12.60.

This shows that the ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style (B1) is higher than with groups of students who have an auditory learning style (B2).

3. Third Hypothesis

There is an interaction effect between providing formative feedback and student learning styles on the ability to write narration

Based on the calculation results of the Variant Analysis of the effect of the interaction between providing formative feedback strategies (**A**) and student learning styles (**B**) on the ability to write narratives, the F_{count} value between ABs was 23.651 which turned out to be greater than F_{table} at 0.01 = 7.08 ($F_h = 23,651 > F_t = 7.08$). This shows that the null hypothesis (H0) **is rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is an interaction effect** between the formative feedback strategy (**A**) and the learning style (**B**) on students' narrative writing abilities.

The results of the calculation of the research data obtained an average score of narrative writing ability on a group of students who have a visual learning style and learning with a written formative feedback strategy (A1B1) of 17.860 and on a group of students who have an auditory learning style (A1B2) on average of 11.930. The average score of the ability to write narration in a group of students who have a visual learning style and learning with an oral formative feedback strategy (A2B1) is 12.450 and in a group of students who have an auditory learning style (A2B2) of 13.261.

The results of further test calculations with the Tuckey test for the two groups compared are presented in the following table.

4,02

2,95

Significant

ne 4. 13.	Summary of Tuckey Test Calculation Results											
	No.	No. Group Comparison		Q _{table}		Conclusion						
	Hypothesis	Group Comparison	Qcount	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.01$	Conclusion						
	4.	A_1B_1 with A_2B_1	6,530	4,02	2,95	Significant						
	5.	A_1B_2 with A_2B_2	1,691	4,02	2,95	Not Significant						
	6.	A_1B_1 with A_1B_2	6,879	4,02	2,95	Significant						

13,176

Table 4.13: Summary of Tuckey Test Calculation Results

A₂B₁ with A₂B₂

4. Fourth Hypothesis

The ability to write narratives of students who learn using formative written feedback strategies is higher than students who learn with verbal feedback strategies, in groups of students who have a visual learning style

In the group of students who have a visual learning style and learning with a written formative feedback strategy (A1B1) and students who study with an oral feedback strategy (A2B1), the Q_{count} value of 6.530 is greater than the Q_{table} at 0.01 = 2.95 ($Q_c = 6.530 > Q_t = 2.95$). This means that the null hypothesis (H0) **is rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is a difference** in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have a visual learning style between students who learn with written formative feedback strategies (A_1B_1) and students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies (A_2B_1).

The results of the calculation of the average score of the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have a visual learning style and learning with written formative feedback strategy (A_1B_1) of 17.860 is higher than the group of students who have a visual learning style and learning with an oral formative feedback strategy (A_2B_1) of 12.450.

This shows that in groups of students who have a visual learning style, the ability to write narratives of students who learn with formative feedback strategies is written higher than students who study with oral formative feedback strategies.

5. Fifth Hypothesis

The narrative writing ability of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is lower than students who learn with verbal formative feedback strategies, on groups of students who have auditory learning styles

In the group of students who have auditory learning styles and learn with written formative feedback strategies (A_1B_2) and students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies (A_2B_2) , a Q_{count} value of 1.691 is smaller than Q_{table} value at 0.01 = 2.95 (Qc = 1.691 < Qt = 2.95). This means that the null hypothesis (H0) **cannot be rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is no difference** in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have auditory learning styles who learn with written feedback strategies (A1B2) and students who learn with oral feedback strategies (A2B).

The results of the calculation of the average score of narrative writing ability on groups of students who have auditory learning styles and learning with written formative feedback strategy (A1B2) of 11,930, do not show a difference that is different from the average score of writing ability in groups of students who learn by strategy oral formative feedback (A2B2) of 13,261. Meanwhile, the results of statistical calculations are obtained that the group of students who have an auditory learning style who learns with a written formative feedback strategy (A1B2) and students who learn with an oral formative feedback strategy (A2B2) the value of Q counts is smaller than Q table.

This shows that in the group of students who have an auditory learning style, the narrative writing ability of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is lower than students who study with oral formative feedback strategies, not supported by empirical data.

6. Sixth Hypothesis

The ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style, on students who study with written formative feedback strategies

Based on the results of the calculation of the advanced variance with the Tuckey test in table 4.13 about the ability to write narratives in groups of students learning with written formative feedback strategies between students who have a visual learning style (A_1B_1) and students who have an auditory learning style (A_1B_2) , Q_{count} value of 6.879 is greater than Q_{table} value at 0.01 = 2.95 (Qc = 6.879 > Qt = 2.95). This means that the null hypothesis (H0) **is rejected**. In other words, it is stated that **there is a difference** in the ability to write narratives in groups of students learning with written formative feedback strategies between students who have a visual learning style (A1B1) and students who have an auditory learning style (A1B2).

The results of the calculation of the average score of narrative writing ability on groups of students who have a visual learning style and learning with written formative feedback strategy (A_1B_1) of **17.860** is higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategy (A_1B_2) of **11,930**.

This shows that in groups of students learning with written formative feedback strategies, the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style.

7. Seventh Hypothesis

The narrative writing ability of students who have a visual learning style is lower than students who have an auditory learning style, in groups of students who study with an oral formative feedback strategy

Based on the results of the calculation of the advanced variance with the Tuckey test in table 4.13 about the ability to write narratives in groups of students who learn by verbal formative feedback strategies between students who have a visual learning style (A_2B_1) and students who have an auditory learning style (A_2B_2) , the Q_{count} value of 13.176 is greater than Q_{table} value at 0.01 = 2.95 (Qc = 13,176 > Qt = 2.95).

This means that the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. This shows that there is a difference in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who study with oral formative feedback between students who have visual learning styles (A_2B_1) and students who have auditory learning styles (A_2B_2) .

The results of the calculation of the average score of the ability to write narratives in groups of students learning with verbal feedback strategies on students who have a visual learning style (A_2B_1) is 12.450 lower than to students who have an auditory learning style (A_2B_2) of 13.261.

This shows that in groups of students learning with oral formative feedback strategies, the ability to write narrative students who have a visual learning style is lower than students who have an auditory learning style.

DISCUSSION

The findings and analysis results of the research data described above are discussed in detail in the following description.

First Hypothesis. The results of the first hypothesis test reject **the null hypothesis**. This shows that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who learn with written formative feedback and groups of students who study with oral formative feedback. This research has proven, that the ability to write narrative groups of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is **higher than** groups of students who study with oral formative feedback.

Through research, it is proven that the written formative feedback strategy is superior to the narrative writing learning process. The advantages of written formative feedback strategies are supported by the following factors. *First*, a written formative feedback strategy is suitable for high school students. At this level, students can already understand the meaning of information through the writing they read. In addition, high school students are already independent, so visual students can utilize written formative feedback to guide them when learning, correct their writing, and improve in accordance with the written comments they read.

Second, written formative feedback is not easily lost because it is recorded on student work papers. These notes are easily obtained by students in each of them correcting their work. The advantage of written formative feedback is that it helps students to recall the lessons that have been given. Students sometimes do not concentrate on the teacher's explanation, so forget if given information orally. With written comments, students can see and re-read the notes of lessons that have been given.

Third, written formative feedback allows students to learn at the pace of their learning. Students who are slow to learn can re-read written comments while improving their writing skills. Meanwhile, students who are fast learners can strengthen their learning by reading and training as often as possible the ability to write based on written formative feedback.

Fourth, written formative feedback is given in detail on each element of the narrative writing assessment that the student has not published in his essay. Written comments on student notes can help students study outside class hours or do assignments at home.

Second hypothesis. The results of the second hypothesis test **reject** the null hypothesis. This shows that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have visual learning styles and groups of students who have auditory learning styles. This research has proven that the ability to write narrative groups of students who have a visual learning style is **higher than** the group of students who have an auditory learning style. Through this research, it is proven that

students who have a visual learning style have better narrative writing abilities. Visual students prefer to doodle, like to receive information through the sense of sight, like reading and seeing pictures. Visual students can remember something that has been seen, and remember something with a visual association.

The characteristics of visual students are very supportive when producing writing. Memories that have been seen by visual students can be used as resources for writing. The imagination to be written in the writing is obtained from materials that have been seen and read. The material will be remembered through visual association, recorded in his memory, and very useful in the writing process. The sharpness of his memory of everything he had seen was very useful when visual students would carry out writing activities

This advantage is not owned by auditory students. Auditory students lack the ability to remember things they see. Auditory students use the sense of hearing more than the sense of sight. Meanwhile, one factor that must be possessed by someone in reproducing writing is to use materials that have been seen as resources of written material. More and more diverse resources of the written material are obtained through sight rather than hearing. This condition is not owned by auditory students, so visual students have better narrative writing skills than auditory students.

Third Hypothesis. The results of the third hypothesis test **reject** the null hypothesis. This proves that there is an interaction effect between formative feedback strategies and learning styles on students' narrative writing abilities. Thus the achievement level of students' narrative writing skills is influenced by the interaction between the application of formative feedback strategies and student learning styles.

Students' writing skills can be obtained through practice, assignments that are part of formative assessment. One function of formative tests is to provide feedback on students' abilities. The teacher is obliged to examine and provide feedback on the results of student writing assigned by the teacher as a form of formative test.

Formative feedback can be given in the written and oral form. Written formative feedback is provided by giving notes, comments, and written explanations of student work papers. Meanwhile, oral formative feedback is carried out by the teacher by explaining the work of students during learning or to students individually.

Written formative feedback is better given to students who have a visual learning style. Visual students concentrate well through the sense of sight and through reading. With the ability to read every detail of writing is very easy to understand by visual students. Visual students easily find and obtain the information provided by the teacher in writing. In this way, students will visually improve their writing. This way is not owned by auditory students. Auditory students find it easier to concentrate and remember information through verbal information. Therefore, auditory students are better off when learning with verbal feedback strategies. Based on these facts, it can be stated that there is an interaction effect between the application of formative feedback strategies and student learning styles in improving narrative writing skills. In other words, in learning to write a narrative, the teacher should implement a formative feedback strategy and pay attention to student learning styles so that the ability to write narrative students can improve.

Fourth Hypothesis. The fourth hypothesis test results reject the null hypothesis. This proves that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have a visual learning style between students who learn with written formative feedback strategies and students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies. This study also proves that the ability to write groups of students who have visual learning styles and learn with written formative feedback strategies (A1B1) are higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies (A2B1).

The ability to write narratives in visual students is supported by two factors, namely factors within students and factors outside students. (1) Factors within students are innate characteristics that are already possessed by visual students. The innate characteristics of visual students include the ability to read, understand, and analyze the information provided in writing. The ability to remember information through the sense of sight and reading. Factors within students are the basic ability when imagining at the time of writing. The basic ability in question is the number of resources of writing material that is in the memory of visual students obtained when reading or visual experience gained through vision. The abundance of writing material resources is seen in the product of the writing. (2) Factors outside students themselves are the learning strategies used by the teacher. In this study, the strategies used by the teacher are written formative feedback and oral formative feedback. If the teacher uses a written formative feedback strategy on visual students, his writing skills develop rapidly.

This factor is conditioned by the teacher when learning to write to visual students. The written formative feedback strategy requires students to read and understand the teacher's instructions, comments, and explanations in writing. Meanwhile, the ability to understand and analyze written information is one of the innate characteristics of visual students.

Factors that support students' visual writing abilities are not owned by auditory students. The innate characteristics of auditory students prefer to concentrate on remembering information through hearing. The characteristic of the auditory student doesn't support the learning process if the teacher applies a written formative feedback strategy.

Therefore, the facts of the results of this study indicate that the ability to write a narrative in visual students is higher if in learning the teacher applies written formative feedback strategies. Meanwhile, this condition is not optimal if applied to auditory students.

Fifth Hypothesis, can not reject the null hypothesis. This means that the results of this study state that there is no difference in the ability to write narratives in groups of students who have auditory learning styles who learn with written formative feedback strategies and students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies. Some reasons this hypothesis is untested are First, factors inherited by auditory students. One of the innate characteristics of auditory students is reading aloud. The habits of auditory students like this carry over when learning to write narratives that apply written formative feedback strategies. When teachers carry out writing learning by applying written formative feedback strategies, auditory students read teacher comments and corrections aloud. Inadvertently, the auditory student heard the written comment through his voice when reading the teacher's explanation of his work paper. While listening to his voice while reading the teacher's comments contained in the assignment notes and exercises, the auditory student focuses and remembers the instructions that need to be implemented to improve the results of his writing. In this way, it is as if the auditory student is dealing directly with the teacher who gives him an oral explanation of the results of his writing.

Second, factors outside the student, the method used by the teacher. The learning method used by the teacher accidentally influences the concentration of auditory students. The method used by the teacher in this study is discussion-question-answer. The discussion-question-answer method is used by the teacher when learning by applying oral formative feedback strategies and written formative feedback strategies. The use of discussion-question-answer methods is a good condition for auditory students to learn. This happens because auditory students utilize the oral information they obtain through the sense of hearing. During the discussion-question-answer session, the auditory students concentrate, remember, and absorb the information discussed by their peers. Through question and answer, auditory students listen to verbal information about learning and teacher's explanations when answering student questions. Auditory students are very concentrated when verbal communication occurs in learning. Auditory students are actively involved in learning, responding, and asking questions about things discussed. Information through the discussion-question-answer session is really remembered. Sharp concentration and strong memory cause auditory students to learn to correct weaknesses and confirm the strengths contained in each essay.

Written formative feedback strategies can be maximally utilized by auditory students if they use learning methods that are appropriate to their characteristics. The application of written formative feedback strategies is utilized as benefits auditory student learning by using oral formative feedback strategies. This has led to an increase in the ability to write auditory students' narratives even though learning applies written formative feedback strategies. Thus, auditory students can improve their learning abilities if the teacher uses a written formative feedback strategy and uses an oral formative feedback strategy. This research also illustrates that teachers should implement a variety of strategies in learning so as to facilitate the diversity of student characteristics in learning. Formative feedback strategies given vary will have a good effect on improving students' narrative writing skills.

Sixth Hypothesis. The results of the sixth hypothesis test reject the null hypothesis. This proves that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write a narrative in groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategies between students who have visual learning styles and students who have auditory learning styles. This study succeeded in proving that the research hypothesis which states that the ability to write a narrative in students who have a visual learning style The results of the sixth hypothesis test reject the null hypothesis. This proves that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write narrative groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategies between students who have visual learning styles and students who have auditory learning styles. This study succeeded in proving that the research hypothesis which states that the ability to write a narrative in students who have visual learning style has higher than students who have an auditory learning style, in groups of students who study with written formative feedback strategy. This study illustrates that written formative feedback strategies can improve narrative writing skills if applied to students who have visual learning styles when compared to students who have auditory learning styles. This happens because the power that exists in visual students is also in the written formative feedback strategy. Visual students have the sharpness of memory through vision, one of them from reading. Whereas, written formative feedback requires students to understand the information in writing. The information provided in written formative feedback comments on work results, assignments, and exercises which are one formative assessment. By reading comments given in writing, students can visually assess, improve, and confirm the superiority of writing.

This is different from auditory students. Auditory students concentrate more and remember information conveyed orally because auditory students rely on their sense of hearing in understanding information. Information relating to correction, improvement, and even confirmation of his writing ability received less attention by auditory students if given in writing. This makes writing ability does not optimal if learning applies written formative feedback. Therefore, teachers should apply written formative feedback strategies to students having a visual learning style.

Seventh Hypothesis. The seventh hypothesis test results reject the null hypothesis. This proves that there is a very significant difference in the ability to write a narrative in groups of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies between students who have visual learning styles and auditory learning styles. This study also succeeded in proving the research hypothesis which

states that the narrative writing ability of students who have a visual learning style lower than students who have an auditory learning style, in groups of students who study with oral formative feedback strategies. This study illustrates that students who have a visual learning style are not effective if learning by using oral formative feedback strategies. This happens because the oral formative feedback strategy emphasizes the ability of students to concentrate on the teacher's verbal explanation. Meanwhile, visual students concentrate more if they use the sense of sight through reading. In this case, visual students can learn better if learning with written formative feedback strategies. This factor causes the visual writing ability of students is not optimal if learning applies oral formative feedback strategies.

Meanwhile, auditory students who learning with oral formative feedback strategies can improve their writing skills. Auditory students have maximum concentration if the information is explained verbally. This happens because auditory students have the characteristics of receiving information through the sense of hearing, remembering what was heard rather than reading. Therefore, when learning applies an oral formative feedback strategy, auditory students can improve their learning abilities. Based on these explanations, this study has proven that the ability to write a narrative in visual students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies is not optimal compared to auditory students.

RESEARCH LIMITATION

The researcher realizes that besides the results of the research that have been stated before in this study, there are still some limitations that need to be stated as a reference for the reader and further relevant research. The limitations referred to are as follows.

First, this research was only conducted in class X students of SMA Negeri 1 Tibawa in the 2011/2012 Academic Year, so the conclusions are drawn only apply to these students. Second, this study uses an experimental design that requires strict control of research variables, beyond the specified variables. However, this treatment is carried out in conjunction with a learning schedule that is also in conjunction with other subjects, so that the time followed by students in the implementation of this treatment is only part of their study time each week. This means that there are still many variables that affect the ability of students in the process of learning to write narration.

Third, This research was not preceded by an initial test, assuming that the students' initial ability in writing narratives was homogeneous. *Fourth*, the grouping only divides students who have visual learning styles and students who have auditory learning styles and does not examine students who have kinesthetic learning styles, which are also between the two groups of students. Therefore, conclusions in this study need careful interpretation.

Fifth, there are factors of limitations beyond the reach of researchers that cause a bias towards student activity. Bias occurs in auditory students when studying teacher feedback given in writing by loudly speaking the teacher's comments. Auditory students learning habits by saying loudly if reading causes them to seem to listen directly to the teacher's verbal explanation and they concentrate on the instructions given by the teacher. Likewise, during the learning process using the discussion and question and answer methods provided during the learning process with written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies. Verbal interactions that take place between teacher and student, and among students provide auditory students the opportunity to concentrate and strengthen auditory students' memories of the lesson. This limitation factor of the author is what led to the fifth research hypothesis which states that the narrative writing ability of students who have an auditory learning style is lower if learning with formative feedback strategies is not tested.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Conclusion

Following the results of the submission of hypotheses, the study concludes the following points.

- 1. The ability to write a narrative in groups of students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than groups of students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies.
- 2. The ability to write a narrative in groups of students who have a visual learning style is higher than the group of students who have an auditory learning style.
- 3. There is an interaction effect between the application of formative feedback strategies and student learning styles on the ability to write narratives.
- 4. The ability to write a narrative in students who learn with written formative feedback strategies is higher than students who learn with oral formative feedback strategies on groups of students who have a visual learning style.
- 5. The ability to write a narrative in students who have a visual learning style is higher than students who have an auditory learning style in a group of students who are learning with written formative feedback strategies.
- 6. The ability to write a narrative in students who have a visual learning style is lower than students who have an auditory learning style in a group of students who study with an oral formative feedback strategy.

IMPLICATION

The results of this study have implications for students with the following things.

- Formative feedback strategies can improve narrative writing skills. Formative feedback strategies consist of written formative feedback and oral formative feedback. The most effective formative feedback strategy applied in learning to improve the narrative writing ability of high school students is the written formative feedback strategy.
- 2. Each student has different abilities in receiving, processing, and remembering information according to their learning styles. Students who have a visual learning style have good abilities in writing narration. The ability to write narratives that exist in students who have a visual learning style needs to be trained intensively and continuously in order to be more improved and have a positive impact on increasing the ability to write other types of essays.
- 3. Students' narrative writing abilities are influenced by formative feedback strategies and student learning styles. To improve narrative writing skills more effectively, the teacher must vary the use of written formative feedback strategies and oral formative feedback strategies interchangeably in classroom learning. So that each student who has a different learning style can improve his learning style by utilizing the advantages of each feedback strategy that the teacher uses varies.
- 4. The written formative feedback strategy is more effectively applied to students who have a visual learning style. With the application of written formative feedback strategies, the ability to write a narrative in students who have a visual learning style is increasing. Meanwhile, oral formative feedback strategies are best when applied to students who have an auditory learning style. Students who have an auditory learning style will improve their writing abilities if the teacher using oral formative feedback strategies in learning.
- 5. Learning to write the narration for students who have a visual learning style is more effective when applying formative written feedback strategies. Meanwhile, for students who have auditory learning styles, the feedback strategies used are variations of oral formative feedback and written formative feedback interchangeably. The use of varied formative feedback strategies can improve narrative writing skills in students who have an auditory learning style.
- 6. The ability to write narratives to students who have a visual learning style will not increase if learning applies oral formative feedback strategies.

REFERENCES

- 1) Akhadiah, S., Arsyad, M., and Ridwan, S. Development of Indonesian Language Writing Ability. Jakarta: Erlangga, 1991.
- 2) Akhmat S.. *Individual Skills (Intelligence and Talent)*. 2011 (http://akhmadsudrajat.wordpress.com). (access atJanuary 21th2011)
- 3) Amir, F.Preparing Children to be champions. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2008.
- 4) Arends. R.I. Learning To Teach. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2008.
- 5) Ary, D., Lucy, C.J., and Asghar, A. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt Rinerhard and Winston, 1998.
- 6) Bloxham and Boyd. *Developing Effctive Assessment in Higher Education: A Practical Guide*. New York: Open University Press, 2007.
- 7) Brockmeier, J. Narrative and Identity Studies in Autobiography, Self and Culture. Amsterdam: Philadelphia, 2001.
- 8) Brookhart, S. How To Give Effective Feedback to Your Student. America; ASCD, 2008.
- 9) Brown, H. D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, translator Noor Cholis. Jakarta: Pearson Education, 2008.
- 10) Budianta, M. Reading Literature. Introduction to Understanding Literature in Higher Education. Magelang: Indonesia Tera. 2006.
- 11) Cohen, L. Lawrence, M, and Keith, M. Research Methods in Education. New York: Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, 2007.
- 12) Daryanto. Education Evaluation. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2008.
- 13) DePorter, B.andHernacki, M.. Quantum Learning. Bandung: Kaifa, 2009.
- 14) Djaali and Muljono, P. Measurement in Education. Jakarta: UNJ, 2004.
- 15) Dornyei, Z. The Psychology of The Language Learner Individual Differences in Second Language Acquistion. London: Mahwa New Jersey, 2005.
- 16) Fraenkel, J. R and Norman. E.W, How to Design and Evaluate Research In Education. New York:McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1993.
- 17) Jamarah, S.B.. Teachers and Students in Educational Interactions. Jakarta. Rineka Cipta, 2000.
- 18) Ginnis, P. Teaching Tricks and Tactics. Strategies to Improve Teaching Achievement in the Classroom. Jakarta: PT Indeks, 2008.
- 19) Gulo, W. Teaching and Learning Strategies. Jakarta, Grasindo: 2007.
- 20) Gunawan, A. Genius Learning Strategy. Practical Guidelines for Implementing Accelerated Learning. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2003.
- 21) Hayes, D. Encyclopedia of Primary Education. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- 22) Hawe, E. Oral Feedback in The Context of Written Language. Australia Journal of Language and Literacy. 2010.http://findarticles.com. (Diakses 15 Pebruari 2011).

- 23) Irons, A. Enhancing Learning through Formative Assessment and Feedback. USA: Routledge, 2008.
- 24) Keraf, G. Argumentaionand Naration. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2007.
- 25) Kosasih, E. Linguistic Competence and Literature. Bandung: Yrama Widya, 2003.
- 26) Khofifi, M. *Prividing Student with Effective Feedback*. Academic Leadership Journal Online volume4–issue. http://akhmadsudrajat.wordpress.com). (Diakses 21 Januari 2011)
- 27) Mahayana, M.S. Nine Answers to Indonesian Literature, a Critical Orientation Jakarta: Bening, 2005.
- 28) Malahayati. Super Teens. Become Extraordinary Teenagers with 1 Effective Habit Jogyakarta: Jogja Bangkit Publisher, 2010.
- 29) Marahaimin, I. Popular Writing. Jakarta: Dunia Pustaka, 2005.
- 30) Meyers. Gateways to Academic Writing. London: Longman: 2005.
- 31) Mukhtar. Successful Evaluation, Guidelines for Measuring Learning Performance. Jakarta: Sasama Mitra Sukses, 2003).
- 32) Mukhtar and Martinis, Y. Ten Tips for Teaching Success in Class. Jakarta: Nimas Multimas, 2007.
- 33) Munandar, S.C.U. Developing Talent and Creativity School Children, Instructions for Teachers and Parents. Jakarta; Gramedia, 1985.
- 34) Muray, R.& Sarah, M, The Handbook of Academic Writing A Fresh Approach. London: Open University Press, 2006.
- 35) Nasution, Various Approaches in Learning and Teaching. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2003.
- 36) Nitko, A. Educational Assessment of Student, Second Edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc A Simon & Schuster Company, 1996.
- 37) Nugriyantoro, B. Assessment in Language and Literature Teaching. Yogyakarta: BPFE,1997).
- 38) O'Malley, J. M and Lorraine, V.P., Authentic Assessment For English Language Learners. Praktical Approaches For Teacher. Amerika: Longman, 2008.
- 39) Parulian, H.& Thoha, N.Competency Plus. Theory, Design, Case and Application for HR and Dynamic Organizations. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2008.
- 40) Permendiknas No.22 Year 2006, concerning Content Standards, Appendix Standards for Indonesian Language Subjects. Jakarta: Depdiknas, 2006.
- 41) Petra, C. University. Ability Theory Study. (http://digilib.petra.ac.id/viewer) (access at Januari 27th 2011)
- 42) Prasing, B. *The Power of Learning Styles. Encouraging Children to Boost Achievement by Recognizing Learning Styles.* Bandung: Kaifa, 2007.
- 43) Purwanto, N.M. Principles and Teaching Assessment Techniques. Jakarta; Rosda, 2009).
- 44) Rofiuddin. Indonesian Language Education in High Class. Depdikbud: Development project of primary teacher Education, 1996.
- 45) Ruptic, H. Practical Aspects of Authentic Assessment: Putting the piece together. Norwood Washinton: Christoper-Gordon, 1994.
- 46) Semi, M. A. Effective Writing. Padang: Angkasa Raya, 1990.
- 47) Senjaya, W. Learning Strategies. Oriented Educational Process. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, 2008.
- 48) Shah, M.A.andSamad, N.A..Effective and Dynamic Facilitator Malaysia, Profesional: 2008.
- 49) Silverius, S. Evaluation of Learning Outcomes and Feedback. Jakarta: IKAPI,1991.
- 50) Sorenson, S. Webster's New World Student Writing Handbook. United States of America: Manufactured, 2010.
- 51) Sugihastuti. Language of Research Reports. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar, 2000.
- 52) Susanto. Brain Managament Series For Learning Strategy Be An Absolute Genius. A Practical GuideHow To Learn according to the Natural Way of the Brain. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo, 2008.
- 53) Suparno. Main Material Basic Writing Skills. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka, 2007.
- 54) Tarigan, Dj. Language Skills Education. Jakarta: Universitas Terbuka, 2000.
- 55) Thahar, H.E.. Creative Writing, Guide ForBeginners. (Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang Press. 2008.
- 56) Tarigan, H.G. Writing as a Language Skill. Bandung: Angkasa,1993.
- 57) Taufik. Teaching and Learning Strategies. Jakarta: Inti Prima, 2010.
- 58) Uno, H.B. New Orientation in Learning Psychology. Bandung: Wacana Prima, 2006.
- 59) Uno, H.B. Learning Models Create Creative and Effective Teaching and Learning Processes. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2009.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.