Chapter 5

Conclusion

The summary and the recommendation of the findings are presented in this chapter. The summary is presented based on the findings and discussion of the findings. The suggestions are given for the recommendations for pedagogical purposes and further studies.

The Summary

Writing is one of English skills that enables students to communicate their ideas in the written form. Although students have learned to express their idea with the right structures and vocabularies, students still make mistakes in writing assignment.

Traditionally, it has been the teacher's responsibility to treat students' errors. However, there has been a change in the higher education in which students discover and construct knowledge themselves while teacher acts as a facilitator. Peer feedback and pair feedback which gives the opportunity to the students to express themselves through sharing ideas and having interaction with their peer can encourage students to participate in the learning process.

Therefore, this study attempts to examine the effect of peer and pair feedback of undergraduate student in writing achievement. The researcher does the research in one of the universities in Surabaya, Indonesia, because there is still rare to find a study on peer and pair feedback of undergraduate students done in Indonesia.

The result of the study reveals that there is no significant difference between the peer and pair feedback in students' recount writing achievement because the members of the Experimental Group and the members of the Control Group are at the same level in their writing skill. Applying feedback to improve students' writing achievement does not depend on the number of the participants in one group. The number of group members in the group will not influence the result of the treatment. Students' writing achievement will be improved with a group of two or a group of four after they get the treatment.

Besides, using peer and pair feedback in recount writing courses is beneficial to students. From a pedagogical perspective, it informs the proper context for effective peer feedback and pair feedback to be applied as a standard teaching and learning strategy.

The researcher realizes that this study still has some limitations regarding the methods of data collection. First of all, it is difficult to draw strong generalizations as the researcher only uses

one program from one of the universities in Surabaya for the study. Second, the study only engaged 26 students for the Experimental Group and 24 students for the Control Group. Third, the study was done in 8 weeks, therefore there was a close time between the pre-test and post-test given to the students. Therefore, treatment should be done in a longer of time to get more reliable data.

In spite of its limitation, the researcher hopes that this study can be beneficial for other researchers or readers who are interested in applying peer and pair feedback in giving feedback to students' writing, especially to undergraduate students.

To sum up, although there is no significant difference between peer and pair feedback on students' writing achievement, the treatment could help improving students' writing skill as evidenced by the significant differences of the pre-test and post-test scores among the participants in the Experimental and the pre-test and post-test scores among the participants in the Control Group before doing the treatment and after doing the treatment.

Implication of the Study

Pedagogical purpose. Based on the result of this study, the researcher offers some recommendations for pedagogical purposes and further studies. Considering the advantageous of applying feedback technique, it is suggested that peer and pair feedback techniques become part of the writing courses at the university. Students are given experience in doing peer and pair feedback in writing courses, because peer and pair feedback which adopt student-centered concept is a very useful, less face-threatening, and interesting activity. The students are able to express themselves without feeling stressful and anxious in writing as they will do peer feedback in correcting their mistakes.

Lecturers give explanation to the students about the purpose of the experiment and what to do during the experiment before they start doing the peer and pair feedback activities. Peer and pair feedback activities do not only give students opportunity to get productive responses and suggestions from their friends but also the chance to learn a lot by reading their peer's writing.

Lecturers who teach writing courses understand the benefits of peer- and pair feedback in enhancing students' social interaction, confidence, and motivation. The peer and pair feedback activity adopts cooperative learning which fosters the students to have interaction with their friends .

Collaborative learning can develop students' decision making, problem solving, social interaction skills while the students applying feedback system (Rushatz, 1992). Working with their peers will enable students to have empathy and willing to help others. This system encourages the student to express their opinion and their ideas freely as they have interaction with their friends not with their lecturer.

In class teachers/lecturers can apply both kinds of learning techniques interchangeably as an alternative in doing feedback for teaching recount writing so that students do not get bored with giving the same feedback in every meeting.

Recommendations for Further Studies. The objective of this research is to find the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' writing achievement. The subjects are students from two classes of the same program. The result of this study reveals that there is no significant differences between the peer and pair feedback on students' writing achievement.

Future study could focus on doing research on peer and pair feedback on students' writing achievement with participants from two or three different programs from the same university. Or else, it might be possible to conduct the same research with the participants from different universities who take the same program .By involving students from different programs or from different universities, it does not only increase the number of the participants but also enables to enrich the discussion of the findings.

This present study used analytical scoring criteria to provide learners with feedback about their writing. Future study could use holistic soring criteria with the greatest advantage of its efficiency to evaluate the data.

In conclusion, in spite of its limitation, the study is beneficial in order to understand the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' writing achievement. Further studies need conducting to develop the applying of peer and pair feedback in writing class.

References

Alavi, S. M., & Kaivanpanah, S. (2007). Feedback expectancy and EFL language learners' achievement in English. *Egitimde Kuram. Journal of Theory and Practice in Education., 3*(2), 182-196.

Al-Buainain, H. (2006). Students' writing errors in EFL: A case study. *http://faculty.qu.edu.qa/drhaifa.*

Attay, D., & Kurt, G. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education., 1*, 12-23.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning - A new paradigm for undergraduate. *Change, 27*(6), 12-25.

Behizadeh, N., & Engelhard, G. J. (2012). Exploring the allignment of writing self-efficacy with writing achievementusing rasch measurement theory and qualitative methods. *J. Appl Meas., 13*(2), 45-132.

Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer feedback in learning English writing: advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education., 3*(4), 91-97.

Bloxham, S., & West, A. (2004). Understanding the rulse of the game: marking peer assessment as a medium fior developing students' conceptions of assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education., 29*(6), 721-733.

Bonn, C. K. (1985). Error analysis and composition marking. *Guidelines, 7*(1), 13-21.

Brophy, J. E. (2004). *Motivating students to learn.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Carnell, E. (2000). *Dialogue, discussion and secondary school students on how others help their learning. Feedback for learning.* London: Routledge.

Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal, 15*(2), 1-14.

Chuang, W. (2007). The effects of four different types of corrective feedback on EFL students' writing in Taiwan. Yongshi Education Journal, 4, 123-137.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 40-58.

Dolly, M. (2008). *Telecollaborative language learning. A guidebook to moderating intercultural collaborative online.* Bern:: Peter Lang.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing composing profess of twelfth grades.* Urbana, IL:: National Council of Teachers of English.

Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. *An-Najah Univ.J.Res. (Humanities)., 26*(1), 172-204.

Gere, A. R. (1987). *Writing groups: History, theory and implications.* Southern Illinois: University Press.

Gorjian, B., Khansir, A., & Sarkhosh, M. (2014). The effect of pair and peer corrective feedback modalities on second language writing skills among Iranian Pre-Intermediate level. *International Journal of Langiuage Learning and Applied Linguistics World., 5*(3), 367-379.

Grabe, P., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing.* The USA: Longman.

Hansen, J., & Liu, W. (2003). *Peer response in second language writing classroom.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Harmer , J. (1988). *How to teach English.* London: Longman.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing.* Person Education Limited. Longman.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing., 1*(3), 255-276.

Jacobs, H., Zinkgraf, S., Wormuth, d., Hartfiel, V., & Hughey, J. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Jafari, S. M., Keshavarz, N., & Shokrpour, N. (2013). The effect of peer review on writing skill of EFL students. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences.*, 24-35.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1989). *Cooperative and competition. Theory and rresearch.* Edina, MN.: Interaction Book Company.

Khansir, A., & Sarkhosh, M. (2014). The effect of pair and peer corrective feedback modalities on second language writing skills among Iranian Pre-Intermediate EFL Learners. *Internatinal Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguisics World., 5*(3), 367-379.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). Genre, Texts, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing: University of New South Wales Press.

Langan, J. (2005). *Colledge writing skills.* The MacGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Laudry, A., Jacobs, S., & Newton, G. (2015). Effective use of peer assessment in a graduate level writing assignment: A case study. *International Journal of Higher Education., 4*(1), 38-52.

Lin, G. H., & Chien, P. S. (2009). An investigation into effective of peer feedback. *Journal of Applied Foreign Language Fortune Institute of Technology., 3*, 79-88.

Lin, N., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education., 11*(3), 279-290.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2005). Guiding priciples for effective peer response. *ELT Journal., 59*(1), 31-38.

McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer.* Pearso. Merriem Webster Dictionary. www.merriem-webster.com/dictionary/achievement.

Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006.). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing., 15*, 179-200.

Mishra, K. C. (2005). *Correction of errors in English: A training course for the teachers of English as a second langiuage.* New Delhi 110002: Sarup & Sons.

Murphy, T., & Jacobs, G. M. (2000). Encouraging critical collaborative autonomy. *JALT Journal., 22*, 228-244.

Narciss, S. (2008). *Feedbach strategies for interactive learning tasks. A handbook of research on educational communities and technology.* Lawrence Erlbaum Association.

Nursahid, & Sudarso. (2011). *8 SMP Panduan Belajar.* Primagama.

Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ:: Lawrrence Erlbaum.

Pultsky, S., & Wilson, B. A. (2004.). Comparison of the three methods for teaching and evaluating writing: A quasi-experiment study. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal., 46*(1), 50-61.

Rau, W., & Heyl, B. S. (1990). Humanizing the college classroom: Collaborative learning and social organizing among students. *Teaching Siciology, 18*, 141-155.

Reid, M. R. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing.* Prentice Hall, Regents.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal., 59*(19), 23-30.

Rushatz, T. A. (1992). *Cooperative learning: An examination of attitudes toward cooperative learnoing and its effectiveness.* State College, PA:: Pennsylvania State University.

Sengupta, S. (1998). Peer evaluation: I am not the teacher. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 19-28.

Shehadeh, A. (2007). The effect of group and individual peer feedback on student writing in an EFL Gulf context (Saudi Arabia). *ERIC*, 148-160.

Siahaan, S., & Shinoda, K. (2008). *Generic text structure.* Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Spear, K. (1988). *Sharing writing.* Partsmouth, NH:: Heinemaan.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing., 14*, 153-173.

Sultana, A. (2009). Peer correction in ESL classroom'. *BRAC University Journal, 6*(1), 11-19.

Swain, M. (2006). *Language agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.). Advanced Language learning:* Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2010). *Taking it through: Languaging as a source of learning. In R. Batstone (Ed.), Sociocognitive perspectives on language use/learning.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thongrin, S. (2001). The effectiveness of self-, peer- and teacher-corrected writing on writing achievement of Undergraduate Political Science Students at Thammasat University. *Journal of Liberal Arts., 1*(12), 119-135.

Topping, K. J. (2000). Peer assessment between students in colledge and university. *Review of Educational Research., 68*(3), 249-267.

Tsay, M., & Brady, M. (2010). A case study of cooperative learning and communication pedagogy: Does working in teams make a difference? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning., 46*(2), 327-369.

Vygotsky, & Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA:: Harvard University Press.

Wiliyanti, C. R. (2014). The effectiveness of per feedback technique in improving students' writing skill in writing narative texts. *respository.upi.edu.*

Wohlin, C., Runeson, P., & Host, M. (2012). Experimantation in software engineering: An introduction. *https://books.google.co.id/books/isbn=1461546257.*

Zainurrahman. (2010). Peer feedback: Students' narrative writing development and students' responses. (A case study in an ESL writing classroom). *http://respository.upi.edu/id/eprint/9970.*

Zawahrer, F. A. (2012). Applied error analysisof written production of English essays tenth grade students in Ajloun Schools, Jordan. *International Journal of Learning & Development, 2*(2), 280-299.