The Impact of Feedback in The Process of Peer Assessment on Students' Recount Writing

Nur Laili Indasari[a,1,*], Oikurema Purwati [b, 2], Muhsyanur Syafi'ul Anam [c, 3]

[a,b,c] Universitas Negeri Surabaya
[1] nurindasari16070835068@mhs.unesa.ac.id*, [2]pungki_unesa@yahoo.co.id, [3]syafiul.anam@unesa.ac.id
,
* corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Providing feedback to peer's writing is not an easy task. It is required an ability to deliver the feedback or comment critically and a competence to master the knowledge of writing. Therefore, the present study is going to explore the impact of giving feedback to the students' writing and to acknowledge what the students challenge while giving feedback to their peers' writing. There are 10 students as the participants of this study. Qualitative study assists the researchers to get the data. The results revealed that the comparison between students' first draft and the last draft had improvements mainly on the aspect of the language use. Meanwhile, most students' challenges while giving feedback to the peer's writing were they had to have knowledge about the grammar mainly the use of simple past tense before giving feedback to their peer.

Keywords: writing, peer assessment, feedback, challenge

A B S T R A K

Memberikan komentar terhadap tulisan teman sejawat bukanlah perkara yang mudah. Hal yang demikian dibutuhkan kemampuan untuk menyampaikan komentar secara kritis dan kompetensi untuk menguasai pengetahuan tentang writing. Oleh karena itu, penelitian sekarang ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis dampak dari pemberian komentar atas tulisan teman sejawat dan untuk mengetahui tantangan yang dihadapi oleh siswa saat memebrikan komentar atas tulisan teman sejawatnya. Ada 10 mahasiswa sebagai subyek dari penelitian ini. Penelitian kualitatif dapat membantu para peneliti untuk mendapatkan data tersebut. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa perbandingan antara draf awal dan draf akhir mengalami perbaikan terutama pada aspek penggunaan bahasa. Sementara itu, tantangan yang paling banyak dihadapi saat memberikan komentar ke tulisan sejawatnya adalah mereka harus memiliki pengetahuan tentang gramatika atau tata bahasa terutama penggunaan simple past tense sebelum memberikan komentar ke teman sejawat.

Kata Kunci: menulis, penilaian sejawat, komentar, tantangan.

1. Pendahuluan

For English as Foreign Language (EFL) Learners, writing is considered to be a difficult skill (Klimova, 2014; Eksan, 2004). Writing does not only require the writer's ability to use his linguistic competence but also his communicative competence. Writing also requires much effort and practice in analyzing the ideas (Myles, 2002). In addition, there are five aspects of writing which must be paid attention by the writers such as organization, content, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (Jacobs et al. cited in Weigle, 2002:129).

Regarding the complexities of writing, the teacher can not merely ask the students to write a text or an essay and ask them to submit it. Writing is a process. Harmer (2004:4-5) says that there are four stages of writing; planning, drafting, editing, and final version. Each stage of writing requires assessment for improvement.

Traditionally, the assessment is conducted by the teacher so that the students are less involved in the learning activities. Meanwhile, the students should be given opportunities to think and share the

ideas by involving them in the process of assessment. Moreover, they can look at each other's work and give advice or suggestion on how it could be improved. This kind of assessment is called peer assessment (PA).

Peer assessment (PA) is a method which requires the students to give either feedback or grades (both) to their peers on a product or a performance based on the criteria of that product (Falchikov, 2007:132). Rosa et al. (2016) agree that this method can show great involvement and responsibility from the students in learning. They can do PA for constructive feedback (Lin, 2017). However, providing feedback mainly to peer's writing is a difficult task because it is related to the students' competence and students' language proficiency. These can be challenges that will be faced by the students while giving feedback to their peer.

By conducting a study about the impact of giving feedback in the peer assessment on the students' written performance, the students can learn how to improve the errors in writing. Meanwhile, a study about the students' challenge while giving feedback to their peer, it is expected that the teacher can predict earlier what problem may appear in the process of PA so that modeling, guideline, or rubric is prepared before conducting PA. For the students, they can learn the strength and the weakness in providing feedback to their peer.

Some researchers conducted studies on the use of PA (Xiao and Lucking, 2008; Suzuki, 2008; Birjandi and Siyyari, 2010; Iraji et al., 2016; Azarnoosh, 2013; Faudi, 2016; Puegphrom and Chiramanee, 2011; Misianto, 2014). The results of those previous studies revealed that PA gave a better improvement in students' writing than the other assessments such as self and teacher assessment. Most of the participants also showed positive responses to the use of PA. However, there were only few studies which described the changes in the students' writing for the first draft and the last draft after getting feedback in the peer assessment and analyzed the challenges which were might be faced by the students while giving feedback to their peers. Therefore, it is needed a study to describe the students' first draft and last draft to follow up the feedback given and a study to find out the possible challenges faced by the students while giving feedback or comment to per's writing.

2. Method

The present study, which employed qualitative design, was intended to describe the changes of the students' first draft and last draft after getting feedback and to find out the possible challenges faced by the students while giving feedback to peer's writing. The participants are ten university students in the second semester. They are in Basic Writing class. It will be conducted in a university in a suburban area in Gresik.

The researchers will collect the data by collecting the students' writing. The students' writing which will be analyzed is a recount paragraph. Related to the second research objective, the researchers will do an open-ended interview. This kind of interview will give more freedom of response. This interview will be conducted at the end of a research observation. The researchers collected the data during three meetings.

The researchers analyzed the students' progress in writing after getting feedback and the students' responses related to the challenges they face while giving feedback to their peer. The researcher showed the aspects that had improvement on students' writings and showed the result of the second research objective through the table so that it could be acknowledged the most problem found while giving feedback.

3. Results and Discussion

1. The changes on the students' first draft and last draft

For the first research objective, the researchers analyzed the changes in the students' writing whether there was an improvement or not. The writing that was analyzed was a recount paragraph. It retells past experiences in the past. According to Knapp and Watkins (2005:234), it has orientation, a series of events, and reorientation (optional). The use of simple past tense and temporal connectives are the linguistic features of the recount.

Through writing recount text, the students were trained to expose their ideas and feeling into the written language. Based on the result of observation in the class, the lecturer asked the students to give feedback on the generic structures and language features. The researchers showed several aspects of the feedback given and the improvements in students' writing. The aspects were categorized as follows:

1.   Organization

The organization is a criterion to assess the students' writing. It depends on how good, logical, fluent, and cohesive they organize the text. Looking at the feedback given by the students, most of the students said that it was not found any problem in the organization of the paragraph.

2.   Language use

Heaton (1991) argues that language use is a criterion to assess students' writing ability which depends on how good they use the right grammar. By looking at the feedback given, most students gave comments on the use of grammar such as the use of simple past tense, passive voice, and the others. The followings are the examples.

"My birthday was on Ramadhan but *there are* two of my friends…" became "My birthday was on Ramadhan month but *there were* two of my friends"

"I couldn't swim because the wind *didn't supported"* became "I couldn't swim because the wind *didn't support"*

And "The examination *started* at 06.00 a.m." became "The examination *was started* at 06.00 a.m."

3.   Mechanics

Mechanics are related to errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing. Some students gave feedback on errors of spelling such as "*foreighner* became *foreigner*," and "*sovenir* became *souvenir.*"

The following table is one of the examples of students' recount paragraph. She wrote the first draft and got feedback from her peers. Afterward, she revised it and got feedback again. The last, she wrote the final draft.

Table 1. The changes on students' recount writing

Students' first draft	Student's last draft
My Story in Yogyakarta	**My Story in Yogyakarta**
A long time years ago when I was four years old *I have* very unforgettable experience with my family in Yogyakarta. *Me and my family* went to holiday in the morning. In Yogyakarta we went to many *pleaces*, such as *in b*orobudur tample, *p*arangtritis beach, and Malioboro.	*A long time ago* when I was four years old *I had* very unforgettable experience with my family in Yogyakarta. *My family and I* went to have holiday in the morning. In Yogyakarta, we went to many *places*, such as *B*orobudur Temple, *P*arangtritis Beach, and Malioboro.

The first *pleace* we visited *b*orobudur temple. I was very happy at that time, because I saw *my mother still healthy* and could walk around like the others. In *b*orobudur temple, *we walk while looking at the temples are* still beautiful and original, because the first time we *go* to Borobudur temple *has not been renovated* due to the tsunami disaster. After we were satisfied walking around Borobudur and taking pictures there, we rested and ate together *to the hotel which i*s close to Malioboro. In the morning *I with my five brothers and my father walking* to Malioboro. In the room there was only my mother and my brother, maybe when he was ten years old. My brother did not follow us, because he was still asleep at that time. After my brother woke up, he toke a bath and follow us to Malioboro by himself. A few minutes later we returned to the hotel and we did not meet my brother. *Without any think* my father immediatly searched my brother. After a long search he did not meet, my father returned to the hotel with anxiety, because *he did not found* my brother. Finally after a few minutes later my brother returned to the hotel by himself. My mother and my father hugged my brother tightly and *cry*, because my brother came back safely. The incident was an unforgettable event, and a very impressive event because it showed the great affection of parents.	The first *place* which we visited *was Borobudur* Temple. I was very happy at that time, because I saw *my mother was still healthy* and she could walk around like the others. *It was still beautiful* and original, because the first time we *went* to Borobudur Temple, it *had not been renovated* due to the tsunami disaster. After we were satisfied walking around Borobudur, we rested and ate together *in the hotel which was* close to Malioboro. In the morning *my five brothers with my father and I* were walking around Malioboro. In the room there was only my mother and my brother, maybe when he was ten years old. My brother did not follow us, because he was still asleep at that time. After my brother woke up, he followed us to Malioboro by himself. A few minutes later, we returned to the hotel and we did not meet my brother. *Without thinking to long* my father immediately searched my brother. After a long time, my father returned to the hotel with anxiety, *because he did not find* my brother. Finally after a few minutes later, my brother returned to the hotel by himself. My mother and my father hugged my brother tightly and *cried*, because my brother came back safely. The incident was an unforgettable event and a very impressive event because it showed the great affection of parents. By MPN

In the Table 1, it could be analyzed that in the first draft, MPN made several errors (the bold and italic words) such as on the use of grammar or language use, mechanics, and language control. Nevertheless, she made improvements (the bold and italic words) in her last draft after getting feedback from her peers.

Based on the results of the students' writings, they had improvements from the first draft to the last draft after getting feedback from their peers. Most of the students' feedback was related to the language use.

2. The students' challenges while giving feedback in the peer assessment

Interview data about students' challenges while giving feedback to their peers' writing are used to answer the second research objective. However, the researchers gave further questions which were related to the merits of peer assessment and whether they got better improvement after getting feedback or not.

The results of the interview revealed that the students' challenges while giving feedback among other things:

1. Tenses

Many students gave an answer on tenses. One of the students' responses was "I have to understand tenses, structure."

2. Vocabulary

One of the students' responses was "I must understand the writing, vocabulary."

To show all the participants' responses, the researchers described them in Table 2.

Table 2. The results of the interview

Students' initial names	Q1 (The challenges)	Q2 (The benefits)	Q3 (The improvement)
DPS	Vocabulary, verb forms	Yes	Yes
AP	Grammar	Yes	Yes
FY	Tenses, structure	Yes	Yes
EE	Grammar	Yes	Yes
FS	Tenses, generic structures	Yes	Yes
MFF	Grammar, Vocabulary	Yes	Yes
NA	Grammar	Yes	Yes
MWM	Grammar	Yes	Yes
EA	Tenses	Yes	Yes
SDM	Material / content	Yes	Yes

From the results of the interview, they could be analyzed that the most challenging aspect of giving feedback to peer's writing was related to the language use (grammar or tenses). Therefore, they learned more about the use of simple past tense so that they were able to give feedback on recount paragraph correctly.

Based on the results of the analysis of the first research objective, the data indicated that the students got improvement from the first draft to the last draft after getting feedback from their peer. This finding was consistent with previous studies on the impact of peer assessment on students' performance (Xiao and Lucking, 2008; Suzuki, 2008; Birjandi and Siyyari, 2010; Iraji et al., 2016; Faudi, 2016; Puegphrom and Chiramanee, 2011; Misianto, 2014).

Meanwhile, for the second research objective which was related to the students' challenges, most students' responses were about grammar or tense. This could be called as the language use in a text. They said that they had to know about the simple past tense. Therefore, in giving feedback, they more focused on the tenses than the other aspects. This finding was supported by Brown et al. (1996:231). They say that peer assessment helps students develop awareness of the importance of structure in their work. Afterward, the students also admitted that they got benefits from PA and they felt that this method (PA) gave improvement to their writing. These results indicated that the students were satisfied with PA. These were in line with previous studies on the students' satisfaction towards PA (Xiao and Lucking, 2008; Azarnoosh, 2013; Faudi, 2016; Puegphrom and Chiramanee, 2011).

4.   Conclusion and Suggestion

Conclusion

The current study explored the impact of feedback in the peer assessment on students' recount writing. The findings of the study reveal that the students have improvements in their writing. There are changes from the first draft to the last draft mainly on the language use. Meanwhile, the students' challenge while giving feedback to peer's writing is mostly about the grammar. Based on these findings, the teacher can acknowledge the students' competence and language proficiency.

Suggestion

The findings suggest the lecturer to prepare the guideline, to give modeling or to train the students first for giving feedback in the process of peer assessment so that the students' feedback will be more arranged or directed than before. The lecturer also should give follow-up tasks to the students. These can be in the form of writing journal reflection, meeting with the teacher, or any purposeful activities. These tasks are expected to give improvements on what students experience after doing pee assessment.

REFERENCES

Azarnoosh, M. 2013. Peer Assessment in an EFL Context: Attitudes and Friendship Bias. *Language Testing in Asia*, 3 (11), 1-10.

Birjandi, P & Siyyari, M. 2010. Self-Assessment and Peer-Assessment: A Comparative Study of Their Effect on Writing Performance and Rating Accuracy. *IJAL,* 13 (1), 23-42.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. 2007. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Method (5th ed.).* USA: Pearson.

Brown, S. et al. 1996. *500 Tips on Assessment.* London: Kogan Page.

Eksan, R. 2004. *Improving Writing Ability of the Second Year Students of SLTPN 18 Malang through Process Writing*. Thesis Unpublished. Malang: Postgraduate Program of State University of Malang.

Falchikov, N. 2007. *The Place of Peers in Learning and Assessment*. New York: Routledge.

Faudi. 2016. The Implementation of Peer Assessment Technique in Teaching Writing. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 7 (3), 402-414.

Harmer, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. England: Pearson Longman.

Heaton, J.B. 1991. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman.

Klimova, B. F. 2014. Constraints and Difficulties in The Process of Writing Acquisition. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 122, 433-437.

Knapp, P. & Watkins, M. 2005. *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Australia: A UNSW Press book.

Lin G.-Y., Anonymous versus identified peer assessment via a Facebook-based learning application: Effects on quality of peer feedback, perceived learning, perceived fairness, and attitude toward the system, *Computers & Education* (2017), doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2017.08.010.

Misianto. 2014. Improving Students' Ability in Writing an Essay through Peer-Assessment Strategy at the Fifth Semester in Cipta Wacana Christian University of Malang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra*, 1 (1), 37-48.

Myles, J. 2002. Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts. *TESL-EJ*, 6 (2). http://tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html

Puegphrom & Chiramanee. 2011. The Effectiveness of Implementing Peer Assessment on Students' Writing Proficiency. *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Humanities and Social Sciences*. Songkla UniversityPutra, Kristian A. (2014). The Implication of Curriculum Renewal on ELT in Indonesia. *Parole,* 4 (1), 63-75.

Suzuki, M. 2008. Japanese Learners' Self Revisions and Peer Revisions of Their Written Compositions in English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42 (2), 209-233.

Weigle, S. C. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Xiao, Y. & Lucking, R. 2008. The Impact of Two Types of Peer Assessment on Students' Performance and Satisfaction within a Wiki Environment. *Internet and Higher Education,* 11*,* 186-193.

Salah Satu Ragam Sastra Lisan Gorontalo. Jakarta: Intermasa.