

EFFECT OF PEER AND PAIR FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' RECOUNT WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

Fransisca Tuti Rahaju Tanuadji

Abstract

This experimental study investigates the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing achievement. The subjects of the study consisted of the first semester students of Hotel Management Program in Surabaya. Twenty-six students who were assigned in the Experimental Group received peer feedback treatment while twenty-four students who were assigned in the Control Group received pair feedback treatment. The research used quantitative method with quasi-experiment design. The instruments used in this study were recount writing pre-test and post-test. The data gathered were processed with t-test using SPSS. The result of data analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the writing achievement of the Experimental Group and Control Group as the p value is $0.18 > 0.5$. The main reason of the result was that all of the students have the same level of writing ability. The participants, however, revealed improvement in their writing skill. In the Experimental Group, the mean score increased 9.18% (6.92 points) which could be seen from the pre-test average mean score 75.42 that reached up to 82.16 for the post-test average mean score. In the Control Group, the mean score increased 9.56% (7.33 points) which could be seen from the pre-test average mean score 76.67 that reached up to 84 for the post-test average mean score.

Keywords: *experimental group, control group, peer feedback, pair feedback, recount writing achievement.*

Introduction

It is compulsory for students at Hotel Management Program to master the four English skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Based on the curriculum of Hotel Management Program, students get English courses in five semesters as they have to be prepared in communicating, spoken and written, with their guests or customers from any countries around the world in their future work places.

Writing is one of the language skills which enables students to communicate their ideas in the written form. In the first semester, students have writing classes with recount writing as the genre. To implement what they have learned in writing class, students are assigned to write composition as "writing is the skill in which students produce sentences which are put in a particular order and linked together in certain ways"

(Zawahrer, 2012, p 281). Hence, producing ideas in recount writing require students to reinforce the grammar structures and vocabularies that they have acquired.

Although students have learned to communicate their idea with the right structure and appropriate vocabularies, they still make a variety of errors or mistakes when writing recount composition. Consequently, language teachers have to help minimize their mistakes in recount writing assignment. However, students feel discouraged if they receive a piece of written paper with underlining and crossing out in red ink (Harmer, 1988).

Traditionally, it has been the teacher who directs the learning process and takes priority in treating students' errors. In other words, the correction technique is adopted as the teacher is believed to have provision of accurate forms for any deviations in the students' performance (Bonn, 1985; Chaudron, 1984). According to Mishra (2005) the teachers know more English grammar and they happen to be experts at error detection.

However, there has been a shift in a mission and purpose of higher education. Barr & Tagg (1995) describes the change as a "move from an 'Instruction Paradigm' in which universities delivered instruction to "transfer knowledge from faculty to a 'Learning Paradigm" in which universities produce learning through students discovery and construction of knowledge."

"Peer feedback takes the focus away from the teacher and thus initiates a transfer of roles from the teacher to the learners." (Sultana, 2009, p 12). According to Mishra (2005) "It is important that language learning takes cognizance of the need to ensure student participation in the learning process". Therefore, it is necessary that students express themselves through sharing their ideas and having interaction with their peers in recount writing correction activities. The purposes of this sharing are to test the students' level of language knowledge and make them become more aware in the job of correction.

Peer feedback and pair feedback with their advantages are a promising way to be used in encouraging students to read and evaluate their peer and pair's recount writing and give their comment before the final recount writing assignment is submitted to their teachers.

In the recent study, Gorjian, Khansir, and Sarkosh (2014) investigated whether there were any differences between the students' feedback modalities toward pair and peer feedback on improving their writing performance. The participants were assigned to two Experimental Groups (i.e. peer feedback with four students and pair feedback with two students) and a Control group (i.e. teacher feedback). Chi-square(X²) analysis showed that the students only had positive attitudes towards pair feedback while they significantly had negative attitudes toward individual

feedback or teacher's feedback. This result illustrated that students preferred to work and do their assignments in small groups instead of getting teachers' feedback. While the statistical result showed that there were no significant differences between the pair, peer, and individual groups in terms of class performance. However, the mean score of peer group with four members was higher than other groups, pair and individual groups, but this difference was not significant.

So far, the effects on having feedback from pairs, peers and individual/teacher have already been given full attention in various countries. However, there has been little discussion about the effects on the peer and pair feedback in writing course on undergraduate students in Indonesia.

Recent research was conducted by Zainurrahman (2010) to investigate the impact of peer feedback on the students' narrative development and to investigate the students' responses toward peer feedback activities in the ESL writing classroom. The study was designed as a qualitative case study by employing purposive sampling of undergraduate students in a university in Bandung, Indonesia. The result proved that peer feedback is beneficial and advantageous. Students found peer feedback is interesting alternatives beside teacher feedback.

The result of the previous research on peer and pair feedback encourages the researcher to try using peer and pair feedback in her writing classes, because there are still a lot of students who make various errors and mistakes when they write the recount composition. They still do not understand how to write a good recount composition with the appropriate content, vocabulary, idea, grammar and mechanics.

According to the higher education paradigm, learning paradigm, university students should explore and discover knowledge by themselves. Therefore, this study intends to focus on the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing instead of using teacher feedback by applying quantitative method as the previous study was in qualitative method.

The researcher is interested in evaluating the effect of peer and pair feedback on recount writing to find out whether peer feedback groups with four participants will get better recount writing achievement than pair feedback. A group with four participants will get the chances more to learn from their peer as they will exchange the assignment three times while the pair group will only exchange the assignment once.

The researcher is curious to know what the result is if the research is done in Indonesia, because the result of Gorjian, Khansir, and Sarkosh's (2014) research reveals that there is no significant difference between peer group with four members and pair group with two members in their writing achievement.

Besides, peer and pair feedback techniques seem to be suitable to be applied to the participants who need a lot of practice in group work as they are Hotel Management students.

Doing peer and pair feedback activities will encourage students to share knowledge to their friends, help each other, and work cooperatively.

This research examines whether there is a significant difference between the peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing achievement.

The result of the study is expected to be of great significance not only to the lecturers who are teaching recount writing to undergraduate students but also to undergraduate students in improving their recount writing. Peer and pair feedback techniques are able to support new paradigm in higher education in which students should discover and explore knowledge by themselves.

The current study will only examine the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing achievement. The focus of the study is on one of the genres namely recount writing because the participants write in recount for their writing skill during the first semester. The participants will receive pre-test, post-test and get treatment on peer and pair feedback on recount writing.

An analytic writing scale developed by Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormouth, Hartfiel, and Hughey (1981) and adapted by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) is applied to evaluate the data from the pre-test and post-test of the Experimental and Control Groups. The writing scale has essential and principal components in writing namely content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics on a 0- to 100-point scale.

Recount Writing

Recount tells a series of event and gives readers a description of what happened and when it happened. According to Knapp & Watkins (2005), recount text is written to make a report of a series of related event. A recount is written to retell events or incidents that happened in the past in a sequence of events. Knapp and Watkins (2005) consider a recount text as a sequential text.

Peer Feedback and Writing

As an important stage in writing process, peer feedback sometimes referred to peer review (Elbow, 1981 Gere, 1987), peer assessment (Spear, 1988) or peer editing (Harmer, 2004), has been widely applied by writing teachers in first language. Bijami et al. (2013) argue "Peer feedback is considered as an important tool in enhancing the

process of learning English writing”. Some researchers state that peer feedback has an important role in improving student’ writing achievement (Pultsky & Wilson, 2004, Topping, 2000).

Peer feedback, with its high level of interactions among students, gives the sense of confidence through a discussion and friendly dialogue which establishes two-way feedback and negotiation between two sides (Rollinson, 2005). The students work together to express their thought and opinions through the writing task. In addition, replying to peer feedback and giving opinions allow students to acknowledge their similar problems and weaknesses in their own writing (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

Pair feedback and Writing

Researchers have done studies applying the role of interaction in L2 development as learning is a socially situated activity. Because no two learners have the same strength and weaknesses, they can provide assistance to each other when working together (Ohta, 2001). Doing pair feedback in writing will help students to get writing achievement that is beyond their own writing skill.

Pair working helps students to recognize their personal development and develop their sense of responsibility. Pair working can facilitate the development of skills (Gorjian, Khansir, & Sarkosh, 2014) which include: teamwork skills that need team dynamics and leadership skills; analytical and cognitive skills that analyze task requirements; question, critically interpret material, evaluate the work of others; collaborative skills in pair group that include conflict management and resolution, accepting intellectual criticism, flexibility, negotiation and compromise; organizational and time management skills.

Peer feedback, Pair feedback and Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is a learning way in which the students learn in groups. In this type of learning the students interact with each other and build their social relationships. Cooperative learning teaches the students to participate in group work and to have grouped responsibilities as well as individual responsibilities. Cooperative learning not only increases the study skills of a student but also develops the communication skills.

In peer and pair feedback, students are expected to have the opportunity to work collaboratively to improve their writing ability. Throughout the collaborative learning which enables students to work with one another, the peer and pair feedback can be established more efficiently (Murphy and Jacobs, 2000). Learning is not an individual activity, but rather a cognitive activity which focus on the interaction with social context.

Research Method

In conducting the research the researcher applied the quantitative research design to get the numeric data as the measurement. The researcher was encouraged to know students' recount writing achievement after experiencing the treatment. The quasi-experimental design was applied because this study examined the effect of peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing.

Treatment was assigned to both Experimental and Control Groups. The researcher used both pre-test and post-test to measure change associated with treatment. In this research, the researcher assigned the participants into two groups, the Experimental Group with peer feedback and the Control Group with pair feedback, and then assessed a pre-test to both groups, conducted the treatment activities with both groups, and finally assessed the post-test to measure the improvement of both groups.

The quasi experiment design was selected to analyze the effects of peer and pair feedback on students' recount writing achievement because it was not possible for the researcher to use true experimental design through random selection for the Experimental and Control Groups. The researcher chose 2 writing classes which were taught by the researcher and manipulated the peer and pair feedback to see what happened to the students' recount writing achievement after the treatment.

The quasi-experimental design in this research was described as follow (McMillian, 2008).

E	O1	X1	O2
C	O3	X2	O4

O1 = Experimental Group pre-test

O2 = Experimental Group post-test

O3 = Control Group pre-test

O4 = Control Group post-test

X1 = treatment using peer feedback technique

X2 = treatment using pair feedback technique

The first semester students of Hotel Management Program who were enrolled in the academic year 2016/2017 at one of the universities in Surabaya were taken as the population. This study involved the first semester students because the students wrote recount text in writing class.

This study took two classes which consisted of Class C (N=24) and Class E (N=26) with the researcher as their teacher. Twenty-six participants would receive peer feedback and twenty-four participants would receive pair feedback. Cluster sampling was applied in this study because there was a small group of population chosen randomly to represent the whole population.

The data were the scores of the pre-test and post-test which required recount writing. The participants received different kinds of feedback; 26 participants from the Experimental Groups received peer feedback and 24 participants from the Control Groups received pair feedback.

The study aimed at analyzing whether there was a significant difference in the students' recount writing achievement of the Experimental and Control Groups after the treatment. Therefore, the data were collected from the pre-test and post-test done by the participants. Pre-test was conducted in both Experimental and Control Groups to gather the data of students' recount writing before they received treatment. While the post-test was conducted after receiving the pair feedback and peer feedback. This post-test aimed to measure the differences of students' score between the Experimental and Control Group (Wiliyanti, 2014) after having the peer and pair feedback treatment.

The researcher scored the students' pre-test and post-test based on the writing scale. Copies of the same writing are given to another independent rater to get valid and reliable scores. The independent rater was a fellow lecturer from the same university who had been teaching writing class for seven years. The rater was also teaching the same subject in another parallel writing class.

To validate the pre-test and post-test, the researcher discussed the tests with the independent rater to check the correctness and the appropriateness the topic for the test. Then the test was piloted with 10 students who were not the participants of the study but they learnt recount writing in other parallel writing class.

The average of the pre-test scores of the pilot group was 75 while the average of the post-test scores of the pilot group was 78, therefore the tests were considered reliable as the instruments.

Pre-test and post-test were given to both Experimental and Control Group. The data gathered were processed with t-test using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The Means and Standard Deviations from the data were computed.

The dependent-samples t-test was applied to find the significance of the writing achievement of the Experimental Group's scores from the pre-test and post-test. The dependent-samples t-test was also used to find the significance of the recount writing achievement of the Control Group's scores from the pre-test and post-test.

The independent-samples t-test used to compare the mean scores of two different groups of people (Pallant, 2011). In this research the independent-samples t-test was applied to investigate whether there was a statistical significant difference in the students' recount writing achievement of the Experimental and Control Groups after the treatment.

The post-test scores from the Experimental and Control Groups are evaluated to find the significant difference between both groups after receiving peer and pair feedback.

Findings and Discussion

Table 1
The Post-test Scores from the Experimental and the Control Groups

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig.	Conclusion
Experimental	26	82.15	5.96	-1.35	48	0.18	Not significant
Control	24	84	3.54				

The data in Table 1 indicated that the mean of the post-test score from the Experimental Group and the mean of the post-test score from the Control Group did not differ significantly from each other as the value of two tailed significance is more than α ($0,18 > 0,05$).

This was in agreement with Gorjian, Khansir, and Sarkosh (2014) who reported statistically that there were no significant differences between the peer, pair and individual groups in terms of students' writing achievement. Perhaps the main reason of the result was that all of the learners are at the same level in writing skill.

In this study, the researcher got another finding concerning the influence of the total members of the students in the group. The number of the participants would not influence the result of the peer feedback. Students' writing would be improved with a group of two members or four members after they got the treatment in recount writing.

The result was in line with the study on peer feedback on writing skill by Gorjian, Khansir, and Sarkosh (2014) who revealed that there were no significant differences between the pair (two members), peer (four members), and individual groups in writing achievement. Besides, the result of the study showed that students got improvement after experiencing treatment.

In order to measure the language proficiency the Elementary Group and Control Group, the researcher evaluated the pre-test scores from both groups with Independent t-test.

Table 2
The Pre-test scores from the Experimental and the Control Groups

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig.	Conclusion
Experimental	26	75.24	6.28	-0.78	48	0.43	Not significant
Control	24	76.67	6.68				

As seen in Table 2 the members of the Experimental and Control groups were within the same level in writing ability. There was no significant difference in the pre-test scores from the Experimental Group (M=75.24, SD=6.28) and the pre-test scores from the Control Group (M=76.67, SD=6.68); $p=0.43 > 0.05$ (two-tailed). It indicated that the two groups were equal in writing ability.

Table 3
The Pre-test and Post-test Scores from the Experimental Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Sig	Conclusion
Experimental Group	pre-test	75.24	26	6.28	.00	Significant
	post-test	82.16	26	5.96		

Table 3 showed that the mean score from the Experimental Group increased 9.18% (6.92 points) which could be seen from the pre-test average mean score 75.24 that reached up to 82.16 for the post-test average mean score. There was a significant difference between the pre-test score (M=75.24, SD=6.28) and the post-test score (M=82.16, SD=5.96) as the value of two tailed significance was less than α ($0,00 < 0,05$). It proved there was an influence of the treatment experienced by the Experimental Group. This result suggested that the members could improve their writing skill after doing peer feedback technique.

Table 4
The Pre-test and Post-test Scores from the Control Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Sig.	Conclusion
Control Group	pre-test	76.67	24	6.67	.00	Significant
	post-test	84	24	3.54		

Table 4 showed that the mean score from the Control Group increased 9.56% (7.33 points) which could be seen from the pre-test average mean score 76.67 that reached up to 84 for the post-test average mean score. There was a significant difference between the pre-test score (M=76.67, SD=6.67) and the post-test score (M=84,SD=3.54) as the value of two tailed significance was less than α (0,00 \leq 0,05). It proved there was an influence of the pair feedback technique as the treatment in the Control Group. This result suggested that the members could improve their writing skill after doing pair feedback technique.

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.

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 scoring criteria with the greatest advantage of its efficiency to evaluate the data.

Conclusion

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.

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

- 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.
- Bonn, C. K. (1985). Error analysis and composition marking. *Guidelines*, 7(1), 13-21.
- Chaudron, C. (1984). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal*, 15(2), 1-14.
- Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing composing profess of twelfth grades*. Urbana, IL:: National Council of Teachers of English.
- 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 Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World.*, 5(3), 367-379.
- Grabe, P., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. The USA: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (1988). *How to teach English*. London: Longman.
- 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 Linguistics World,
5(3), 367-379.

- 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.
- McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer*. Pearson. Merriem Webster Dictionary. www.merriem-webster.com/dictionary/achievement.
- Mishra, K. C. (2005). *Correction of errors in English: A training course for the teachers of English as a second language*. New Delhi 110002: Sarup & Sons.
- Murphy, T., & Jacobs, G. M. (2000). Encouraging critical collaborative autonomy. *JALT Journal*, 22, 228-244.
- Narciss, S. (2008). *Feedback strategies for interactive learning tasks. A handbook of research on educational communities and technology*. Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- 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.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(19), 23-30.
- 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.
- Topping, K. J. (2000). Peer assessment between students in college and university. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249-267.
- Wiliyanti, C. R. (2014). The effectiveness of per feedback technique in improving students' writing skill in writing narative texts. *respository.upi.edu*.
- 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.