

An Analysis of Peer Corrective Feedback on Writing Recount Texts for Indonesian EFL University Students

Mohammad Fatoni

mohammadfatoni@unugiri.ac.id

English Education Department, UNUGIRI Bojonegoro, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyse of peer corrective feedback on recount text for Indonesian EFL University Students. The use of peer corrective feedback was analyzed descriptively and the university students' recount writings were analyzed in term of vocabulary, grammar and language use. Results of the analysis reveals that peer corrective feedback depends on how the lecturer does setting and training of how to edit their peer writings. Although peer corrective feedback technique emphasizes on the university students center and collaborative learning, the role of the lecturer is significantly needed to train them how to use it. From 10 university students' recount texts analyzed, peer corrective feedback also influenced peer writing in term of vocabulary 5 univeristy students (50%), language use 6 university students (60%) and mechanics 3 university students (30%). They are easily correct vocabulary and language use than mechanics because they assume mechanics is not important in their writings and also doesn't change the meaning significantly.

Keywords: Peer corrective feedback, recount text, writing components

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa umpan balik koreksi teman sebaya pada teks *recount* bagi mahasiswa yang menggunakan bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa Asing. Penggunaan koreksi teman sebaya dianalisa secara deskriptif dan tulisan mahasiswa dianalisa dalam hal kosa kata, tata bahasa dan mekanik (tanda baca dan huruf kapital). Hasil dari penelitian ini menunjukkan umpan balik koreksi teman sebaya tergantung dari bagaimana dosen mendesain dan melatih mahasiswa menggunakan teknik ini. Meskipun teknik umpan balik teman sebaya menekankan pada *students center* dan pembelajaran berkolaborasi, peran dosen sangat dibutuhkan untuk melatih mahasiswanya bagaimana teknik ini digunakan. Dari sepuluh teks tulis *recount* mahasiswa yang analisa, respon umpan balik koreksi teman sebaya juga mempengaruhi kosa kata sebanyak 5 mahasiswa (50%), tata bahasa sebanyak 6 mahasiswa (60%) dan mekanik sebanyak 3 mahasiswa (30%). Mereka juga mudah mengoreksi kosa kata dan tata bahasa dari pada mekanik karena mereka menganggap mekanik tidak begitu penting dalam tulisan mereka dan tidak mengubah makna secara signifikan.

Kata Kunci: umpan balik koreksi teman sebaya, teks *recount*, komponen tulisan.

Introduction

In University level, teaching learning process should focus on the students center and use cooperative learning. A lecturer should not dominate the class and stimulate students to be active in teaching learning process. He should be able to design the class in order that the students of university collaborate with their peers to solve the problems in the teaching learning process by themselves.

Meanwhile, the students of university sometimes get difficulty in composing their writing in the class when the lecturer ask them to compose their own writings especially recount texts. Their writings were not composed well and seems many grammatical errors on them. This is in line with Megawati and Anugerahwati (2012, p. 184) claims the students had difficulty in composing their own writings and seems unmotivated during teaching learning process. A number of factors including students' low interest in writing English class, the students' limited grammatical and vocabulary mastery in learning English, the absence of instructional media in the class, the monotonous teaching learning strategy. Among those factors, the researcher believes teaching learning strategy was taken into account as the most crucial problem because teaching writing should follows a number of writing stages that guide them in producing appropriate writing texts.

In fact, the lecturer usually asks the university students to compose a certain writing texts without giving appropriate guidance from him. Then, he asks them to hand in their writing texts. After that, he decided the score. They assume nothing more needs to be done with their writing texts. This case does not make them understand how to write composition appropriately, motivate them to be creative and critical to construct appropriate writing texts. This might lead to failure in writing programs in the class.

Therefore, the lecturer should pay more attention because writing is considered to be both process and productive activity. It also involves many aspects or considerations such as problems that will be faced by the students during writing process. In relation to those phenomena, the students of university needs the readers to provide corrective feedback to their writings. According to Ellis (2009,p.16), "Corrective feedback is a complex phenomenon. This complexity is reflected in the controversies that surround such issues as whether to correct, what to correct, how to correct and when to correct". Corrective feedback (CF) is a common practice in education field, where a learner obtains comments from a teacher or peer on any task that he or she has done. In this case, their peer provide the correct answers of their peer writing when they make mistakes. In this research, the writer only focuses on vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

Several theoretical frameworks supports peer corrective feedback including process writing, collaborative learning theory, Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, and interaction theories of second language acquisition (SLA) (Hansen & Liu, 2005, p. 31). Peer corrective feedback is necessary needed component in the

process writing approach. It usually takes place on editing stage in which the students' writing texts need peer corrective feedback. It is also supported by collaborative leaning theory, which holds that learning is a socially constructed activity that takes place through communication with peers (K. A. Bruffee, 1984, p. 182). Learners communicate and discuss their works each others to make their works better. Support theory for peer corrective feedback also comes from Vygotsky's zone of proximal development theory. According to Vygotsky (1978, p. 86) that the cognitive development of individual result from social interaction in which individuals extend their current competence through the guidance of a more experienced individual, which is also referred to as 'scaffolding'. The last, it is also empowered by interaction theories of SLA, which hold that learners need to be pushed to negotiate meaning to facilitate SLA (Long & Porter, 1985, p. 306).

However, Most of the studies on the peer corrective feedback from ESL (English as Second Language) context. Then, it comes up the question if EFL (English Foreign Language) learners behave similar to ESL students in a peer corrective feedback setting. ESL is characterized by teaching in the immersion context, where English is the language of the environment. However, EFL learners mostly learned English in the classroom (Levine, Oded, Connor, & Asons, 2002). The researcher is also curious about the implementation of peer corrective feedback in the class wheather peer corrective feedback is useful or not in writing class. Therefore, it is significant to analyze of Peer Corrective Feedback on Writing Recount Texts for Indonesian EFL University Students.

Research Methodology

The purpose of this present study is to analyze of peer corrective feedback on writing recount texts for indonesian EFL university students. The study need to be carried out in natural setting where the researcher has no control over the variables to reach the aim of the research. Therefore, the qualitative approach is seen as the appropriate approach for this study, since it is an approach where the natural setting and the absence of intervention or manipulation over variables are required (Wiersma, 1995). In this study, the writer employs one type of qualitative research that is called basic qualitative study or basic interpretative study since it describes and interprets a phenomenon or process (Ary, Donald, Jacobs, Cheser, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 452). It defines as a form of qualitative research that provides a descriptive account targeted to understanding a phenomenon using data that may be collected as a variety of ways.

The subjects of this study are the university students of Nahdlatul Ulama Surabaya, especially second semester students because it has students from heterogeneous background and they get the recount text in their teaching learning process.

The data in this study are qualitative data. Qualitative data, namely data in the form of words (Sharp, 2009, p. 104). There are two sources of the data in this study: First, data source in this study acquired from the field notes through observation that the writer conducts in the classroom during writing learning process is taking places. Second, the data from students' writing recount texts when applying peer corrective feedback.

University students' Abilities in Writing Recount Text When Applying Peer Corrective Feedback

The researcher takes only ten students writings as the examples to be analyzed. He analyzes the components of writings descriptively. They are language use, vocabulary and mechanics. Language use was observed in term of the use of grammar such as the use of simple verb, past verb, gerund, verbs after modals and to infinitive. Vocabulary was observed in term of correct spelling, the appropriate vocabulary used and word choice. Mechanics will be observed in term of the use of punctuation, such as full stop, comma and capital letters after full stop and also name of the characters.

The students' writing was analyzed based on the scoring rubric of ESL Profile. The components of writing proficiency are vocabulary, language use and mechanics. The following table was summarized scoring rubric of students' writing.

Table: The Students' Score Rough and Final drafts

University Students	Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics	
	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D
University Student 1	4	4	4	4	3	3
University Student 2	4	4	3	4	3	3
University Student 3	3	4	3	4	3	4
University Student 4	3	4	3	4	3	3
University Student 5	4	4	3	3	3	4
University Student 6	3	4	3	4	3	4
University Student 7	3	4	3	4	3	3

University Student 8	3	4	3	4	3	3
University Student 9	3	3	3	3	3	3
University Student 10	3	3	3	3	2	2

Note: R.D=Rough drafts' Score

F.D= Final drafts' Score

Based on the result of the students' writing above, it could be said that the students abilities had different range in the aspect of vocabulary, language use and mechanics. From ten student five students (50%) also could correct the mistakes of words from rough to final drafts. They could tried to correct misspelling and word choice to make their peer draft better. Six student (60%) could edit their mistakes in language use from rough to final drafts. The could correct the grammatical errors and provide the correct ones. In mechanics, only three students (30%) could edit the mistakes in mechanics from rough to final drafts. They assumed mechanics is not important in their writings and also didn't change the meaning significantly.

Discussion on Analysis of Peer Corrective Feedback on Writing Recount Texts

Finding of this research indicated peer corrective feedback technique made beneficial contribution to the students' writings in term of vocabulary, language use. In other hand, this finding contrasts to the previous studies (Ting and Qian, 2010) concludes peer corrective feedback is not useful to her class. However, In her research, she did not train her students how to use peer corrective feedback. She just asked her students to give corrective feedback to their peer writings. Her students got confused how to give and correct their writing texts based on feedbacks which are given by their peer.

Fortunately, This finding is in line with the study by Lu (2010). Based on this finding, it can be concluded that the corrective feedback was actually beneficial to improve students' writing accuracy. They could correct their peer misspelling of the words and also correct their grammatical errors. However, new finding in this research, the university students gave a few corrective feedback in term of mechanics.

Overall, Peer corrective feedback gave beneficial contribution towards the students' writing in term of vocabulary and language use. Although, the peer response was student centered, the participation of lecturer to make them understood on how to do peer corrective feedfack correctly was significantly needed.

Conclusion

Peer corrective feedback technique emphasizes on the collaborative learning and the students center. In this case, the lecturer should train his university students how to conduct this technique effectively. The success of implementing this technique depends on how the lecturer does the setting and training of peer corrective feedback.

There is improvement on the students' writing ability in vocabulary and language use by using this technique. Meanwhile, mechanics does not significantly improve. They rarely gave their peer corrective feedback in term of mechanics because they assumed it is not important to their writings and also doesn't change the meaning significantly.

REFERENCES

- Ary, Donald, Jacobs, Cheser, L., & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative Learning and the Convention of "Mandkind". *College English*, 28(I), 181-188.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*. 1(1), 3-18.
- Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31-38.
- Levine, A., Oded, B., Connor, U., & Asons, I. (2002). Variation in EFL-ESL peer response. *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 6(3).
- Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group Work, Interlanguage Talk and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 305-325.
- Lu, Y. (2010). The value of direct and indirect written corrective feedback for intermediate ESL students. Unpublished Thesis. Auckland: Auckland University of Technology.
- Megawati, F., & Anugerahwati, M. (2012). Comic strips:A Study on the Teaching of Writing Narrative Texts to Indonesian EFL Students *TEFLIN Journal*, 23(2), 183-205.
- Sharp, J. G. (2009). *Study Skills in Education: Success with Your Education Research Project*. Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Ting, M., & Qian, Y. (2010). A Case Study of Peer Feedback in a Chinese EFL Writing Classroom. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics* 33 (4).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Process*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. 1978. *Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Process*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research Methods in Education: An Introduction* (6th ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon.