

The Effect of Trained Peer Feedback on Narrative Text among Low English Language Proficiency Students

Achmad Zainudin
University of Islam Malang
Email address: zaenbinahmad@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines trained EFL learners to peer feedback on narrative text in the context of students with low English language proficiency. The researcher conducted a pretest to each student (n=26). They write a narrative text in which the title has been prepared by the researcher then review their peer writing. After that, students are given two coaching peer feedback. Each meeting is eighty minutes. After that, the researcher conducted a posttest and compare the pretest and posttest. The result showed that students who obtained training peer feedback are better than before getting trained peer feedback on their writing ability although it is not a significant result. The improvement of students' scores can be seen from the difference both pretest and posttest. The mean score of pretest improved from 56 to 66.31. The researcher concludes that the extensive training will implicate to the significant result of their writing and it enhanced the critical thinking of LP students.

Keywords: EFL writing, peer feedback, peer feedback training

Various teaching strategies, techniques, and methods in writing have risen. Those ways are to make students with low English proficiency to accept and enjoy learning writing skills. They have difficulty when the teacher asked them to write something with the English. They have difficulty in choosing the topic and how is to develop their good English written. So the role of teacher and peer are an important and crucial issue in writing skill. Yu and Lee (2016) stated that the teacher evaluated their students by using teacher feedback meanwhile the peer contributed to peer feedback in the teaching and learning writing skills.

In addition, providing effective written feedback is one of the most important tasks for English writing teachers (Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). However, Chokwe (2013) stated that giving fewer occasion writing and fewer practicing the foreign language are one on of un-effective teaching. Underprepared teaching writing skills is a scourge of low English language proficiency students in learning writing skills.

Otherwise, in examining the use of feedback, McCarty (2013) found that the implementation of peer feedback might disturb low English language proficiency student ability to give critical, comments, and suggestions on a peer. Perhaps, low English language proficiency students have discomfort feeling to participate in the peer feedback experiment. Hulse & Page (1994) stated the different backgrounds of low English language proficiency students may make them uncomfortable to be encouraging to each other including students' beliefs, cultural and family.

However, there are some negative results in examining peer feedback but, Khasminder & Tan (2016) revealed that giving peer feedback in the teaching and learning process had a positive effect as well as receiving peer feedback. Furthermore, there is some researches evidence to encourage that student with low English language proficiency students has significant contribution in giving comment and writing quality (Yu and Lee; 2016) showed that peer feedback has an essential role in learning writing as a foreign language in all English language proficiency levels. Peer feedback will contribute among students with low language proficiency to develop and to improve their writing skills. Furthermore, low English language proficiency students do not only always become receiver feedback but also they can become a giver contribution to the learning process (Yu & Lee, 2016). It expected that LP students might develop their writing too in the peer feedback. Students trained with peer feedback will give them chance to interact and share their comprehension of the writing text in English with another student. Saito (2008) stated low English language proficiency students require coaching on peer feedback in the learning writing as a foreign language.

So, based on the issue above, it investigates the effect trained peer feedback on narrative text among low proficiency students particularly in Indonesia school where the trained peer feedback implemented rarely in the classroom. It will investigate LP students by comparing both before and after having treatment. This research focused on LP students who get trained peer feedback on L2 writing, whether there is or not the significant different statistically from before and after having LP students' treatment peer feedback on their writing.

Method

Research method

The main purpose of this study is investigating whether trained peer feedback on writing among low English language proficiency students after treatment is better than before trained peer feedback on their narrative text. The research approach is quantitative by using paired sample T-test. It means that researcher will take a group as subject for pretest and posttest. The research design is Pre-Experimental research. The pretest and posttest was given in difference topic when the average score of posttest is significantly higher than the average score of pretest it can be conclude that the treatment is effective.

Participant

The population of this research is the eleventh grade class of senior high school precisely vocational high school of Madani Indonesia. There are 47 students. LP students categorized in English proficiency test or alternative categorize was identified by using the midterm examination score.

Setting

It is located at Karang Ploso Malang. The research was conducted in this school because the majority of the students have low English language proficiency and they had never carried test out of English language proficiency. In the Nurse's class, they wrote a narrative text of about 150-200 words at equal intervals during

the academic year. They also learned strategies for revising, editing and commenting on peer feedback.

Peer feedback training

The concept of the training is through some steps. Here are some concrete steps to make effective peer feedback in the classroom. Firstly, use the feedback rubric. Feedback rubric focuses on student constructive activity informative feedback. This rubric can also co-create with students. If they can help to formulate the criteria, they will develop a much deeper understanding of what good work looks like. This rubric will help teachers and students what and how should they do on the writing process.

Secondly, moderate and review feedback from the student. In the beginning, the process, giving and receiving peer feedback is hard to do. Most students may be uncertain to share their work with a peer and write feedback to their friends because they are unfamiliar with peer activity. By creating training peer feedback on how to give and receive peer feedback will help students to write better feedback. An interactive learning writing classroom will be build from this activity.

Third, make the feedback process anonymous. Students often feel uncertain about the peer review process. Their most common fear is that they will receive "unfair" feedback from peers. To help alleviate this problem, the Researcher will recommend teachers to moderate the process. When specific student feedback is lacking, some digital tools for peer review makes this easy by allowing students to flag feedback for teacher moderation.

Fourth, ask students to react to the feedback they receive. One of the best ways to learn is getting feedback in the teaching and learning writing process. This is of course also the case when it comes to giving feedback. Ask students to "give feedback on the feedback" that they receive. This way, students know how their comments are perceived, and allow them to improve their feedback-giving skills. Good feedback should be constructive, specific, kind, justified and relevant.

Fifth, start small and in class. When peer review is new to teachers and students, it's unlikely that the first attempt will be perfect. It always recommends that teachers start small. Ask students to review something short and simple, such as the introduction to an essay. If possible, make the peer review session a classroom activity—instead of homework—so it can assist students if they have questions and concerns.

Modeling

First session 40 minutes, Students submitted their written homework to the teacher together, then the teacher distributed their writing to others. Each student received peers' writing. The researcher ensures that students reviewed the peer writing. After that, the researcher divided them into the small group. Each group contains 4-5 students and they checked their peer mistake on text (fifth categories) and gave comments.

Second session 30 minutes, teacher ask a student in each group to present their finding on text and ask him/her to give feedback to their friends. In the third session 10 minutes, the teacher asks students to submit the text to their friend and give them to review their writing.

Data collection procedure

The researcher will accumulate the data in this study when students were drafting narrative text. The data were in the form of students' writing score from pretest and posttest direct writing test. The collection data process is divided into three parts. There are pretest, treatment process and posttest. Additionally, Data sources included video recording of peer feedback sessions, and drafts of students' text. There were four procedures of this research, pretest activity, giving treatment, interviewing activity and posttest activity

Data analysis technique

In this researcher, the data from pretest and posttest were analyzed by using t-test in order to calculate it. The researcher used dependent t-test because he wants to compare the dependent variable. The paired sample T-test or dependent sample T-test is also used to find out how significant the difference between the students' writing skill in pretest and posttest is. As mentioned, the two works must be converted into the scores before the result are being compared.

Result

The result of the comparison of students' pretest and posttest results is provided in the form of a table.

The table 1 Comparison Pretest and Posttest Data

Statistics		Pre_test	Post_test
N	Valid	26	26
	Missing	0	0
Mean		56.00	66.31
Median		56.00	68.00
Mode		52 ^a	64
Std. Deviation		8.390	11.492
Variance		70.400	132.062
Range		32	40
Minimum		40	44
Maximum		72	84
Sum		1456	1724

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

The table showed that the mean scores of pretest and posttest are 56 and 66.31. It showed that there was an increasing score before and after training. In short, the average score in the posttest was higher than the average in the pretest. Moreover, based on the statistical result, it was assumed that the students writing in posttest among low English language proficiency is better than pretest in vocational high school of Madani Indonesia Malang.

Discussion

Both pretest and posttest had been analyzed, the result showed that there is an increasing score on narrative text for low English language proficiency students by using trained peer feedback. It can be checked and seen on comparison of

scoring both pretest and posttest result ($56 < 66.31$). Despite the result of this research, it is a positive effect but using one group design provided little control of extraneous variables. The obvious extraneous variable in this research is maturation. It means that low English language proficiency students are more enthusiastic to review and to give feedback to peers than the previous experiment in the learning narrative text. Latief (2012, p. 101) stated that maturation interferes the result of educational experiments in the experimental group. The effect of cognitive ability for low English language proficiency students in learning is faster before treatment is done. Researcher believed that the low English language proficiency students learn from the pattern of pretest because the researcher used the same pattern for the posttest with the different topic and the coaching peer feedback help them to be better on understanding the narrative text.

However, the design of this research is weak but the researcher observed the low English language proficiency students in great detail on the analysis of the weakness of peers. The single group design used by the researcher is to emphasize and to demonstrate that children with a down syndrome of training peer feedback. Frankel & Wallen (2009) stated that single-subject design is most commonly used to study the changes in behavior an individual exhibits after exposure to intervention or treatment of some sort.

In addition, Min (2016) said that after a student got coaching Peer feedback peer review better than before and has been trained on the quality of revision on students' writing. Trained peer review feedback positively effects for EFL students' revision types and quality of text directly. This research, students with low English language proficiency on the Vocational high school of Madani understood the peer's mistakes and their mistakes self. When they were on the posttest, they knew well their mistake in the pretest. They did not want to make the same mistake. They carefully tried to minimize their revision in the text.

Based on the statement above, extensive training is necessary. The researcher believes that extensive training of peer feedback will give a significant effect on students with low English language proficiency writing. In this research, the training is conducted only two meetings. The result was not significant. It evidences that there are some students who have a similar score in both pretest and post-test. Perhaps adding the coaching student will help them to write narrative text better.

A similar finding was reported by Farrah (2012), he claims that trained peer feedback is worthwhile to experience such as social interaction, enhancing critical thinking of students, confidence, creativity, and motivation. In this research, some students were more active in the group. They provide critical evaluation and comment. Writing a narrative text with a good arrangement is not easy for low English language proficiency but through peer sharing, and feedback they wrote narrative well. Peer feedback made students more responsible for activity in the class. They could compare their writing and ideas with their peers.

Yu & Lee (2016) stated social interaction and community building can be created through peer feedback on learning writing. In the research, building relationship reflected harmonious working relationship in the class among low English language proficiency students. When they accepted and gave peer feedback from the other, they were available to include in the class interaction. The relationship and solidarity among low English language proficiency were

stronger than before treatment. Because they have high motivation to gain a good score in the class.

The researcher found some factors that might influence the success of coaching peer feedback for low English language proficiency students. Firstly, the researcher facilitated them easy way and explanation to understand their role in the classroom by using Bahasa (Indonesia). Secondly, the researcher stimulated them by using a short video about the narrative story which was known well by students.

Based on the explanation above, it might be concluded that students with low English language proficiency have better skill in writing if peer feedback is given with effective and intensive coaching. A similarity with the result of this research, trained peer feedback among students with low English language proficiency is better than before training. This finding should be tried by EFL instructor or teacher who has integrated learning and teaching writing class was another research design.

Conclusion

As result, coaching trained peer feedback can improve students' writing ability in the vocational high school of Madani Indonesia in Karangploso – Malang. Referring to the research findings of this study, there are some suggestions for the teacher, students, and the next researcher. Firstly, it is a suggestion for the teacher to implement peer feedback on learning writing. It can improve low English language proficiency students. As many of us knew that starting writing for EFL learners is not easy. Because of EFL teacher should have a passion to create innovative learning in the classroom. Peer feedback gave real contribution in the scoring or assessment the EFL students to include activities in teaching and learning EFL. Secondly, it is a suggestion for EFL students. The grade or level English proficiency is not the main problem in the learning EFL. The key to successful studying English is how much do you practice the fourth English skill. Writing in English is not easy but it is a simple activity if you will try it continuously. Thirdly, for the next researcher who wants to take trained peer feedback and writing skills. In this research, the research design is the pre-experimental design. Pre-experimental design cannot be defined as a real experimental design since there is only one group of students who given treatment. It does not have any other group comparison. Therefore, the future researcher can use another design that is stronger such as true experimental study.

These findings suggest that analysis mistakes in the peer feedback may be particularly helpful for LP students who need guidance in the peer feedback group. In the analysis mistakes in peer feedback on writing skills will contribute LP students for developing writing skills and the benefits of peer feedback for students as both receivers and givers, as well as the significance of good working relationships in successful peer feedback activities.

References

- Chokwe Jack M. (2013). Factors Impacting Academic Writing Skills of English Second Language Students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy*. E-ISSN 2039-2117, ISSN 2039-9340. Vol 4 No 14.
- Claiborn, C. D., & Goodyear, R. K. (2005). Feedback in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 61, 209-217. doi: 10.1002/jclp.20112
- Farrah Muhammad. (2012). *The Impact of Peer Feedback on Improving the writing Skills among Hebron University students* (Unpublished masters' thesis). An-Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities). Vol. 26 (1)
- Frankel. J. R & Wallen. N. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Seventh edition. San Francisco State University. New York.
- Hulse-Killacky, D. & Page, B. J. (1994). Development of the Corrective Feedback Instrument: A tool for use in counselor training groups. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 19(4), 197-210. doi:10.1080/01933929408414365
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255–286.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185–212.
- Khasminder, S. & Tan, B.H. (2016). Effects of Structured Peer Feedback on Secondary School Students' Text Revision. *The English Teacher*, 45(3), 126 - 143.
- Latief, M.A. (2012). *Research Method on Language Learning: An Introduction*. Malang: UM Press
- McCarty, T. (2013). Feedback sandwiches affect perceptions but not performance. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 18, 397-407. doi: 10.1007/s10459-012-9377-9
- Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15: 118–141
- Min, H. T. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System*, 33(2), 293–308.
- Peterson, S. (2010). Improving Student Writing Using Feedback as a Teaching Tool. *Journal of Research into Practice*, 29 (2), 1-4
- Saito. H. (2008). EFL Classroom peer assessment: Training effects on rating and commenting. *Language testing*. Ibaraki University, Japan 25; 553
- Yu. S, & Lee. I. (2016). Understanding the role of the learner with low English language proficiency in peer feedback of second language writing. *TESOL: Quarterly*. 50/2, doi 10.1002/tesq.301.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the effective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of second language writing* 4/3: 209-220.

Appendices

Appendix A: Trained Process

Content

The teacher informed students about hand-written narrative text well with the appropriate topic and trained students how to give peer feedback in content including necessary who, what, where and how in the narrative text.

Categories

The teacher trained students how to create the appropriate title, effective introductory paragraph, the topic is stated, leads to a body, supporting evidence given for generalization, the conclusion logical and complete and how to review the peer's writing.

Vocabularies

The teacher informed students to choose of appropriate words and expression language and to use of parallel structure by using explanation and giving example. Then the teacher trained them to analysis the written of the peer.

Grammar

The teacher explained to students how to use the simple past tense, subject-verb agreement, tense, numeral, article, preposition, pronoun, and reflexive in narrative text accurately. Then, they trained to review their peer's text.

Mechanism

The teacher trained peer feedback students about punctuation and capitalization accurately by using their peer's paper.

Commenting

Teacher trained peer feedback students about giving commenting and analysis the content, categories, grammar, vocabulary

Appendix B: Guidance sheet for reviewing narrative text

Content

Read your peer written text! is there topic conclude who, what, where and how
Underline the topic sentence

Categories

Did the writer write according to your expectations?
Is there any clear transition to connect among the paragraphs?

Vocabularies

Did your partner use any transitions to connect this paragraph with the previous one?

Grammar

Did your partner use appropriate grammar such as simple past tense, subject-verb agreement, tenses, numeral, article, preposition, pronoun, and reflexive in narrative text?

Mechanism

Did your partner use accurately punctuation and capitalization in the paragraph?

Commenting

Did your partner use any transitions to connect this paragraph?

Appendix C: Trained Guidance procedure

Pre-peer feedback

Teacher clarifying the benefit of peer feedback

Grouping the students

The teacher may show how to give peer feedback by doing an example

While Peer feedback

Students begin their feedback
The teacher is a monitor

Post-Peer feedback

Students reflect on what they did during peer feedback
They write about their experience
The teacher evaluated students' works