

The Impact of Peer Corrective Feedback toward Descriptive Writing Quality of Junior High School Students

Sindhy Melinda

English Language Teaching Study Program
Postgraduate School, Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia
Email: sindhy.mel90@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback through peers and teacher in writing paragraph description of junior high school students. The initial sample in this study included 50 students which divided into two groups, experimental group and control group. In peer-corrective feedback group, the correction code was carried by their peers who assessed the paragraph using Chandler's composition model as the coding descriptor. In teacher corrective feedback group was carried by the teacher also using Chandler's composition model as the coding descriptor. Then both score of students' paragraph are given score by the teacher by using the composition reference by Jacobs et al. In this study the use T-test is to investigate differences in writing results obtained by students before and after providing corrective feedback from friends and teachers. This finding also revealed to find out the aspects that improve the most after the implementation of peers and teacher feedback. Giving feedback in this study is more focused on grammar and mechanics, paragraph content, vocabulary, and organization. Students also revealed that giving feedback by peers and teacher had a positive impact on the ability in writing their paragraphs and it also could exchange insights with friends.

Keywords: Peer Corrective Feedback, Descriptive Paragraph, Writing Quality.

INTRODUCTION

In a teaching and learning process, sometimes students often make mistakes that can make it difficult for readers to understand the contents of the writing. Providing feedback on the results of student writing is as crucial as revising or editing in the writing process. Feedback can be said as a source of information on the strengths and weaknesses of students in learning to write in order to know the extent of improvement and development of their writing. Among the types of feedback given to students at the secondary school level are peer feedback and teacher feedback. Just like all forms of human interaction, a form of reciprocal communication between

teacher and student can be done by giving written comments about student understanding

According to Ferris (1997) and Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), the specific type of feedback is more influential in the revisions students undertook in their writing. Among researchers studying the type of feedback, Ferris (1997) considered the type of feedback in terms of certain communicative goals, i.e. In this case, once a teacher provides writing assignment to students, the teacher asks students to write good paragraphs or essays based on a given topic.

In fact, students don't understand why they get such scores and don't get anything from the process. Indeed, obstacles in the learning process of writing increase not only from students' abilities, but also from how teachers provide feedback on their work. Feedback is extremely important to encourage students' writing ability because it can improve the students' performance, ability, and motivation for future learning.

How to provide feedback should be based on student needs.

Some introverted students are more comfortable if they get feedback from partners because they can exchange ideas with them. According to Richard and Renandya (2002), writing is known to be the most important English skills for students. Writing is organized thinking, so a lot of work is required to create so generate the concept in a piece of paper. The student appears to be confident that there are not many mistakes in his composition. In his research, it was shown that the difficulties faced by students in learning to write are caused by errors when the learning process during the class.

This demonstrates that teaching writing only stresses to the principle of grammar and vocabulary, instead of giving students the ability to write as much as possible. Students do need to be worried about the quality of teaching, not just how to write it. Students are only asked to write explicitly accordingly the basis of the subject matter and only the score is taken without regard to the errors made by the students. Such practice will also make students repeat their errors in writing if their writing was not right.

Corrective feedback is one of the appropriate techniques to be taught by teachers in learning to write English. According to Ellis (2009), corrective feedback relates to a variety of divisive issues as it represents one form of negative feedback. Although Truscott (2007) in his research considered the effectiveness in providing written feedback based on specific grammar categories, he concludes that all forms of corrective feedback are inadequate for all domains from different grammar categories that are an integral part of complex structures.. His statement indicates the likelihood

that different forms of corrective input can have different effects on different categories of grammar.

In his research, Lalande (1982) conducted a study comparing the effectiveness of self-correction to teacher correction of students in Germany. In his research, he explained the combination of mistakes made by students in writing and rewriting using problem solving strategies that can provide changes to students' writing skills. Wu (2006) investigated a research on university level students to find out students' reactions when getting peer revision in EFL class. His research found that corrective feedback from peer and teacher provided very similar results to their writing.

Almost the research conducted on university students stated that giving feedback both directly and indirectly was very helpful especially to students who have a low ability in English. This latest study looked at the comparison of the effectiveness in giving peer and teacher corrective feedback on eight graders of junior high school. To this review, however, the writer is interested in examining only the corrective feedback used by the teacher and peer and the function of remedial feedback feature. In addition to analyzing how students' reaction, the writer wants to know the degree to which English teachers are pleased with the response of their students to their comments. In addition, these errors would be made not only in vocabulary and pronunciation, but also in grammar.

Another reason is based on the writer's experience when asking the students to create English stories that there are some students who have difficulty in building good sentences in paragraph form. There are some difficulties faced by students in the writing process. In addition, these errors would be made not only in vocabulary and pronunciation, but also in grammar. The writer of this study, who is also an English teacher at SMP Nasional Malang, found the problem that students were not excited when they asked to write paragraph. This is because students never get feedback if their writing has an error. They feel there is no progress in being able to write better. Besides aiming to compare gaps against the use of teacher and peer feedback methods, this study also identifies aspects of writing that have the most errors in student writing.

Based on the context, the writer has formulated the problems of the study. The first question is "To what degree do the students who are taught by peer corrective feedback achieve better writing performance than those taught by teacher corrective feedback of junior high school?" and the second question is "How effective is the use of corrective feedback in students' writing performance of junior high school?"

Types of Corrective Feedback

It is better that in teaching writing activities, the teacher provides feedback to the results of student' work so that students know the mistakes they made that will be

remembered by students in order to do not repeat these mistakes. Ganji (2009) defines several types of corrective feedback in his research, namely teacher corrective feedback and peer corrective feedback. The most widely used method to help students improve their writing skills is teacher corrective feedback because the teacher can give grades right away and does not require much time. By Hyland and Hyland (2001) have explained that written feedback from teachers is one of the important roles in L2 writing class. In general, teachers can provide feedback in two ways, namely direct feedback and indirect feedback. Direct feedback gives the teacher a chance to explain the mistakes made by students so students know the mistakes they made. Whereas indirect feedback usually only shows that students make mistakes without explaining the right one. According to Ferris (2007), there are three methods that can be done by teachers to show students' mistakes in writing L2. The first is pointing out an error by giving encoded error (abbreviation or symbol), showing an error by using unencoded error but only using underscores or circles without showing the form of the error, and feedback of marginal errors (using margins to indicate the number of errors in each line. According to many students in ESL classes, constructive feedback is very important for them to improve and develop their grammar and writing style, and the teacher should approach students and give positive motivations related to the mistakes that students have made, however, direct feedback demands cognitive burdens that are burdensome for students who ask them to understand, compare and differentiate

The other is peer corrective feedback. Storch (2004) claimed that the feedback given by peers also has a theoretical and pedagogical basis to support the principle of a communicative approach in language learning. According to Long and Porter (1985), explaining that to be able to understand interactions through symbols that are carried out during the interaction process, it is very important for students to carry out discussion activities to help their SLA learning. Hyland and Hyland (2001) add that the feedback given between peers can increase the involvement of students' activeness and creativity and reduce student dependence on teachers. In addition, peer feedback can also provide an opportunity to find out the difference in the content of their writing with those of their peers so that they can provide self-reflection and develop students' editing skills. Whereas ESL students feel that peer feedback can help them to improve learning where they still feel unsure of their reading skills. There are several obstacles that can occur in implementing peer feedback, namely students only respond to surface errors rather than semantic errors, students give less encouragement to their peers because they only give, and students lack confidence in giving feedback and fear that feedback is inaccurate (Leki, 1990).

Feedback Correction Codes

Correction codes refer to the indication of types and locations of students' errors through the use of correction codes, just like those proposed by Chandler (2003). Types of error codes by Chandler provide a sentence example in each type in order to avoid confusion in identifying errors directly to the learners, making sentence. Therefore, the writer prefers to use his type error codes as a reference to do the study. The following table shows some different kinds of correction codes suggested by Chandler (2003).

Descriptive Text

Descriptive text is a text that aims to give the reader a picture of an object and its features such as a person, object, a place, animals, and plants. Kane (2000) describes how something that can be seen, heard, and felt by the senses of the reader. To be able to explain, mostly obtained from a visual experience.

In addition, McKay (1985) said we should be able to make the readers understand what we mean in our writing when we want to explain it. McKay often cites descriptive styles describing a process most frequently, describing an entity, describing a location, describing a personality and describing an event. Students must be able to grasp the substance of this learning process and render concise texts based on their generic structure.

The description describes an object's parts, qualities, and characteristics of an object. It is consistent with Gerot and Wignel (1994) that there are two basic structures in descriptive literature, namely identification and definition. The descriptive text's generic structure that students must know: Identification is an introduction, in the form of a general description of a topic and description, contains the special characteristics of the object, place, or person described. For example: traits, physical features, and other things that are written specifically.

METHOD

To find out the difference between the effectiveness of providing peer feedback and teacher feedback, this study used a quantitative research design with quasi-experimental methods. Quantitative research is research conducted using data in the form of numbers and then analyzed using statistics. While the experimental method is a research method used to look for the effect of certain treatments. It was emphasized that the purpose of this study was to find out the effectiveness between the use of peer corrective feedback and teacher corrective feedback on the results of writing paragraph descriptions of students in VIII class.

Quantitative research method according to Sugiono (2011) is a research that the data in the form of numbers and it analyzed by using statistic. Quantitative method used a descriptive and verification research approach because the variables have to be examined for their relationship and the aim to present a structured, factual, and picture of the facts of the relationship between the variables. It means that this research involves selecting groups, experimental and control groups and the participants have the same chance of being assigned to the comparison group.

This study was carried out at SMP Nasional Malang. The population in this study was VIII students which involved 2 classes that will be used as a comparison to obtain the data. Each class consists of 25 students, VIIIC as the experimental group and VIIID as the control group. Pretest is given to both groups at the first meeting before doing the feedback technique. After the pretest was given and the results were reported, the treatment that was scheduled to last for 3 weeks began. Here is the tables show the techniques of the data collection.

Methods of Data Gathering	
Peer correction	Teacher correction
Pre-test	Pre-test
Result recorded	Result recorded
Treatment (Teacher explain about correction symbol and peer correction)	Treatment (Teacher explain about correction symbol)
Post test (with different topic of paragraph)	Post test (with different topic of paragraph)
Students submit the essay	Students submit the first draft
Result recorded	Result recorded
Teacher divide the class into a group of 5	Teacher hand in the paragraph
Each group correct peer's paragraph (circling or underlining the errors, and giving error codes)	Students get errors circled by the teacher
Students return peer's paragraph	Students correct errors on the paragraph
Students rewrite their paragraph in correct form	Students rewrite the paragraph in correct form
Students submit the paragraph	Students submit the paragraph

Result recorded	Result recorded
Teacher hand in the paragraph	Teacher hand in the paragraph
Teacher asks students to correct peer's paragraph once again in the same way.	Students get errors circled and get the correct form from the teacher
Students rewrite with the correct form	Students rewrite with the correct form
Students submit the final draft	Students submit the final draft
Result recorded	Result recorded

The process of scoring students' assignments does not end in giving scores in each category. After obtaining the individual score, the writer had to find out the mean of all scoring by inputting the data into SPSS (Statistical Analysis Software). In order to get the mean score of each group then compare the mean score between the two groups, descriptive statistics and t-test were used.

RESULTS

Group Statistics

Pre-Test Score		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1. Experimental,	1,00	25	67,0400	6,69253	1,33851
2. Control	— 2,00	25	66,6000	4,95816	,99163

Table 1: Mean scores of the pretest of experimental group and control group

Based on the table above it can be seen that the pretest results of the mean performance of the experimental group were 67.0400, and the control group was 66.6000. They were then evaluated using the Levene variance equation test.

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Pre-Test Equal variances	,387	,537	264	48	,793	,44000	1,66581	-2,90934	3,78934

Score	assumed									
	Equal variances not assumed			,264	44,246	,793	44000	1,66581	-2,91670	3,7967 0

Table 2: Mean scores between pretest experimental and control group

From the table above can be seen that the result is 0.793 or 79.3% which is greater than 0.05 or 5%. It could be assumed that the experimental and control groups were not significantly different. This also means that all students from the two groups were at the same level of capability to compose paragraphs. The pretest result showed that the mean score of experimental group was 67, and for the control group was 66. Only 9 of 50 students earned more than 70.

Post test was given after the writer explained the technique of corrective feedback by providing some kinds of correction codes to the students. This was done to ensure that the students were aware of the sort of mistakes they frequently made in writing. To find out the differences in the post test results between the experimental group and the control group, it is explained further below.

Paragraph Results Writing by Using Peer Corrective Feedback

After collecting all the students' work that were corrected by their peers using the peer correction method, then the writer input the students' score into SPSS application to find out the mean scores before and after being given treatment.

Paired Samples Statistics

			Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Before treatment	getting	72,5200	25	4,77947	,95589
	After treatment	getting	79,7200	25	4,86073	,97215

Table 3: Comparative mean score between the results of students' paragraph writing before and after the treatment of peer correction

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			

Pair 1	Before Treatment -	-7,20000	1,73205	,34641	-7,91496	-6,48504	-20,785	24	,000
	After Treatment								

Table 4: Result of students' paragraph writing using peer correction

The tables above provide the information that the students' mean score of pretest (before treatment) was 72.5200 and post test (after treatment) was 79.7200. The standard deviation was 7.20000. The t-test result was then 0.00 or less than 0.05 or 5%, indicates that student scores after being given treatment have increased compared to scores before being given treatment which means that significantly increased. This can be shown that 0.00 or 0 percent $< 5\%$ was the relationship between post test scores before treatment and post test scores after treatment. Therefore, it can be assumed that implementing peer correction technique can influence the improvement of students' paragraph writing significantly.

Result of Paragraph Writing by Using Peer Corrective Feedback

After collecting the assignments and bringing them at home, the teacher or the writer started doing the correction. There are some steps the teacher done in correcting students' paragraph. First, the teacher read and circled the wrong form or the errors occurred in the essay. Then, the teacher gave the error code right on the circled area. After that, she gave the correct form only in certain areas especially the area that had the worst form or structure. Finally, the teacher scored the essay in five categories that consist of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Then, she counted the scores in each student' paragraph. The final result before and after treatment can be seen in the following tables.

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 Before the Treatment	72,4400	25	3,02875	,60575
After the Treatment	81,2800	25	3,55340	,71068

Table 5: Mean score between the result of the students' paragraph writing before and after the teacher's correction

Paired Samples Test

Paired Differences						T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
			Lower	Upper				

Post-Test Score	Equal variances assumed	1,633	,207	-1,295	48	,201	-1,56000	1,20421	-3,98124	,86124
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,295	43,953	,202	-1,56000	1,20421	-3,98701	,86701

Table 8: Equality variances of final post test between experimental and control group

This can be seen from the table above that the result is 0.201 or 20.1% and it is greater than 0.05 or 5%. It can be said that from the post test results between the experimental group and the control group no significant differences were found. This shows that both correction techniques have a major impact on improving students' writing paragraphs.

The students' writings were also analyzed to find out the aspects that improve the most after the implementation of peers and teacher feedback. Feedback from surface level concerns about content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. To get the result of how much feedback is having an effect on student writings by comparing the score between pretest and post test. Both corrective feedbacks (peer and teacher) in all aspects of writing, namely content, structure, vocabulary, grammar, and pretest and post test mechanics, are improving.

The students' score improved from pretest to post test score of peer-corrective feedback in the content aspect is 8.4%; in the organization aspect is 16.2%; in the vocabulary aspect is 12%; in the grammar is 12.96%; and in the mechanic aspect is 24%. The students' score improved from pretest to post test score of teacher corrective feedback in the content aspect is 11.33%; in the organization aspect is 27.6%; in the vocabulary aspect is 13.6%; in the grammar is 10.08%; and in the mechanic aspect is 31.24%.

DISCUSSION

There are several findings that can be inferred in this study based on the results provided in the preceding sections of this review. First, the average score of the experimental group's pre-test (67.04) was found to be higher than the control group (66.60), but not significant. Surprisingly, the mean score of the final post test of experimental group (79.72) was slightly lower than control group (81.28). Therefore, the teacher corrective feedback may be believed to have brought about greater improvement to the students' paragraph writing ability compared to the peer correction. This assumption was based on several weaknesses that occurred during the peer correction activities. Some factors were considered as the weaknesses in the peer correction activities in the class.

The followings are the examples of error types made by the students in experimental group adopting Chandler's (2003) correcting codes.

No.	Error Type	Sentence	Codes
1.	Paragraph	Do not indent with every new paragraph.	Indent
2.	Structure sentence	There many animals are different	Struc.
3.	Meaning unclear	He submit Islam religion	Mean
4.	Awkward	My mother is good cooker	Awk.
5.	Spelling	My mother has beautifull heir	Spell.
6.	Punctuation	Her hobbies are read, cook (,) and watching movie	Punc
7.	Capitalization	My cat name is miko	Cap
8.	Delete	Mother helps for me when study	Del
9	Insert	She also help neighbor (who) get difficult	>
10.	Word order	I and mother playing cooking.	W.O
11.	Wrong word	Playing with cat can minus my problem	W.W
12.	Repetition	Siwon is a famous and well-known actor in Korea.	Rep
13.	Agreement	Mother have to cook everyday	AGR
14.	Verb-tense	I am like with cat	Tens
15.	Voice	Cat can help for family with stress who do not heal.	Act/Pas
16.	Plural	She has two child	Num
17.	Article	I have pet at home. It is (a) dog	Art

Table 9: Examples of error types taken from students' paragraph

According to the table above, it could be seen that Chandler's correcting codes mostly focus on grammar. Although in reality, the categories of scoring paragraphs were not just about students' grammar but also on the content and organization.

Therefore, the students from the experimental group made correction only on grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The writer herself made the correction of content and organization and the writer also measured the final score.

The efficacy of giving peer feedback to students' descriptive paragraph can be proved in the pretest results of the VIIIC graders was fairly poor in writing descriptive paragraphs with an average of 67.04, and after receiving peer feedback, student post test scores improved by an average of 79.72. Likewise, the efficacy of teacher feedback with VIIID graders on the pretest results also getting quite low results in writing descriptive paragraphs with an average of 66.60, then after getting treatment with teacher feedback method, students post test scores increased by an average of 81.28. It can be concluded that feedback succeeded in improving writing performance of VIII grade students in writing descriptive paragraph.

From the explanation of the previous data analysis, every writing aspect has gained in students' writing. The aspects of writing are including content, structure, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics. The aim of language writing is to provide authentic, efficient and meaningful information. To be grammatically correct you need to write continually. We cannot distinguish between making mistakes during the process of teaching and learning. Based on the previous explanation, it can be concluded that there is positive impact to students' ability to write after they are taught by using corrective feedback (peers and teacher). Some stages in providing corrective feedback could help students increase their ability to write, which could be seen from the gain of student's writing mean score.

CONCLUSION

This analysis yielded several conclusions, from the results and discussions given in the chapter before. Mean score of pretest from experimental group (67.04) is higher than control group (66.60) but is not significant. This suggests that both classes were at the same level of writing ability. Interestingly, the findings of post tests revealed that the mean score of control group (81.28) was higher than mean score from experimental group (79.72). This means that peer correction and teacher correction greatly improves students' ability in writing paragraphs.

Teachers should look for more chances in their writing classes to apply peer feedback activity, and students should be better trained before the peer review sessions. Being an experimental study, this study has drawbacks such as the number of participants, the lack of post test and semi-structured interviews with some students. Further research on these subjects may be expanded, and papers from the students are also evaluated for more surface level errors. Further research can investigate changes in the level of meaning.

Furthermore, providing peer and teacher corrective feedback greatly increases the short paragraph writing of the students, and also minimizes long-term errors. Teacher corrections are best for generating honest feedback and students can update them easily and quickly. Nonetheless, based on the student interview on the benefits and drawbacks of both approaches, students agree that they have benefited more from teacher correction although that it took more time for the teacher to make the first draft.

This study described that the teacher correction method was a kind of waste of time and energy for the teacher. Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the writer wants to make a number of suggestions. First, it is recommended that teachers use the most effective methods in their writing class, specifically to improve students' writing abilities and make students more competent. In addition, by implementing peer correction, students could be trained to deliver effective revision because students in peer-correction community would ultimately be conscious not only of type but also of meaning. The writer also offers some suggestions in relation to this study at the end of this article.

The writer hopes that this study would not end here but could be a beginning of future studies in the same study community. Moreover, to get better understand about kinds of feedback, teachers must examine more closely to practice their correction. Eventually, certain error criteria will be recognized by students by improving their writing assignments that have been marked by both teachers and peers. Then, it reduces the number of errors in the written task that are often done repeatedly after examining and correcting them for several times. Next, students will be motivated to develop oral fluency practice during the discussion in pairs or in groups about the correction of errors in the written task. Last but not least, it helps to wean students from being dependency to be always corrected by their teacher.

For further study, the researcher can explore more deeply how grammatical understanding, experience, attitudes, and encouragement of teachers and students towards feedback can be explored. Finally, other studies need to be done to help teachers understand what is going on during peer correction activity and what strategies that is suitable to be used to help improving students' writing abilities.

REFERENCES

- Brooks, F. & Donato, R. 1994. *Vygotskyan Approaches to Understanding Foreign Language Learner Discourse During Communicative Tasks*. Hispania, Vol.1, No. 77.
- Chandler, J. 2003. The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

- Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*.
- Ferris, D. R. 1997. The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL Quarterly*.
- Ferris, D. 2007. Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing Vol. 1 No.6*.
- Ganji, M. 2009. Teacher-correction, Peer-correction, and Self-correction: Their Impacts on Iranian Students' IELTS Essay Writing Performance. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL Vol.6, No. 1, Spring 2009*.
- Gerrot, L., & Wignell P. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antepodean Educational Enterprises.
- Hatch, E. , & Farhady, H. 1981. Research Design & Statistics for Applied Linguistics. Tehran: Rahnama Publications.
- Hedgcock, J. S. & Lefkowitz, N. 1994. Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Hyland, F. and Hyland, K. 2001. Sugaring the Pill: Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 1, No. 10*.
- Kane, Thomas. S. 2000. *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. [Online]. Available in http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Text_linguistics.
- Lalande, J. 1982. Reducing compositions errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*.
- Leki, I. 1990. *Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response*. In: B. Kroll, (Ed.), Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levene, H. (1960). In *Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of Harold Hotelling*, I. Olkin et al. eds., Stanford University Press.
- Long, M. & Porter, P. 1985. Group Work, Interlanguage Talk and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 19, No.2*.
- McKay, S. 1985. *Fundamental of Writing for Specific Purpose*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. United Kingdom: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

- Storch, N. 2004. Writing: Product, Process, and Students' Reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 14 No. 3.
- Sugiyono. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Afabeta
- Truscott, J. 2007. The Effect of Error Correction on Learners' Ability to Write Accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
- Wu, W. S. 2006. The effect of blog peer review and teacher feedback on the revisions of EFL writers. *Journal of Education and Foreign Languages and Literature*.