



## THE USE OF PEER FEEDBACK TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' ABILITY TO WRITE DESCRIPTIVE TEXT

Khadijah Mahdiyyah<sup>1</sup>, Atti Herawati<sup>2</sup>, Lungguh Halira Vonti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The student of English Language Education Study Program FKIP Pakuan University

<sup>2</sup>The lecturer of English Language Education Study Program FKIP Pakuan University

<sup>3</sup>The lecturer of English Language Education Study Program FKIP Pakuan University

---

### Article Info

*Article history*  
Leave it empty

---

### Keywords:

Writing, Descriptive text, Peer Feedback.

---

### \*Correspondence Address:

---

### Abstract

Writing is one of productive skills that is different from other skills. In writing, students need more time to express their idea in a written form. Besides, teacher also needs time to give feedback to motivate the students in revising their work. To make the activity of giving feedback more effective and efficient, this research was conducted. It is aimed to find out whether peer feedback has positive effect or not in enhancing students' ability to write descriptive text. This research involved the third semester students of English Language Education Study Program, Pakuan University. The sample was 21 students from semester 3A. They were chosen by using random sampling technique. The researcher used quantitative approach and applied pre-experimental method. She chose one group pre-test post-test design. The instrument of this research was writing test to measure students' ability to write descriptive text. In addition, the data were analyzed by using t-test formula. From the calculation, she finds the result of t-test value is 9.41 meanwhile the t-table value is 2.09 from the significant level 0.05 with the degree of freedom (*df*) is 20. It means that the t-test value is higher than t-table value ( $9.41 > 2.09$ ). The calculation indicates that the null hypothesis (*H<sub>0</sub>*) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (*H<sub>a</sub>*) is accepted. Thus, peer feedback affects students' ability to write descriptive text.

## Introduction

Writing is a productive skill that can facilitate people to convey message, thought, feeling and opinion. In addition, writing is also used to describe something that can be felt through the five senses which is commonly called as descriptive text. In learning writing, it is believed that using appropriate technique is needed to improve students' ability to write.

There was previous research entitled "The Effect of Peer Correction on Students' Ability to Write Recount Text" applied in Senior High School. The result showed that there was no effect of peer correction on students' ability to write recount text. However, the researcher chose similar topic to be applied to university students with different text type as well as different way that is peer feedback. This technique was chosen to find out whether it could enhance students' ability to write descriptive text or not if it was applied to university students. The statement of the problem was: "Is there any effect of using peer feedback on students' ability to write descriptive text?"

Writing has a different way to practice than speaking and listening skills. It is a process of organizing ideas into one word with another word to become a sentence and arranged it into paragraph, so it can be presented to the reader (Siburian, 2013: 33). Besides, in writing process, the students need more time to think because they should pay attention to grammar and language use (Harmer, 2004: 31).

There are several kinds of writing, one of them is descriptive writing. Oshima and Hogue (2007:61) mentioned when the students would like to write descriptive text, the five senses such as eyes, feeling, smells, test and hear should play a role to describe the object. However, Brown (2004:218) said they also fully understand the difficulty of learning of writing well in any language even in their native language. Therefore, Writing requires specific way to make people focus on the process (Harmer, 2015: 360).

Peer feedback is the process of discussing and measuring the performance between one student and his peer. Lee (2017) declared that in literature, peer feedback is usually used with the same related terms such as peer response, peer review, peer evaluation, peer editing and peer assessment. According to Oshima and Hogue (2007: 194) peer feedback is pointed as the process of reading and commenting other works interactively. In addition, peer feedback is provided to support the learning process by checking the performance either it agrees or not with the criteria, it is completed with the

feedback on strengths, weaknesses and suggestion for improving next performance (Falchikov 2001:2).

The previous research that conducted by Lon et al (2016) entitled "Writing Peer Feedback to enhance Students' Current and Future Learning", mixed method and the semantic analyzes conducted during September 2014 until June 2015. They used non-random sample method, 160 students from the autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB) undergraduate program in pedagogy and social education. They collected the students' written peer feedback and the questionnaire were distributed to the students and the teachers. The outcome of this study demonstrated that the feedback that they were received could facilitate them in improving and supporting them to write a better task at the future learning.

### **Research Method**

The researcher conducted this research at Pakuan University, Bogor. She employed quantitative approach, it required the researcher to determine how one variable affected other (Creswell, 20012: 13). The population of this research was chosen from the third semester students of English Language Education Study Program. There were three classes consisting of class IIIA, IIIB, IIIC and the total number of the population was 85 students. In conducting this research, the researcher chooses one class by using random system sampling technique and class IIIA was chosen as the sample of this reserch.

To find out the students' ability to write descriptive text, the first steps that the researcher did is giving pre-test to them. In this test, the researcher asked the students to write a simple descriptive text based on the topic that provided. The goal of this pre-test was to measure the students' preliminary knowledge of descriptive text and their achievement

The second step was giving treatment which was peer feedback. The treatment was held for three meetings. Another step was post-test, which conducted after the peer feedback technique was applied in the class. The result of pre-test and pre-test were measure by two teachers and the researcher compared the score of pre-test and post-test to determine their progress whether their ability increased or not after having the treatment.

The researcher conducted several procedures in analyzing the data. The first, she scored the students' achievement from the pre – test and post – test. Next she calculated the mean  $Md = \frac{\sum d}{n}$ . Afterward, she gained standard deviation of Gain (Xd). Then, she calculated the t-test value  $t = \frac{Md}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2 d}{n(n-1)}}}$  and testing hypothesis d.f = n-1 which was taken from Arikunto (2013:208).

### **Finding and Discussion**

After conducting this research, the researcher found the result of pre-test and post-test in the following table:

No	Name	Score		Gain(d) d=(Y-X)	Md	Xd (d-Md)	Xd <sup>2</sup>
		Pre-Test (X)	Post-Test (Y)				
1	FEA.	75	75	0	21. 73	-21.73	472. 19
2	AC	50	87.5	37.5	21. 73	15.77	248. 69
3	UJP	68.75	87.5	18.75	21. 73	-2.98	8.88
4	SRS	75	75	0	21. 73	-21.73	472. 19
5	VA	43.75	81.25	37.5	21. 73	15.77	248. 69
6	AA	62.5	75	12.5	21. 73	-9.23	85.1 9
7	PAL	56.25	68.75	12.5	21. 73	-9.23	85.1 9
8	AHA	56.25	81.25	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
9	KA	50	75	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
10	MP	50	81.25	31.25	21. 73	9.52	90.6 3
11	AMD	50	75	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
12	HTS	50	81.25	31.25	21. 73	9.52	90.6 3
13	PNQ	56.25	81.25	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
14	AA	62.5	81.25	18.75	21. 73	-2.98	8.88

15	RRP	43.75	75	31.25	21. 73	9.52	90.6 3
16	MS	62.5	75	12.5	21. 73	-9.23	85.1 9
17	MJ	56.25	68.75	12.5	21. 73	-9.23	85.1 9
18	AAA	31.25	50	18.75	21. 73	-2.98	8.88
19	DJF	43.75	68.75	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
20	WNY	50	81.25	31.25	21. 73	9.52	90.6 3
21	RR	56.25	81.25	25	21. 73	3.27	10.6 9
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1150</b>	<b>1606.25</b>	<b>456.25</b>		<b>434.52</b>	<b>2235 .86</b>

The researcher obtained the data from the result of pre-test and post-test. From the pre-test result, it can be seen that several students still had grammatical error such as using inappropriate tenses, to be and possessive pronoun. Mechanic errors were found in the pre-test such as punctuation, capitalization and spelling. Moreover, there was several students' who only wrote one paragraph, otherwise some of them wrote the text in a full of paper event though the description of text was still origin.

During the first treatment, the students felt awkward to the researcher. They did not dare to ask something they did not understand both of descriptive text and peer feedback roles in the form. In the next meetings, they began to try to ask what they did not understand with the result that the students could follow the treatments conducted three times.

In contrast, the post test result that was given after the treatment showed that the students' writing was increased. It could be seen from the result of post-test which was higher than the pre-test score with the average number 76.4881. Not only that, grammatical and mechanic errors that they made in the previous test decreased in the

post-test. In grammatical aspect, they used appropriate tense in the post test even though the researcher still found some of them wrote the text by using simple present tense and past tense. Moreover, the students knew when they should capitalize the first word in the sentences, names and places. They paid more attention on how to spell the right words. The students also recognized when they should put the comma and point. Other than that, the students who were in the pre-test wrote only one paragraph had progresses and they were able to write more than one paragraph.

The finding of this research indicated that peer feedback could create various inputs from one student to another as pointed by Wakabayashi (2013). It could be seen from the data of t-test value was higher than the t-table value ( $9.41 > 2.09$ ) so the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative ( $H_a$ ) hypothesis was accepted. Hence, the various inputs from the feedback were given by their pairs had an effect on students' ability to write descriptive text.

The result of this research was in line with Yoghoubi & Ghanei (2015) when stated that peer feedback had a challenge for the students to read more comments and suggestion at the previous works to improve their next writing before their works were submitted to the teacher. The statement was proven by the students' post-test score as the result of the treatments. The students did pay attention to their pair correction, comments and suggestions so they could decrease the mistake in the post-test. Thus, peer feedback in this research could be applied as an appropriate technique on writing descriptive text to university level students.

## **Conclusion**

This research was aimed to enhance students' ability to write descriptive text. It was involved the third semester students of English Language Education Study Program at Pakuan University with 21 samples. As written on the research finding and discussion at the previous chapter, it could be seen that the result of the t-test value is higher than t-table value ( $9.41 > 2.09$ ). It means that the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted and the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected so this research indicated that peer feedback affected students' ability to write descriptive text.

After conducting this research, the researcher concludes that the students can set the advantages from peer feedback technique. In peer feedback, the students had two roles as the writer and reviewer so they can learn from each other to have a better writing.

They could learn from their pairs' mistake so that they did not make the same mistake. Through peer feedback, indirectly they had been motivated themselves to correct their own mistakes for the next writing. Thus, peer feedback was an appropriate technique to be applied to university students.

### **Bibliography**

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2013. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta

Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principle and classroom practice*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Falchikov N. 2001. *Learning Together Peer Tutoring in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Harmer, Jeremy. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited  
\_\_\_\_\_. 2015. *The Practice of English Language Teaching (Fifth Edition)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

John W. Creswell. 2012. *Educational Research*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Lee Icy. 2017. *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts*. Singapore: Springer Nature. DOI 10.1007/978-981-103924-9-7

Lon Georgeta, Coramibas B. A, Thomas- Floch Marina. 2016. *Written Peer-Feedback to Enhance Students' Current and Future Learning*. Barcelona: International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher education DOI 10.1186/s41239-016-0017-y

Oshima, A and Hogue, A. 2007. *Introduction to Academic Writing (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)*. United States of America: Person Education. Inc.

Siburian. T.A. (2013). *Improvement Students' Achievement on Writing Descriptive text through thing pair share International Jurnal of Languange Learning and Applied Linguistic Word (IJLLALW)*. Vol. 3, pp. 30-43

Yaghoubi, A. & Ghanei, H. 2015. *The Effect of Peer Feedback on Cohesion Improvement in Writing skill Among EFL Learners*. Iran: (IJLLALW) 103-112.



## **Biography**

Khadijah Mahdiyyah was born in Sukabumi, August 10<sup>th</sup> , 1995. She lives in *Ciburahol*, RT 02/05, *Desa Bojongsawah*, *Kec. Kebon Pedes*, *Kab. Sukabumi*. She is the first daughter of H.Samsuddin Yusuf and Lia Maslia. She started her study in SDN Bojongsawah (2001-2007). Then, she continued her study in Mts Assalam Sukabumi (2008-2011). Next, she continued her study in MA Assalam Sukabumi too (2011-2014). After that, she continued her first degree (S1) in Pakuan University and took English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teaching Training and Educational Sciences (20015-2019). In Oktober, 25<sup>th</sup> 2019 she graduated as a Bachelor of Education.