

PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN TULISAN

Saya yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini:

Nama : Muslikhotin
NIM : D35206002
Tempat/tgl lahir : Lamongan, 13 february 1988
Alamat : Trosono-Sekaran-Lamongan
Jurusan/Fakultas : PBI/Tarbiyah

Menyatakan dengan sebenarnya bahwa skripsi yang saya tulis ini benar-benar merupakan hasil karya saya sendiri, bukan merupakan pengambil alihan tulisan atau pikiran orang lain yang saya akui sebagai tulisan saya.

Apabila di kemudian hari terbukti atau dapat dibuktikan bahwa skripsi ini hasil jiplakan, maka saya bersedia menerima sanksi atas perbuatan tersebut.

Surabaya, 13 Agustus 2010

Yang Memuat Pernyataan

Muslikhotin

d. Writing a Final Copy

After writers have edited their drafts that they consider being necessary, they produce their final version. The final version is the best writing that should be taken into score. This represents the whole idea of their writing that is complete and perfect.

The other experts also have the same idea about writing process. According to Hogue states that writing is a process of creating, organizing, writing and polishing.²⁰ This proves that writing has to follow several steps before it considers being final drafts. In the end, the writers get their best final draft.

From those explanation above we can see that revising stage is important and by using peer feedback technique the students are able to improve their writing performance by giving positive comments and feedback so the students can revise their writing into good writing.

4. The Element of Writing

Heaton said that the writing skills are complex and difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgment elements. the skills necessary for a good writing are:

²⁰Ann Hogue, *The Essential of English: A Writers' Handbook*, (New York: Pearson Education, Inc), 2003, p. 255

Chaulk states that the teacher feedback is rather general, whereas, the students' response is more specific.³⁹ Finally, it may be become a critical reader of others' writing makes students more critical reader and revisers of their own.

The writer, however, did not always revise accordingly to the reactions of their peers, and sometimes resented the criticisms. So, that's why there are different responses toward the peer feedback according to the feedback they got by implementing peer writing group, teacher encourage students to give, seek, and react to feedback among themselves as they write. In addition, for reacting to the teacher's traditional comments on finishing paper.

Peer feedback can be define as the use of learners as sources of information, It is sometimes mentioned as peer response, peer review, peer rating, peer assessment, or peer editing. Liu and Hansen define it in a more detail way as "the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's draft in both written and oral formats in the process of writing."⁴⁰ It means that the students use their peer to give the response towards their writings.

³⁹Ken Hyland and Fiona Hyland, *Feedback in Second Language Writing*, p.8

⁴⁰Yanhong Zeng, *Peer Feedback in College SLW classroom*, Vol.3, No.3, (<http://www.jstor.org/pss.2006>), Retrieved on 4th April 2010, at 4.00 pm

their teachers pointing out their grammar problems.⁵⁵ This statement indicate that the teachers' assessment just focuses on correcting their students' grammar, in spite of other components of writing such as content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanic.

In conclusion, peer feedback technique is useful in teaching writing. peer feedback can enhance students' communicative power by encouraging students to express and negotiate their ideas. Peer response activities help students gaining confidence and reducing apprehension by allowing them to see peers' strengths and weaknesses in writing, Sharing individual strengths and weaknesses in the group encourages connectivity in the learning community.

E. Assesment

In this section, the researcher will discuss about the nature of assessment, and peer assessment.

1. The Nature of Assesment

Nowdays, the term of assesment is used rapidly in education especially language teaching. Johnson and Johnson define the meaning of assesment as a collection of information about the quality and quantity of a change in a

⁵⁵ D. Ferris, *Students' Reactions to Teachers Response in Multiple Draft Composition Classroom*, *TESOL Quarterly*, 1995, vol. 29, ([Http//rel.sagepub.com/content/abstract](http://rel.sagepub.com/content/abstract), 1995), Retrieved on 6th July, 2010, at 09.00 am

peer feedback can improve the students' writing ability in term of content, organization, and grammar.

Secondly, with the research that was done by Amrina who conducted a study "the use of peer feedback to improve the students' speaking ability in the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 1 Babat. She used experimental research to investigate the significant difference in speaking ability between the students who are taught by using peer feedback and who are not taught by using peer feedback. Amrina used statistical analysis by using t-test to gain the data. Finally, she found that there was significant difference in the speaking ability between the students who were taught by using peer feedback and who are not. She concluded that there are some aspects which have the significant improvement and which do not have it. The speaking aspect which had the significant improvement was the students' eye contact, body language or gesture, rate of speech, volume of speech and pronunciation. Whereas, the speaking aspect which had no the significant improvement was the students' grammar.

From the previous study above, there are some differences from this study but also it had the same technique in teaching English. The researcher used classroom action research as a research design. This kind of study was never implemented before. She focused on the implementation of peer feedback technique in the class, students' response, and students' improvement in writing. The researcher used observation checklist, questionnaire, and analytical score to

gain the data. It was concerned with the students' writing ability focused on language use and mechanic. And she used narrative text as a material.

Actually, the object of the research of the writer and amrina was in the same place in lamongan. But there were some reason why the researcher conducted her research in Islamic senior high school although it was same the same place in Lamongan too. According to researcher in Islamic senior high school Lamongan was better than SMA Negeri 1 Babat. First, in Islamic senior high school Lamongan the facilities were complete such as laboratory, library, free hotspots, and many others. Second, the location of Islamic senior high school was also could support the process of teaching learning process, because the location was strategies and included the education are. Besides that, the teacher and the students in Islamic senior high school Lamongan were samewha' creative, discipline, competence, and responsibility. Based on the explanation about Islamic senior high school above, it could support the researcher to conduct this research in that school.

material, the teacher monitored the students' activities when they made narrative text, and the teacher have had a louder voice.

- 2) The students were enthusiastic and approximately 75 percent of them participate during the teaching and learning process
- 3) More than or equal 60% of the students could improve their score especially in language use and mechanic after peer feedback was implemented.

3. Acting stage

After doing planning stage, the researcher acts as the English teacher who teaches the students in writing class based on the lesson plan had been made. And the collaborative English teacher acts the observer in doing teaching and learning process in class. Here, the students did peer feedback technique in teaching writing skill.

In this study, the researcher did some activities namely in invention, revising, and editing. Those activities was suitable with Flash that there are three stages in peer feedback. They are invention, revising and editing.⁶⁸

a. Inventing Stage

First, the researcher taught their student about the definition and generic structure of narrative text. The teacher also gave the explanation about the procedure of peer feedback and example of narrative text.

⁶⁸P. Flash, teaching with writing : peer response workshop, ([Http://writing.umn.edu/tww/responding-grading/peerworkshop.html](http://writing.umn.edu/tww/responding-grading/peerworkshop.html)), retrieved on July 6, 2010, at 4.20 pm.

C. Subject of the Research

The subject of the study was the students of the first grade of MAN Lamongan, in academic year 2009-2010. The researcher took class X-B as the subject of the study. This class consists of 43 students, 38 girls and 5 Boys. The researcher took this class because the students at the first grade had learnt narrative text in junior high school but it was not detail. The researcher wanted to discuss narrative text more detail than before. Besides, some of the students at the first grade also had low ability and motivation in writing skill. It was proved by the student' writing score in preliminary study. Finally, the researcher was intended to mix them about above average, average, and below average students in some groups. It was line with scaffolding theory by Bruner that is the child-adult peers are engaged in close and ended tasks. However, some of adaptation is required to make the concept meaningful in the context of acquiring writing skills.⁷¹

D. Setting of the Research

This study was conducted at MAN LAMONGAN, which was located on Jalan Veteran 43 LAMONGAN. The researcher was interested to conduct the research in this school because the students were from heterogeneous background. Of course, they had different ability in learning English. Beside that, peer

⁷¹ Hyland Key and Hyland Fiona, *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, p. 248

and learning process in the classroom. This activity was done when the researcher was doing observation. The aim of researcher used field note was prepare to note down some aspects of the teaching and learning which are not covered in the observation checklist.

Third, the assessment form for result of the students' ability in writing in the classroom. It contained some scores to measure the students' ability in writing with peer feedback technique. The researcher scored the students' writing by using analytical score which a piece of writing was scored on the basis of the quality of each writing component that makes up the whole to get the overall score.

The researcher used ESL composition profiles adapted from Joy M.Reid. The researcher used it because the researcher wants to know the result of improvement the students' writing ability in the classroom those used peer feedback technique in every meeting. The criteria of scoring the students' writing ability were about organization, content, vocabulary, language use and mechanic. But in this study, the researcher only focused on language use especially in term of grammar. And mechanic, especially in term of punctuation and capital letter. The assessment was conducted by the researcher after peer feedback technique was applied. And it was always done for three meeting (see appendix XI).

And the last instrument is questionnaire. The questionnaire was used to know the student's response after the implementation of using peer feedback

technique. The researcher gave the questionnaire in the last meeting. The questionnaire consists of 12 questions (see appendix XX).

F. Data Collection technique.

Data collection technique is the way to get the data research. In collecting data, the researcher used two ways as follows:

1. Observation

Observation is aimed at recording and describing behaviour as it occurs.⁷³ In this research, the researcher used observation checklist to observe the situation of teaching and learning process in the classroom (the student and teacher activity in the classroom), students' response when peer feedback was implemented, and the material that was given by the teacher. Observation checklist referred by put a mark or tick to statements of process writing was done.

2. Questionnaire

Questionnaire is some question to the students about some problems that have purpose to get opinion of the students.⁷⁴ The students must answer about the question based on what they got after the teacher had applied a peer feedback as media to motivate students in learning English.

⁷³ David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, *Meaningful Assesment : A Manageable and Cooperative Process*, Boston: A Pearson Education Company, 2002, p. 136

⁷⁴ Burhan Nurgiyantoro, *Penilaian Dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Dan Sastra*, (Yogyakarta: PT BPF, 2001), p.57

The Questionnaire was given to the student in order to know what the students do with the material given, what the students' responses on the task given by the teacher, and what the problems of that are faced by students when using peer feedback in writing. Here, the researcher used questionnaire with Indonesia language in order to the student can understand more clearly about what the researcher means was.

G. Data Analysis

After getting the data, the researcher analyzed the data with descriptive manner. The researcher describe the data to give any information in which peer feedback had been used as means of teaching English, especially for writing skill.

There were three kinds of data gathered in the study. First, data was concerned with the result of teaching and learning process. Second, data was concerned with the students' response during the teaching and learning process. And the last data was concerned the students' score of writing class during applying of peer feedback technique.

In the process of analyzing the result of teaching and learning process, the researcher done observation checklist. For the students' activity, observation checklist was needed to know whether the implementation was good or not. It can be known from the students' performance in teaching learning process when using peer feedback technique.

the collaborative English teacher prepared the lesson plan covered the opening activity, main activity and closing activity. In main activity covered invention, revising and editing (see Appendix I). Second, the teacher and the collaborative English teacher prepared three titles: they were **Malin Kundang, Sangkuriang, and Timun Emas**. They also made a lottery to determine the title and asked the chief of the class to take the lottery. Then, they also prepared pictures series as a media.

The topic was given is taken from internet. The collaborative English teacher and the researcher also prepared peer feedback sheet to the students' writing.

2) Acting

After doing the planning, the collaborative English teacher did some activities in invention, revising and editing. Here, the researcher act as practitioner and the collaborative English teacher acts as observer.

In invention stage, the researcher gave explanation about the definition and generic structure of narrative text. After giving explanation about narrative text, the researcher gave them the examples of narrative text in order to the students understand more clearly about narrative. After that, the researcher explained the procedure of peer feedback technique. She also gave example to the

students how to give response or feedback to their friends, how to revise and edit their writing.

Then, the researcher made lottery and asked the chief of the class to come forward and took it to decide the title that would be used. In the first meeting, the topic was selected about “Legend”. The title chosen was **Malin Kundang** (See Appendix IV).

After choosing the title, the researcher divided the students into some groups. Each group consisted of three people. The member of groups was heterogeneously. It means the group consists of above average, average, below average. The researcher was intended to mix them based on the scaffolding theory which was fundamental theory of peer feedback. Those groups were chosen based on the students’ score in writing test. The researcher got the students’ score in preliminary study.

Then, the researchers distributed some pictures series about Malin Kundang and asked the students in every group to discuss the pictures. Then, she asked them to write narrative text based on the pictures individually in one group. The aim of this activity was to train the students in writing narrative text, to give chance to the students to express their idea in writing narrative text, and to know the students’ understanding in narrative text.

Then, the researcher continued her activity in revising stage. After the students have finished writing, the researcher asked the students to give their rough draft to their peer in one group. This activity was followed by the other groups. Then, the researcher distributed the first peer feedback sheet consist of the strength and weakness of their writing in language use (see appendix VII). After they had finished giving peer feedback sheet, the researcher asked them to give again the rough draft and peer feedback sheet to the owner. Then, the researcher asked them to revise their writing based on the feedback was given by their peer.

After revising their writing, the researcher asked them to give their revise draft to their peers to check their writing after they had revised it. Then, the researcher gave them the second peer feedback sheet in mechanic (see appendix VIII).

In editing stage, the students exchanged their revised drafts with their peer in one group. The teacher reminded them to write the line to the sentence or paragraph that should be edited. It was done to make their peer find the mistakes easily. Then, they began to give response to their peer in second peer feedback sheet. After they had given the response towards their peer mistakes, they gave back the second peer feedback sheet and revised draft to the owner. Finally, they edited



about the material before because it was included familiar story. But, the teacher forgot giving motivation to the students about writing.

According to the collaborative English teacher, the teacher could not control the time. She didn't give limitation time to the students when they wrote of narrative text. Therefore, the teaching and learning process with using peer feedback technique could not finish that day.

While, for about the researcher' performance as the teacher was quite good. For example: the researcher gave explanation about narrative text and procedure of peer feedback technique with clearly. When the researcher explained the material, she walked around to the students in order to help the students could hear her voice clearly. She also gave clear instruction to the students. Finally, the students could understand about the teacher said, but there were still some students who asked their difficulties about the material.

Then, the researcher always walked around to monitors the students activities during teaching and learning process using peer feedback technique was applied.

4) Reflecting

Based on the result of observation in the first cycle, the collaborative English teacher and the researcher discussed the problem on teaching and learning process to make some reflection. First, in the next cycle, the teacher must manage the classroom effectively because

of narrative text. After she explained all about narrative text and the students understood about narrative text well, the teacher gave them an example of narrative text entitled “Danau Toba” and asked the students to evaluate it. The aim of this activity was just to remind and check how far the students’ understanding about narrative text.

After that, she explained again the role of peer feedback more clearly. Because there were some of students still did not understand about it in the first cycle. After that, she took examples of their students’ feedback toward their peer writing and explained about the mistakes in giving response. To make their students understand well, the teacher also gave their students the appropriate examples how to give response, revise and edit their draft based on the feedback was given. After everything was explained clearly, she did invention stage.

Invention stage, the collaborative English teacher made lottery and asked one of the student to come forward and took it to decide the title that would be used. In the second meeting, the topic was selected about “Legend”. The title chosen was Sangkuriang (see appendix V). After choosing the title, the collaborative English teacher divided the students into some groups. Each group consist of three people. The member of groups was heterogeneously. The researcher was intended to mix them based on the scaffolding theory which was fundamental theory of peer feedback. The collaborative English teacher was chosen

those groups based on the writing score in the first cycle. It was consisted of above average, average and below average.

Then, the collaborative English teacher distributed the picture series one by one to the students in one group. After that, the collaborative English teacher asked the students in every group to discuss what the pictures talked about. During the students discussed the picture, the teacher wrote some difficult word related with the story on the blackboard. The aim of this activity is to make the students wrote narrative text easily. After discussing the picture, the collaborative English teacher asked the students in every group to make narrative text based on the picture series. After they have finished writing, the collaborative English teacher asked the students to give their rough draft to their peer in one group. Then, the collaborative did revising stage.

In revising stage, the students exchanged their rough draft to their peer in one group. The collaborative English teacher distributed the first peer feedback sheet consist of the strength and weakness of their writing in language use (see appendix VII). Then, the collaborative English teacher asked one of the students to read his or her rough draft while their peer followed along his or her rough draft in one group. And the aim of reading is to avoid misreading of the

students' narrative text because the students got many misunderstanding about the spelling in the first cycle.

After finishing reading it, their peer did same thing in turn. This activity was followed by the other groups. After that, the students gave feedback or response towards their peer writing. And she reminded their students to give the feedback operationally and wrote the line to the sentence, word or paragraph that should be revised. It was done to make their peer could revise their writing better. After the students had given response in first peer feedback sheet, the collaborative English teacher asked them to give back the rough draft and peer feedback sheet to the owner and revised it. Then, the students revised their rough draft based on first peer feedback sheet was given by their peer. Their peer did the same thing. Then, the collaborative English teacher went in editing stage.

In editing stage, the collaborative English teacher asked them to give their revise draft to their peers in the right side in one group to check their writing after they had revised it. Then, the students exchanged their revised drafts with their peer in one group. The collaborative English teacher reminded them to write the line to the sentence or paragraph that should be edited. It was done to make their peer find the mistakes easily. After that, the collaborative English teacher distributed second peer feedback sheets in mechanic (see

learning was conducted. According to the researcher, the situation and the condition in the second meeting was better than before. The students could enjoy to do peer feedback technique. They also had motivation to do that. But the students still made mistakes in giving response to their friends. So, the teacher must give them more explanation about it.

For about the material was quite good. It means that the material could make the student interesting. The students also have been known about the material before because it was included familiar story.

According to the researcher, in the second meeting, the collaborative English teacher could not control the time again. Although she had given limited time to the students when they wrote narrative text but they still asked more time to finish their writing on time. It might caused by the students still get difficulties in producing vocabulary and English pattern. So, they felt confused to make narrative text.

While, for about the collaborative English teacher performance as the teacher was good. For example: she gave clear explanation and instruction. Her voice also could be heard by the students in the back. Beside that, the collaborative English teachers always walk around to monitor the students' activity.

feedback technique. The first, the researcher and the collaborative English teacher prepared the lesson plan covered with opening activity, main activity, and closing activity. In main activity covered in invention, revising and editing stage (see appendix III). After that, the researcher and the collaborative English teacher prepared three titles: they were **Panglima tobo ali, Ali baba and Timun emas**. They also prepared a lottery to choose the title that would be composed. Then, the collaborative English teacher and the researcher also prepared pictures series. The topic was given is taken from internet. Beside that, they also prepared peer feedback sheet to the students' writing.

In the third cycles, the collaborative English teacher was really control the time, because in the first and second cycle the student took along time to make narrative writing.

2) Acting

In this meeting, the researcher controlled the time. Because in the first and second cycle the time uncontrolled well. It was caused by the students faced some problems when they were making narrative writing.

Before the teacher started the lesson, the teacher had asked the students about the problems reducing faced in the first and second cycles. Here, the researcher acts as practitioner. After analyzing the problems, the researcher asked some questions to the students about

the material in the second cycle. It was done to check the students' understanding about the material more detail. After the collaborative English teacher giving question to the students, then, she did invention stage.

In invention stage, the researcher made lottery and asked one of the student to come forward and took it to decide the title that would be used. In the third meeting, the topic was selected about "Legend". The title chosen was Timun emas (See appendix VI). After choosing the title, the researcher divided the students into some groups. Each group consist of three people. The member of groups was heterogeneously. The researcher was intended to mix them based on the scaffolding theory which was fundamental theory of peer feedback. The researcher was chosen the group based on the writing score in the second cycle. Then, the researcher distributed the picture series randomly. After that, the collaborative english teacher asked the students to arrange the pictures in series.

Then, the researcher asked the students in every group to discuss what the pictures talked about. During the students discussed the picture, the teacher wrote some difficult word related with the story on the blackboard. The aim of this activity is to make the students wrote narrative writing easily. After discussing the picture, the researcher asked the students to write a narrative text.

individually based on the picture series in one group. The researcher asked the students to give the rough draft to his or her peer in one group. Then, she continued in revising stage.

In revising stage, the students exchanged their rough draft to their peer in one group. The researcher distributed the first peer feedback sheet consist of the strength and weakness of their writing in language use (see appendix VII). Then, the researcher asked one of the students to read his or her rough draft while their peer followed along his or her rough draft in a group. The aim of reading is to avoid misreading of the students' writing because the students got many misunderstanding about the spelling in the first and second cycle.

After finishing reading it, their peer did same thing in 'urn. This activity was followed by the other groups. After that, the students gave feedback or response towards their peer writing. The teacher reminded their students to give the feedback operationally and wrote line in order that their peer could revise their writing better. After the students gave response in first peer feedback sheet, the researcher asked them to give the rough draft and peer feedback sheet back to the owner. Then, the students revised their rough draft based on first peer feedback sheet was given by their peer. Their peer did the same thing. Then, the researcher did in editing stage.

In editing stage, the researcher asked them to give their revise draft to their peers in the right side in one group to check their writing after they have revised it. Then, the students exchanged their revised drafts with their peer in one group. The teacher reminded them to write the line to the sentence or paragraph that should be edited. It was done to make their peer find the mistakes easily. After that, the researcher distributed second peer feedback sheets in term of mechanic (see appendix VIII). The researcher also asked the students to read his or her revise draft to their peer by silent reading. After that, they gave response to their peers' writing. All of the students did it in turn and each of students in one group got two second peer feedback sheets.

After giving response in second peer response sheets, the students gave back the second peer feedback sheets and also their revised drafts to the owner. Finally, they edited their revised draft based on their peer's recommendation. After that, they wrote it into final draft. Then, the researcher ordered the captain of the class to submit it.

3) Observing

The collaborative English teacher collected the information about the topic, material, and the teachers', and the students' activities during acting stage by using observation checklist and field note. She ticked the observation checklist in term of yes, no and some (see

appendix XVIII-XIX). Here, the collaborative English teacher acts as the observer. Her name was Elvi Laelativa. And the researcher acts as the practitioner

As a result of observation checklist on the second cycle, the collaborative English teacher found some problems when teaching and learning was conducted. According to the researcher, the situation and the condition in the third meeting was better than before. The students could enjoy to do peer feedback technique. They also had motivation to do that. But some of the students still made mistakes in giving response to their friends. So, the teacher must give them more explanation about it.

For the material was quite good. It means that the material could make the student interesting. Beside that, the students have been known and ever read about the material before because it was included familiar story.

According to the researcher, in the third meeting, the researcher could control the time be better than before. She gave limitation time to the students when they wrote narrative writing. But they still asked more time to finish their writing on time. It might caused by the students still get difficulties in producing vocabulary and English pattern. So, they felt confused to make narrative text .

Table 1.1

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat perlu		25	58,14%
2	Perlu		8	18,60%
3	Kurang perlu		7	16,28%
4	Tidak perlu		3	6,98%
Total		43	43	100%

For question number 2, does the students need to know the procedure of peer feedback technique before this technique be implemented in writing class? The results are:

Table 1.2

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat perlu		29	67,44%
2	Perlu		14	32,56%
3	Kurang perlu		0	0%
4	Tidak perlu		0	0%
Total		43	43	100%

For the question number 3, how is your opinion about the implementation of peer feedback technique in writing class?

Table 1.3

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat menyenangkan		10	23,26%
2	Menyenangkan		26	60,46%
3	Kurang menyenangkan		4	9,30%
4	Tidak menyenangkan		3	6,98%
Total		43	43	100%

For the question number 4, do the peer feedback techniques help the students to express their idea in writing class?

Table 1.4

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat membantu		13	30,23%
2	Membantu		23	53,49%
3	Kurang membantu		7	16,28%
4	Tidak membantu		0	0%
Total		43	43	100%

For the question number 5, does your teacher often motivate you by using peer feedback technique in writing?

Table 1.5

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat sering		23	53,49%
2	Sering		20	46,51%
3	Kurang sering		0	0%
4	Tidak sering		0	0%
Total		43	43	100%

b. The students' opinion about the students' improvement in writing after peer feedback technique be implemented

For question number 6, are there progression in writing after peer feedback technique be implemented? The results are:

Table 1.6

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat ada		12	27,91%
2	Ada		27	62,79%
3	Kurang ada		4	9,30%
4	Tidak ada		0	0%
Total		43	43	100%

For question number 7, does the topic given by the teacher during peer feedback technique improve the students' writing ability? The results are:

Table 1.7

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat membantu		12	27,91%
2	Membantu		28	65,12%
3	Kurang membantu		3	6,97%
4	Tidak membantu		0	0%
Totai		43	43	100%

c. The students' opinion about the material

For the question number 8, is the topic given while applying peer feedback technique interesting?

Table 1.8

No	Criteria	N	F	Total
1	Sangat menarik		12	27,91%
2	Menarik		29	67,44%
3	Kurang menarik		2	4,65%
4	Tidak menarik		0	0%
Total		43	43	100%

For the question number 9, do you understand about the material given by the teacher easily?

was 2,70 and final drafts' mean score was 3,53. The improvement score was 0,83. In cycle 3, rough drafts' mean score was 2,79 and final drafts' mean score was 3,67. The improvement score was 0,88. It could be seen in appendix XII.

In cycle 1, the tense used in narrative text was simple past tense. However, the students had many mistakes in term of using past tense . they sometimes switched to use simple present tense in their writing. The students' rough draft mean score was 2,65 and final drafts' mean score was 3,46. The improvement was not significant because they could not edit the mistakes in language use correctly, especially in tense. In addition, the teacher did not give the adequate training on how to edit it.

In cycle 2, the teacher guided the students on how to correct their peer grammatical error by checking the regular and irregular verbs in the dictionary. She also trained them how to give response and edit the mistakes in term of using simple past tense. The other mistakes were the use of to be. The students' rough drafts mean score was 2,70 and final drafts' mean score was 3,53. The different score was 0,83. The improvement was caused by the students had given response towards the language use and they edited them based on the response given.

In cycle 3, the teacher asked her students to write the paragraph and lined the words that should be edited. This was to avoid time consuming. Then she also gave her students explanation how to edit their

3,07 and final drafts' mean score was 3,40. The improvement score was 0,33. In cycle 3, rough drafts' mean score was 3,12 and final drafts' mean score was 3,69. The improvement score was 0,57. It could be seen in appendix XIII.

In cycle 1, the teacher taught the students how to response towards the mechanic. However, her students did not give any response towards it. They were confused how to give response because their teacher never taught in daily teaching learning process. They was also assumed that mechanic was not important in the element of writing so they ignored it. This was proved by their mean score of mechanic in cycle 1. It showed that there was a little improvement.

In cycle 2, the teacher guided the students on how to correct their peer error in punctuation and capital letter, especially to take comma or dot in their writing. She also trained them how to give response and edit the mistakes in term of punctuation and capital letter. The students' rough drafts mean score was 3,07 and final drafts' mean score was 3,40. The different score was 0,33. The improvement was caused by the students had given response towards the mechanic and they edited them based on the response given.

In cycle 3, the teacher reminded them to edit their peer writing in mechanic. She also taught them the mechanic that should be corrected. For instance: Punctuation and Capital Letter. Then, she guided them step by

this technique used the students center and collaborative learning technique as a core of teaching learning process. It meant the students should conduct their learning independently. In this case, the duty of the teacher was to prepare the students how to conduct peer feedback. This technique would be unsatisfactory if the teacher failed to train them how to give response, revise and edit their writings based on the response given.

Finding of this research indicated peer feedback Technique made beneficial contribution to the students writing in term of language use and mechanic. This finding was in line with Hedgcock and Leftcowitz that peer feedback comments can lead to meaning ful revision and that compared with teacher feedback , revision based on peer comments can be better in vocabulary, organization. language use, mechanic and content.⁷⁷

Another reason was some of the subject in this research made the mistakes in term of language use, especially grammar. They were not consistent in using past verb by editing their mistakes based on the response given by their peer.

In language use, the students' score improved significantly. In the other hand, there was one of writing component which was improved slightly. It was mechanics. The researcher found that the students did not have the appropriate ability and always ignored it when they assessed their peer

⁷⁷ J Hendgcock and J. Lefkowitz, *Collaborative Oral / Aural Revision in Foreign Language Writing Instruction*, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol.1, (<http://www.linkinghub.elsevier.com>, 1992), Retrieved on 6th May 2010. at 7.00 pm

After that, the students gave response to their peer based on peer feedback sheet was given by the teacher. After giving response in second peer feedback sheets, the students gave back the second peer feedback sheets and also their revised drafts to the owner. Finally, they edited their writing. Beside that, there were some difficulties when peer feedback technique was implemented, but both the teacher and the researcher could solve it together. The teacher could do her job maximally and the researcher could too. The problem which was found that the students got difficulties when they made narrative text. But for about materiatl and the technique can be accepted by the student.

2. The students' improvement in writing ability after peer feedback technique was implemented

For about the students' score in writing could improve when peer feedback technique applied. The students' writing ability could improve in every meeting. It could be seen based on the students' score in language use, especially in tense and mechanic, especially in punctuation and capital letter. The mean score of language use of the students' rough and final draft in cycle 1 was 2,69 and final draft 3,46. The improvement was 0,77. In cycle 2, rough drafts' mean score was 2,70 and final drafts' mean score was 3,53. The improvement was 0,83. In cycle 3, rough drafts' mean score was 2,79 and final drafts' mean score was 3,67. The improvement was 0,88. While, the mean score of mechanic of the students' rough and final

draft in cycle 1 was 3,00 and final draft 3,25. The improvement was 0,25. In cycle 2, rough drafts' mean score was 3,07 and final drafts' mean score was 3,40. The improvement was 0,33. In cycle 3, rough drafts' mean score was 3,12 and final drafts' mean score was 3,69. The improvement was 0,57. From the explanation about the score of the students in language use and mechanic means that peer feedback could help the students to improve their writing ability.

3. Students' responses in using peer feedback technique in the teaching of writing

From the questionnaire could be known that almost of students gave positive responses to the use of peer feedback technique in the teaching of writing. It could be known by the questionnaire which was given to the students in the last meeting. And the researcher has analyzed it. In fact, there were 83,72% students answered that they felt enjoy with the implementation of peer feedback technique and they hope peer feedback technique could be applied in their school although the research has done. Beside that, the student can be responded goodly all of question. In conclusion, peer feedback technique included into one of the effective ways experimented in foreign language writing classroom based on the experience that Rollinson and Caulk have founded.

