

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter consist of discussions relate to the issues from this study including peer collaboration, peer written feedback, followed by students' orientation of giving feedback, the aspects of peer feedback, and last one previous study.

2.1 Peer Collaboration

During the process of peer feedback, two students are involved, whether to be a feedback giver or feedback receiver. In relation to that, there is some interaction between the two of them. Peer feedback also considered as peer collaboration, because when the students give or receive a feedback they need to collaborate each other in order to make a better comment and revision for their text. Peer feedback studies investigated how students approach collaboration during feedback session (Lochart&Ng 1995). Pilehvari (2015) for example investigated the impact of peer review on two groups of EFL learners' writing proficiency, the ones who only provide feedback and the one who only receive it. The result shows that the giver improved more than the receiver in both aspects global and local. Baker (2009) also looked at which one is more beneficial to improving students writing during the feedback sessions, giver or receiver. Wabayashi (2013), peer feedback is defined here as a collaborative learning task in which learners learn to write through taking the role of both writer and reviewer. In a collaborative learning, learners are expected to

be aware of their roles for active and effective participation in the peer feedback session. Collaborative learning is “a form of indirect teaching in which the teacher sets the problem and organizes students to work it out collaboratively” (Bruffee, 1984, p. 637)

The use of peer feedback triggered learners to be more attractive, the ability of giving or receiving feedback let them interact to each other. That interaction makes the students involved in the sociocultural theory or social interaction strategy. Lundstrom and Baker (2009) stated that the skill of giving or receiving feedback may be best understood within the framework of sociocultural theory (e.g., Vygotsky, 1986), which theorizes that learners can only acquire information within their zone of proximal development (ZPD). The Social-Interaction Strategies (such as elaborating, facilitating flow of conversation, responding (whether their peers is agree or disagree to the comment), and paraphrasing in Bejarano et al.'s (1997), providing elaboration and suggestion (Sim, 1998; Zhu, 2001); providing restatement, grammar correction, explanation (Komathy, 2000; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; using questions (Komathy, 2000; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Sim, 1998; Zhu, 1997). From a sociocultural theoretical perspective, where all learning is said to occur in social interaction with appropriate forms of assistance (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), peer interaction provides learners with opportunities for ‘languaging’ (Swain, 2000, 2006; Swain, Lapkin, Knouzi, Suzuki, & Brooks, 2009) and ‘collective scaffolding’

(Donato, 1994). Sociocultural theory is one of theoretical perspective on language learning which support the use of interaction for learning (Lasito, 2013).

2.2. Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is considered as an important tool that can help students enhance their learning. The use of peer feedback practices is one way to enhance ongoing, immediate feedback for teacher candidates' professional growth (Shin, Wilkins, & Ainsworth, 2006; Wynn & Kromrey, 2000). Peer response/review has been found to help both college (de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Villamil & de Guerrero,1996) and secondary (Peterson, 2003; Tsui& Ng, 2000) students obtain more in sight into their writing and revision processes, foster a sense of ownership of the text (Tsui & Ng, 2000), generate more positive attitudes toward writing (Min, 2005), enhance audience awareness (Mendonca& Johnson, 1994; Mittan, 1989; Tsui& Ng, 2000), and facilitate their second language acquisition (Byrd, 1994; Lockhart& Ng, 1995) and oral fluency development (Mangelsdorf,1989).

Peer feedback has been shown to increase instructional effectiveness (Birrell & Bullough, 2005). Past research has shown that peer feedback can promote reflection with teacher candidates (Harlin, 2000; Kiraz, 2004; Shin, Wilkins, & Ainsworth, 2006; Wynn & Kromrey, 2000).

2.3 Students' Orientation in Giving Feedback

Student's orientation during feedback session would take certain stances, whether to be a feedback giver or a feedback receiver. Feedback giver is participants who only give a feedback, feedback receiver is participants who only receive a feedback (Sotoudehnama& Pilehvari, 2015). Study from Wakabayashi (2013) defined a brief explanation about feedback giver and receiver with the different term. She stated that giver is a reviewer and receiver is a reviser. A reviewer is the one who tries to see a text through the writer's eyes, does not change the writer's focus or argument, points out possible problems to readers, and makes suggestions on it (Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992) through negotiating with the writer to help articulate new ideas (Lockhart & Ng, 1995a, 1995b). The one who receives feedback and does the revising is the one who only receive every feedback provided by the reviewer in a passive way.

Studies on students orientation during feedback session from Hui-Tzu Min (2006), Richard Badger, Yang Miaoa,1, Yu Zhenc,2, (2006) , Wakabayashi (2013), showed that during the feedback session the one give a feedback improved more than the one who receive it. Hui-Tzu Min (2006) for example, investigated the impact of trained responders' feedback on EFL college students' revisions, both in terms of revision types and quality. She used qualitative analysis as a method, the participants were 18 sophomores in the instructor/researcher's writing class. There were 16 females and 2males, and their average age was 19. This study found that students

incorporated a significantly higher number of reviewers' comments into revisions post peer review training. The number of peer-triggered revisions comprised 90% of the total revisions, and the number of revisions was significantly higher than that before peer review training. The researcher concludes that with extensive training can trained peer review feedback can positively impact EFL students' revision types and quality of texts directly.

Similar study from Richard Badger, Yang Miaoa,1, Yu Zhenc,2, (2006), examined whether peer feedback may provide a resource for addressing this issue by examining two groups of students at a Chinese University writing essays on the same topic, one receiving feedback from the teacher and one from their peers. The data from this study are text and questioner with the video recorders and interviews as the instruments. This study used a case study data as a method and the findings are, The students adopted more teacher feedback than peer feedback, from the interview section said the teacher was more "professional," "experienced," and "trustworthy" than their peers, and the most commonly reported reason for the non-incorporation of teacher feedback was that it was "ignored". It can be seen that from the study, the students prefer feedback from the teacher rather than their peers.

Another study from Wakabayashi (2013), investigated the EFL learners' perceptions of peer feedback in writing instruction in the context of a Japanese university. To investigated the learners' perceptions a questionnaire survey and follow-up interviews were conducted with a total of 51 students enrolled in two

writing classes. The result from this study showed that the students perceived peer feedback to be useful, and that they did so more from the writer's stance than the reviewer's. The studies about giver and receiver showed that the students prefer as a feedback giver more during the feedback session, some of studies also revealed that some students prefer feedback from teacher more during the feedback session.

2.3 Aspect of peer feedback

During the feedback session the students need to understand which part that they need to review. In relation to this statement, there are two aspects from feedback. The first one is global and the second one is local.

2.2.1 Global Aspect

Global aspect covers the general aspects of peer feedback such as development, coherence, cohesion, and organization. The skill of being able to critically evaluate writing, defined as the ability to look at a classmate's writing and then provide effective feedback, particularly on a global level (i.e., at the level of content and organization), is a very necessary skill for writing quality and academic success in general (Gieve, 1998; Thompson, 2002). Assessments on global aspects include development, organization, cohesion and coherence. First, development is to do with judgment whether ideas are naturally expressed in writing (Martin, 2000). Next is organization, this aspect is dealing with the way we organize the combination

of examples and illustration, narration, description, process, comparison and contrast, analogy, cause and effect, classification and division, and definition Nordquit (2015).

Coherence and cohesion are to do with connecting ideas between sentence or paragraph. Coherence associated with the relation of all main ideas in paragraph, it also associates with the choice words in sentences. While cohesion is related to how to make every sentence in a paragraph, and every paragraph in a text are connect to each other based on grammatical aspects of writing Min (2012)

2.2.2 Local Aspect

The local aspects in peer feedback include structure, vocabulary, and organization. Developing the students' editing skills (the local level) is also necessary as the grammatical inaccuracies can have negative effects on the overall quality of our students' writing (Ferris, 2002). The study from Lundstorm and Baker (2009) examine the types of improvements students made, whether in global (i.e., organization, development, and cohesion) or local (i.e., structure, vocabulary, and mechanics) aspects of writing. First structure is dealing with the use of verb tense choice and the use of article (Aldosari, Storch 2012). Next is vocabulary which is deals with the choice of words in a text and word meanings (Aldosari, Storch 2012). Meanwhile the last aspect is dealing with punctuation which is associates with punctuation, spelling, and pronunciation (Aldosari, Storch 2012).

1.4 Previous study

There are so many studies about peer feedback, for instance study from Reyna Wakabayashi (2013) which examined EFL learners' perceptions of peer feedback in writing instruction in the context of a Japanese university. The result from that study indicates that the students perceived peer feedback to be useful, and that they did so more from the writer's stance than the reviewer's. Study from Yang Miaoa,1, Richard Badger b,*, Yu Zhenc,2, (2006), this study examines whether peer feedback may provide a resource for addressing this issue by examining two groups of students at a Chinese University writing essays on the same topic, one receiving feedback from the teacher and one from their peers. The result from this study showed that students used teacher and peer feedback to improve their writing but that teacher feedback was more likely to be adopted and led to greater improvements in the writing. Another study from Hui-Tzu Min (2006) aimed to examine the impact of trained responders' feedback on EFL college students' revisions, both in terms of revision types and quality. The result showed that students incorporated a significantly higher number of reviewers' comments into revisions post peer review training. The number of peer-triggered revisions comprised 90% of the total revisions, and the number of revisions with enhanced quality was significantly higher than that before peer review training.

However, only few studies which focused on aspects of peer feedback and students orientation as feedback giver or feedback receiver. For example the study from Lundstorm and Baker (2009), aimed to determine which one is more beneficial

to improving student writing: giving or receiving peer feedback. The participants of the study are 91 students enrolled in nine sections of writing classes at the English Language Center (ELC) at Brigham Young University. The data are an overall score for each pre- and post-test essay, as well as the scores for the 6 aspects of writing: organization, development, cohesion, structure, vocabulary, and mechanics. One of the result of this study revealed that Giving peer feedback on a paper seems to improve writing ability more than learning to use peer feedback to improve writing. Another study is from Sotoudehnama& Pilehvari (2016), which is aimed to Compares two groups of participants to determine whether the most advantageous effects of peer review can be found in giving or receiving feedback. The participants are 122 female students aged 18 to 30, selected from a pool of Persian-speaking learners of English, studying in high-intermediate levels (1,2, and 3) at the Iran Language Institute (ILI), Tehran, Iran. The result showed that Students who provide feedback improved their writing abilities more than the ones who used the received feedback to revise those essays.