CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into three main sections: research finding, hypothesis testing, and discussion. The research finding consists of the presentation of data and the findings which describes the scores of students' writing test. The hypothesis testing reveals whether or not the null hypothesis is rejected. The discussion explains descriptions of the result of the entire study.

A. Research Finding

1. The presentation of data

The presentation of data provided some calculations including the highest score, the lowest score, the mean score and the standard deviation of both classes. The sample of this research was 67 students. The data of this research consisted of pre-test score and post-test score of experimental class and control class. The detail explanations about the result of research will be explained as follows.

a. Experimental Class

The data of experimental class are divided into two sections that are the pre-test score and the post-test score. The data of the pre-test score and post-test score of the experimental class are explained as follows.

1) **The Data of the Pre-Test Scores of the Experimental Class**

Experimental class is a group which was given a treatment in writing analytical exposition text by using peer feedback. Before the experimental class was given a treatment, the researcher arranged a pre-test for this class in the form of writing analytical exposition text as a pre-test that delivered for control class. The subject of pre-test in experimental class consisted of 35 students. Based on the result in pre-test, the highest score was 85, and the lowest score was 52. The students' pre-test score can be seen in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Pre-test' Score of the Experimental Class

No	Students' Name	PRE-TEST
1	ATK	75
2	AS	52
3	AP	76
4	AFZ	79
5	AM	81
6	AU	59
7	DS	75
8	DA	70
9	EL	85
10	FAN	68
11	FYD	83
12	HAMP	74
13	IY	85
14	KN	68
15	KDA	79
16	LZ	74
17	MFM	80
18	MAA	81
19	MRTA	67
20	MAs	72
21	MAb	73

Continued

Continuation

No	Students' Name	PRE-TEST
22	MUA	66
23	MK	75
24	MRNA	68
25	M	58
26	NIU	65
27	NNA	76
28	OIA	78
29	RN	73
30	RLF	68
31	RM	72
32	SSN	80
33	UR	80
34	WSP	68
35	ZR	57

The scores which presented above were calculated based on the writing rubric that was given. There were five aspects that should be scored in students' writing skill, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Each aspect had different points depending on the criteria on the writing rubric.

Based on the result of statistic calculation by using SPSS 16.00 for Windows computer program, the mean score of pre-test in experimental class was 72.57 with the standard deviation 8.02. The median was 74 and the mode was 68. The statistical data can be seen in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Summary of the Statistical Analysis of Students'

Pre-test Score in the Experimental Class

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		72.5714
Std. Error of Mean		1.35615
Median		74.0000
Mode		68.00
Std. Deviation		8.02308
Variance		64.370
Range		33.00
Minimum		52.00
Maximum		85.00
Sum		2540.00

Based on the result above, the students' range score was 33 with the means score was 72.57. It means that there were some students who got high score in pre-test, but otherwise there were some students who got low score in pre-test.

2) The Data of the Post-Test Scores of the Experimental Class

Administering a post-test in writing analytical exposition text for experimental class was used to measure student' skill in writing analytical exposition text after they learnt writing by

using peer feedback. The subject of post-test in experimental class consisted of 35 students.

Based on the result in post-test, the highest score in experimental was 92. While the lowest score in post-test was 68. For the detailed experimental class students' score in post-test can be seen in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Post-test' Score of the Experimental Class

No	Students' Name	POST-TEST
1	ATK	90
2	AS	68
3	AP	86
4	AFZ	87
5	AM	85
6	AU	70
7	DS	82
8	DA	85
9	EL	90
10	FAN	77
11	FYD	80
12	HAMP	88
13	IY	90
14	KN	85
15	KDA	77
16	LZ	80
17	MFM	87
18	MAA	89
19	MRTA	70
20	MAs	77
21	MAb	79
22	MUA	81
23	MK	70
24	MRNA	77
25	M	77
26	NIU	79
27	NNA	75
28	OIA	90
29	RN	79
30	RLF	86

Continued

Continuation

No	Students' Name	POST-TEST
31	RM	79
32	SSN	92
33	UR	87
34	WSP	77
35	ZR	77

Based on the result of statistic calculation by using SPSS 16.00 for Windows computer program, the mean score of post-test in experimental class was 81.37 with the standard deviation 6.55. The median was 80 and the mode was 77. The statistical data can be seen in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Summary of the Statistical Analysis of Students'
Post-test Score in the Experimental Class

N	Valid	35
	Missing	0
Mean		81.3714
Std. Error of Mean		1.10696
Median		80.0000
Mode		77.00
Std. Deviation		6.54885
Variance		42.887
Range		24.00
Minimum		68.00
Maximum		92.00
Sum		2848.00

Based on the result above, the students' range score was 24 with the means score was 81.37. It means that there were significantly improving scores from the pre-test. It can be seen that the students' skill in experimental class increased after giving several treatments using peer feedback. Students improved their mastery in writing an analytical exposition after applied that technique in their learning process which proved by increasing mean score from 72.57 in pre-test to 81.37 in post-test.

b. Control Class

The data of the control class cover two important points: the data of the pre-test scores and the data of the post-test score. The data of the pre-test score and post-test score of the control class are explained as follows.

1) The Data of the Pre-Test Scores of the Control Class

Control class is a group which was given a treatment in writing analytical exposition text without using peer feedback. In control class, the learning activity was done by the teacher as usual. Before the control class was given a treatment, the researcher delivered a pre-test for this class in the form of writing analytical exposition text. The subject of pre-test in control class consisted of 32 students. Based on the result in pre-test, the highest score was 85 and the lowest score was 51. For the whole students' pre-test score in control class can be seen in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Pre-test' Score of the Control Class

No	Students' Name	PRE-TEST
1	ARF	78
2	ABO	85
3	AHA	56
4	AYAF	79
5	AAN	69
6	ANM	75
7	CRS	75
8	DFM	65
9	DFS	85
10	DSKP	73
11	EMK	85
12	FNF	72
13	FZS	82
14	HI	65
15	IRF	74
16	KMK	67
17	LNA	80
18	LEP	82
19	MAS	70
20	MRF	73
21	MYH	85
22	MAFR	65
23	MATS	52
24	MKB	63
25	MMK	70
26	NM	67
27	PDA	64
28	RI	80
29	RS	51
30	SA	68
31	SNH	65
32	STS	78

Based on the result of statistic calculation by using SPSS 16.00 for Windows computer program, the mean score of pre-test in control class was 71.81 with the standard deviation 9.28. The median was 72.50 and the mode was 65. The statistical data can be seen in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Summary of the Statistical Analysis of Students'

Pre-test Score in the Control Class

PRE-TEST SCORE

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		71.8125
Std. Error of Mean		1.64024
Median		72.5000
Mode		65.00
Std. Deviation		9.27862
Variance		86.093
Range		34.00
Minimum		51.00
Maximum		85.00
Sum		2298.00

Based on Table 4.6. above showed that the students' range score was 34 with the means score was 71.81. It means that there were some students who got high score in pre-test, but otherwise there were some students who got low score in pre-test.

2) The Data of the Post-Test Scores of the Control Class

Administering a post-test in writing analytical exposition text for control class was done to know the improvement of the student's skill in writing analytical exposition text although the

leaning activity was without using peer feedback. The subject of post-test in control class consisted of 32 students.

Based on the result in post-test, the highest score in control class was 91. While the lowest score in post-test was 60. For the whole students' post-test score in control class, it can be seen in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Post-test' Score of the Control Class

No	Students' Name	POST-TEST
1	ARF	76
2	ABO	91
3	AHA	73
4	AYAF	89
5	AAN	74
6	ANM	69
7	CRS	85
8	DFM	69
9	DFS	79
10	DSKP	79
11	EMK	69
12	FNF	77
13	FZS	76
14	HI	69
15	IRF	79
16	KMK	78
17	LNA	79
18	LEP	79
19	MAS	83
20	MRF	78
21	MYH	86
22	MAFR	77
23	MATS	69
24	MKB	63
25	MMK	73
26	NM	69
27	PDA	63
28	RI	84
29	RS	74
30	SA	71
31	SNH	60
32	STS	75

Based on the result of statistic calculation by using SPSS 16.00 for Windows computer program, was known that the mean of student's score in post-test was 75.47 with the standard deviation was 7.35. The median was 76 and the mode was 69. Based on the result of control class students' score in pre-test and post-test, there was different score between both test where the mean of students' score in post-test was better than the mean of students' score in pre-test. For the detailed evidence of statistical data can be seen in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8: Summary of the Statistical Analysis of Students' Post-test Score in the Control Class

POST-TEST SCORE

N	Valid	32
	Missing	0
Mean		75.4688
Std. Error of Mean		1.29903
Median		76.0000
Mode		69.00
Std. Deviation		7.34840
Variance		53.999
Range		31.00
Minimum		60.00
Maximum		91.00
Sum		2415.00

From those data, it was known that the process of administering post-test in writing analytical exposition text for control class showed that the students' range score was 31 with the means score was 75.47. There was improvement of student's skill in writing analytical exposition text although the learning activities without using peer feedback which the score was 71.81 in pre-test and 75.47 in post-test. However, the improvement score was not significant like in the experimental class. The learning activities without using peer feedback made the students can not realize their mistakes in writing and never looked into the material related to analytical exposition a much deeper, therefore they were lack for reflecting their ideas to write an analytical exposition text. Hence, the impact was the improvement of the student's skill was not reached optimally.

2. Findings

In the findings, the researcher analyzed the students' score of experimental class and control class in pre-test and post-test, the researcher tried to compare the students' score of both classes consisted of the highest score, the lowest score, and the mean score in pre-test and post-test in writing analytical exposition text. Afterwards, the researcher found out the gained score of each group from pre-test to post-test to know whether the students' skill was ascending, same, or descending after they learnt writing by using peer feedback or without using peer feedback. The result of comparison of statistical data in pre-test and

post-test of experimental class and control class can be seen in the Table 4.9 below.

Table 4.9: Comparison of Statistical Data in Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental and Control Class

Class	Data	N	Highest Score	Lowest Score	Mean	Gained Score
Experimental Class	Pre-test	35	85	52	72.57	+ 8.80
	Post-test	35	92	68	81.37	
Control Class	Pre-test	32	85	51	71.81	+ 3.66
	Post-test	32	91	60	75.47	

The table above presented the comparison of the students' score in pre-test and post-test of experimental class and control class in writing analytical exposition text. In pre-test, the students' score of experimental class in writing analytical exposition text showed that the highest score was 85, the lowest score was 52 and the mean score was 72.57. Whereas in post-test, the students' score of experimental class in writing analytical exposition text showed that the highest score ascended into 92, the lowest score ascended into 68 and the mean score was getting improvement became 81.37 with the gained score 8.80 from the mean score in pre-test.

Afterwards, in pre-test of control class showed that the highest score was 85, the lowest score was 51 and the mean score was 71.81. Whereas in post-test, the students' score of control class in writing analytical exposition text showed that the highest score ascended into

91, the lowest score ascended into 60 and the mean score was getting improvement became 75.47 with the gained score 3.66 from the mean score in pre-test.

The result above showed that the gained score of experimental class who learnt writing by using peer feedback was higher than the gained score of control class who learnt writing without using peer feedback. It shows that there was significant difference of the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text by using peer feedback than who learnt writing without using peer feedback.

B. Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing was used to reveal whether there was a significant difference on the writing skill between the students who were taught by using peer feedback and they who were taught without using it. The null hypothesis (H_0) is "There is no significant difference in writing skill between students who were taught by using peer feedback and they who were taught without using it." The alternative hypothesis (H_a) states that there is significant difference in writing skill between students who were taught by using peer feedback and they who were taught without using it."

The researcher used SPSS for Windows 16.00 computer program to analyze the data for post-test. Theoretically, the hypothesis was accepted if the value of the significant level was lower than 0.05. The result of hypothesis test is presented in Table 4.10 below:

Table 4.10: The Computation of the Data

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SCORE	Equal variances assumed	.046	.831	3.477	65	.001	5.90268	1.69782	2.51189	9.29346
	Equal variances not assumed			3.459	62.378	.001	5.90268	1.70670	2.49145	9.31391

Table 4.10 shows that the Sig. (2-tailed) revealed the significance point was 0.001. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) is lower than significant level (0.001 < 0.05). Therefore, H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. In other words, there is a significant difference in the writing skill between the students who were taught by using peer feedback and they who were taught without using it. Moreover, the finding asserted that peer feedback was effective used in writing analytical exposition text for the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Tulungagung.

C. Discussion

In this research, the researcher gave the test to the respondents twice, they were pre-test and post-test. The researcher analyzed the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text when they learnt writing by using peer feedback (experimental class), and when they learnt writing without using peer feedback (control class) to get score both of the classes.

Regarding to the research which was done, it is considered that there is a significant difference on the students' writing skill between the students who were taught by using peer feedback and they who were not. The absolute gained scores of the mean and the standard deviation of both classes emphasized on the significant difference of the students' writing skill.

The description of the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text between the students who learnt writing by using peer feedback and those who learnt writing without using peer feedback will be explained as follows:

1. Description of the Students' Skill in Writing Analytical Exposition Text when They Learnt Writing by Using Peer Feedback

In experimental class, pre-test was conducted before the treatment. From the result of pre-test, it was known that the students faced some difficulties in writing an analytical exposition text. The students' skills were in low level when they had to arrange sentences to be a good paragraph by considering main idea. It meant that the idea was not clearly stated and the sentences were not well-organized to support the main idea. Not only the sequence of sentences which were made by the

students were not complete, but also they had many difficulties in vocabulary, language use, and mechanic. Therefore, the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text could not be understood. To minimize the number of the students' mistakes in their writing, the researcher collected students' writing, gave correction, and returned the paper to them. From the correction of their mistakes, the students were supposed to learn more and supposed to improve their understanding and their ability in writing analytical exposition text. The stages that have been mentioned above also were done for control class although the learning activities in writing analytical exposition text without using peer feedback.

After compared with the students score in pre-test and followed with analyzing of the students' score in post-test, it was found that the students' understanding in writing analytical exposition text after getting treatment improved. In the treatment, the students were given peer feedback checklist that was in line with the function of analytical exposition text, its linguistics features, and its generic structure.

Based on the criteria of scoring rubric for writing analytical exposition text, the example of experimental class students' writing showed that the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text by using peer feedback as a technique in teaching learning was getting improvement. (See Appendix 7 for the detailed examples of students' writing products in experimental class).

After the student got a treatment by using peer feedback as technique in writing learning of analytical exposition text, the student was able to develop their idea easily. Besides, the students' skill in developing the paragraph is better than before the student got a treatment. As in thesis, the main idea and supporting sentences stated completely and clearly. Most of students were able to organize paragraph in well development, well-organized, and coherent.

Based on the result of student's writing, the student almost no error in choosing the appropriate tenses for writing analytical exposition text. The improvement of the students' skill was proved by the mean score in post-test was higher than the mean score in pre-test. The mean score of pre-test was 70.57 and the mean score of post-test was 81.75 with the gained score was 8.80.

2. **Description of the Students' Skill in Writing Analytical Exposition Text when They Learnt Writing without Using Peer Feedback**

In the control class, there was not a new treatment in the teaching and learning process. They were given a usual treatment. They learnt writing analytical exposition text without applying peer feedback technique after writing a text. By just using usual way in teaching and learning process, the teacher had used a common technique that could not make students to reflect and review their understanding on writing analytical exposition text. It made the students could not write the analytical exposition text correctly because the students got difficulty to

develop their paragraph and did not understand about their mistakes in generic structures, vocabulary, language use and mechanic of analytical exposition text.

Based on the criteria of scoring rubric for writing analytical exposition text, the example of control class student's writing showed that there were many lacks based on the content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. (See Appendix 7 for the detailed examples of students' writing products in control class).

Compared with the example of the student's writing in pre-test, the example of student's writing in post-test was getting improvement although they learnt writing without using peer feedback, but it was not significant.

Based on the criteria of scoring rubric for writing analytical exposition text, the example of student's writing in post-test showed that the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text was getting improvement.

After getting explanation about what analytical exposition text is, the students were able to develop their ideas into good written although there were still any mistakes in tenses. The main idea and supported sentences stated fairly, sufficiently, and clearly. The generic structure was fairly well organized and generally coherent.

Although the students were not given any treatment, they got improvement in their skill in writing analytical exposition text. The

researcher assumed that the improvement of the control class students' skill was caused by *maturation*. According to Donald Ary (2002: 304) *maturation* refers to changes in the subjects themselves that occur over time. Between pre-test and post-test, the students were growing mentally and physically, and they might have learning experiences that could affect the dependent variable. As long as they learnt writing analytical exposition text although without using peer feedback, the students had learning experiences in writing analytical exposition text so their skill in writing this text were getting improvement.

The improvement of the students' skill was proved by the mean score in post-test was higher than the mean score in pre-test. The mean score of pre-test was 71.81 and the mean score of post-test was 75.47 with the gained score was 3.66.

3. The Effect of Using Peer Feedback on the Students' Writing Skill

Based on the result of pre-test and post-test that had been done for experimental class and control class, it shows that there was significant difference of the students' skill in writing analytical exposition text between the students who learnt writing by using peer feedback and those who learnt writing without using peer feedback.

According to the computation of the post-test result, the mean score of experimental class on their writing skill was 81.37 while that of the control class was 75.47. It could be interpreted that the mean score of the

experimental class that were taught by using peer feedback was higher than control class that were taught without using it.

In addition, from the gained test score, the absolute gain score of the mean of the experimental class was 8.80. It was higher than that of score of mean of control class which was 3.66. In conclusion, based on the absolute gain score of mean from both classes, teaching writing by using peer feedback was more effective than that of without using it.

Related to the statistic calculation of Lavene-Independent Samples of t-test by using SPSS 16.00 for Windows computer program, the result of Sig. (2-tailed) showed that the significant value of the group was 0.001. It was less than the significance level of 0.05 so that the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. Statistically, there was a significant difference when the significant level of Independent Sample of t-test was higher than the significance level of 0.05. It means that that there was significant difference of the students' skill. in writing analytical exposition text between the students who learnt writing by using peer feedback and those who learnt writing without using peer feedback. So, it indicates that the using of peer feedback was effective for students' skill in writing analytical exposition text at the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Tulungagung in academic year 2017/2018.

It has been discussed in Chapter II that peer feedback was beneficial to help students in the teaching-learning process especially for the

writing skill. It motivates students to evaluate the mistake that they made in writing process. Students studied how far they should give the mark to their peer's work. Kamimura (2006) investigated the effect of peer feedback on the students' writing performance. His finding showed that peer feedback had positive effect on the students' writing performance and it had significant improvements on the revisions produced by the students.

Furthermore, peer feedback had an important role for the student compared with the teachers' comment. Kurt and Atay (2007) find that students who did peer feedback had a lower level of anxiety than the students who did not. Then, they benefited peer feedback process as their peers told the mistakes that they were not aware of and gave them opinions and suggestions. They also felt free and confident in discussing their point of view in peer feedback. In the aspect of the teaching-learning process, peer feedback could be used to solve problems in writing activities. It was because peer feedback gave opportunities for students to work with their peers that maximize students' writing activities. It promoted student-centered learning in the writing class. This learning activity made students became creative. They shared the ideas one to another and got more knowledge of writing by editing their own work and others' work. This activity encouraged students' motivation in writing.

In addition, peer feedback in teaching writing can be an alternative solution to solve the students' difficulty in writing. Astuti (2013) discovers that peer feedback strengthens the theories of teaching writing that a suitable technique is needed to be applied in the teaching learning of writing regarding with students' writing problem. Peer feedback is needed in teaching writing because it gives a chance for students to evaluate their work. It is very beneficial for students if the teachers always share the students' error and mistakes. In line with that previous study, Iryanti (2015) explored the effect of peer feedback in improving students writing achievement. She finds that teaching writing by using peer feedback is more effective than by using teacher feedback because peer feedback gives valuable effect in improving students writing achievement. In her findings she indicates a significant explanation that the role of giving peer feedback which join with teacher guidance before is important to make teacher easier in building the students mapping on how to write effectively. From the explanation above, it could be concluded that peer feedback was appropriate technique to be applied in teaching-learning writing for all level of senior high school.

The improvement of the experimental class was due to the different treatment as well. The treatment was to use peer feedback in teaching writing of analytical exposition text in the experimental class. On the other hand, the improvement of the control class that was taught without

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents conclusion and suggestion from the research finding. The conclusion is presented based on the result of the data analysis of the research. In addition, suggestions are given to the students, the English teacher, and the future researcher.

A. Conclusion

After the researcher finished the previous chapters, the researcher would like to present the conclusions as the result of the research on the effectiveness of using peer feedback on students' writing skill in MAN 1 Tulungagung. The researcher concludes the result of the research to answer the research question which stated previously in Chapter I.

The data of this research shows that the mean score of experimental class between pre-test and post-test were 72.57 for pre-test and 81.37 for post-test. It improved significantly at 8.80 point. Therefore, students' writing skill of the control class improved from the mean score 71.81 in pre-test to 75.47 in post-test. This result shows that it slightly improved at 3.66 points. Accordingly, it indicated that in teaching writing, students who were taught by using peer feedback had higher scores than those who were taught without using it. This implies that the use of peer feedback is needed in teaching writing due to its potential for enhanced student learning. It considers as an

important dominant tool in enhancing the process of learning English writing. Therefore, peer feedback in writing classes is useful in term of the cognitive and social benefits for students.

Based on the findings of the research, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the writing skill of the eleventh grade students of MAN 1 Tulungagung that were taught by using peer feedback and those who were taught without using it. The data shows that the value of significance is 0.001 and it is lower than 0.05. Therefore, the hypothesis which says: "There is a significant difference between students' writing skill taught by using peer feedback and without using peer feedback" is accepted. Peer Feedback can be used as an alternative for teaching writing.

B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion of the research, the researcher proposes some suggestions for the following parties: teachers, students, and other researchers.

1. English Students of University

Through peer feedback in teaching writing, the English students of university are expected to be no longer dependent on their lecturer in receiving feedback. They could ask their peers to provide feedback for their writing. At last, peer feedback is expected to help English students of university to improve their writing skill by sharing their new idea and diverse perspectives.

2. **English Teachers**

In teaching learning of writing, an English teacher needs to be selective in applying an appropriate technique which improves motivation for students. The researcher also suggests the teachers should apply peer feedback in teaching writing because it gives a chance for students to evaluate their work. It is very beneficial for students if the teachers always share the students' error and mistakes. The students know their mistake and they know how to revise it.

3. **Other Researchers**

This research is aimed at finding only the significance of peer feedback on the teaching-learning process of writing. It is expected that the result of the study can give an informative input to other researchers who want to conduct similar researches. It is possible for other researchers to conduct experiment or action research to improve speaking or others dependent variables skill through peer feedback. It is also possible for them to design the same topic from the level of vocational high school to the university based on their need and condition.