

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is the last chapter of the study comprising two parts. The first part puts forward conclusions based on the findings and discussions in the previous chapters. The second part puts forward suggestions expected to give benefits and meaningful input generally for the readers who are interested in feedback development.

5.2 Conclusions

The conclusions have been drawn based on the findings and discussion in the chapter IV. There are two major conclusions found. They are (1) based on types of feedback proposed by Hedge *et al* (1988), the teacher used for types of feedback; (2) the given feedback was responded positively and negatively by the students. The more elaboration of each point will be presented below.

There are four types of feedback based on Hedge *et al* (1988) used by the teacher. First, it was found that the teacher used *whole class conference* in providing feedback to the students. It was usually done by giving the students direct explanation orally, in front of the class, to the students by telling them the mistakes on their writing, the reason of the mistakes and the solution of how to revise it. Second, the teacher also used *one-on-one conference* to the students. In this stage, the teacher also tended to give the students direct explanation of what they have to for their writing improvement. On the other hand, in the written level, the teacher tended to give indirect feedback to the students. It was done by applying what is called as *minimal marking*. The teacher gave them several signs to indicate mistakes that they have

Indri Eka Pertiwi , 2013

made. The signs were in the form of circle, underline and arrow. Those signs were used to indicate different kinds of mistakes. The circle one indicated that there was something wrong with the grammar or the spelling of the word. The underline one indicated that there was something missing on the part of the sentence. The arrow one indicated that the students need to pay attention on the word order that they have made. Besides, the teacher also used *commentary*. The comments were *very good* indicating no mistakes on the students' writing, *good*, there are one until four mistakes on their writing, *not bad* indicating that there are more than four mistakes on their writing, *poor* indicating that their writing could not be understood as a whole. But above all, regardless of those strategies given, it was also indicated that the teacher believed that feedback is needed by the students and it should be given to all students. This is basically in line with Lewis (2000) stating that feedback, written or spoken, is beneficial and meaningful to enhance the students' language input. Thus, the teacher kept providing feedback for the students.

In terms of responses of the students toward the feedback given by the teacher, the students responded positively and negatively to the teacher feedback. From the interview to the teacher, she assumed that the students tended to respond positively to the feedback since it has been given continually to the students. This assumption is basically supported Thomson (2007) stating that to succeed any kinds of feedback, it would be beneficial for the students to have feedback continually and consistently from the teacher. If the students make several mistakes, and the teacher helps them to repair them by giving them feedback, it challenges them to consider it and really learn from it.

Besides, it is also strengthened by the result of the questionnaires which was found that, in general, students gave positive responses toward the teacher feedback. The result of it showed that the most students agreed that feedback in any forms is needed for their writing development. On the other hand, from the interview to the

Indri Eka Pertiwi , 2013

students, it was found that there were also negative responses conveyed by the students. This negative response came from low achieving students who had difficulties in understanding written indirect feedback from the teacher. They preferred to have spoken direct explanation to reduce their confusion in revising their writing. This kind of negative response indicates that basically, the students have different strengths and weaknesses, especially in writing descriptive texts. Moreover, as Lewis (2002) proposed, it is essential for the teacher to know that since every student has his or her own mistakes, the input should be more specific and personal, thus addressing his or her needs. Besides, both high achiever and low achiever students need reinforcement and encouragement but they need to be given in different ways.

5.3 Suggestions

There are several suggestions recommended for the follow-up studies. These suggestions will be focused on two parts; suggestions for English teachers and for the researchers who are interested in the same field.

To English teachers, there are several suggestions in providing feedback to the students. Firstly, teachers need to know exactly what the students really need for their writing. They need to know the characteristics of the students which can be used as the considerations for choosing strategies of providing feedback to the students in order to make them understand about what they have to do to their writing. It is also suggested that teachers should pay more attention to the low achiever students. They need to give more them direct explanation about their mistakes and what they have to do to revise them. Therefore, all of the students can comprehend the feedback, thus giving benefits for them.

There are also several suggestions for the researcher who are interested in the same field. Firstly, it would be better to dig deeper each strategy applied by the

Indri Eka Pertiwi , 2013

teacher in this study and the effect of it for the students. Secondly, it is also suggested that further researchers to have well consideration in choosing the teacher since he or she is the main participant in the study. Lastly, it is recommended to find other strategies in providing feedback for the shake of student writing development.



Indri Eka Pertiwi , 2013

Teacher's Feedback On Students' Descriptive Texts: A Case Study Conducted In A Junior High School
In Bandung
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu