

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions and Suggestions

This chapter presents the conclusion of the current study and provides suggestions for teaching implication and future research.

#### 5.1 Conclusions

The present study investigated peer feedback in an EFL classroom, specifically towards science students who were assigned to do lab reports. Text analysis on the subjects' lab report drafts were exhibited to portray the types of peer feedbacks produced. Respectively, learners' perceptions were also taken account to explore how they experienced the peer feedback activity and their response towards the different types of feedback for future revision/writing. The findings of the study can be summarized based on the three research questions (as mentioned in chapter 1) in the proceeding discussion, where the conclusions were assimilated from one to the other as it was seen as a justification.

The results confirmed that the learners responded positively towards the peer feedback session in general as it was viewed as effective and beneficial towards the development and improvement of their writing. Additionally, the collaborative atmosphere encouraged the respondents' motivation towards an autonomous learning experience due to helpful social exchanges which helped reflect on their own writing

ability and knowledge. This was contradictive to previous studies (Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Carson & Nelson, 1996; Connor and Asenavange, 1994; Fei, 2006, Sultana, 2009) confirming that Asian learners had negative attitudes towards peer feedback, as it was seen ineffective to various reasons.

Learners' did not really take particular preference on the types of feedback they received, as long as it was useful for them to enhance their writing. Accordingly, the different types of feedback were acknowledged to have diverse roles towards the development of writing, either it was supportive for better writing or it was accommodating learner's self confidence. How comments were put into text also affected the way respondents perceived the feedbacks. For instance, short comments might give an unclear cut of what has to be done as it would be affectively different to a complete comprehensive comment.

Nevertheless, the study found that most of the written feedbacks were categorized as suggestions, where criticism took second place, and praise was the least favorite category. It shows that learners are trying to aid one another in the way of improving the writing quality, since more of the feedbacks were accounted into constructive comments.

On the contrary, the imbalanced figure also contradicts to the fact that the subjects were unfamiliar in producing positive comments due to the negative impression of feedbacks, if not; as a result of the absence of teacher feedback in providing comments (Connors & Lundsford, 1993; Lee).

The study also shows that learners found difficulties in providing feedbacks by reason of lacking confidence in producing feedbacks, arguably because of their insufficient knowledge of the content and language.

However, learners humbly found their peers' comments to be clear and leaning towards the correct direction, nonetheless, it was confirmed that most of their mistakes were due to their own carelessness.

Surprisingly, only 39.39% of the 132 usable feedbacks were found to be incorporated into revision, where most were considered as surface changes. This shows that more or less only some of the comments were viewed to be worth using into their writing, and that learners seem to focus more on surface level of writing, in the context of the study. Regardless, respondents acknowledged the commentary feedbacks as useful to improve their lab report, specifically when they were productive comments.

In conclusion, peer feedback can be an effective tool to promote better writing product through a collaborative process where it enhances not only the writing quality, but also the social cognitive aspect in a cooperative learning experience. Despite the positives, EFL learners are found to be unconfident in providing commentary feedbacks caused by the lack of practice and demonstration from the teacher/instructor. This also affects the quality of feedbacks produced by learners. Hence, even though this method endures the learner-centered approach, teachers as the facilitator have an essential role towards the success of the activity. Additionally,

different group or class settings would have dissimilar approach to benefit from peer feedback. As for the present study, science students can benefit from peer feedback, especially in developing and improving their lab report where scientific writing is highlighted.

## **5.2 Suggestions**

Based on what has been presented above, there are some suggestions for future teaching implications which could be taken into account when applying peer feedback into EFL writing activities.

First, teachers should carefully acknowledge the objective of the activity to the students and guidelines that follow before starting any peer feedback. This is to demonstrate how the activity is carried out and illustrate the purpose namely through explaining the benefits and advantages students could gain, and give examples of the different types of feedbacks. Its best when students are informed of being graded, either as writers or reviewers, thus both would give an effort to achieve optimally in the positive sense of collaboration.

Second, in the EFL context, carrying out peer feedback would be better done through stages depending on the general level of proficiency. In the first stage, students should focus on giving comments towards their peer's draft on the surface level of writing, such as spelling, tenses, punctuation, vocabulary, and wording. This

can encourage students to be more confident on the surface level of writing before coming to a more substantial issue. After the previous stage, the second draft is then given feedbacks, but the focus is more on the content of writing (e.g. whether the paragraphs have been coherent or cohesive with the ideas, has the text fulfilled the objectives, etc). This can motivate the students to write a better piece of writing, where the audiences are the purpose of text. The third stage is a general feedback of all the aspects, where students have quite enough practice after the two previous ones. The peer feedback is best done by a new partnership to exploit writing from a new perspective. Throughout the peer feedback session, teachers should monitor the process and supervise students if any problems occur.

The final suggestion is that teachers should consider the class characteristics (e.g. cultural values, level of proficiency, age, etc) and setting (such as class size, gender ratio, and so on) to discover appropriate ways to suit peer feedback into activities that would benefit the students and achieve the learning objectives. Pairing the students with suitable partners should also be taken into consideration, when applying this technique in classrooms. Additionally, the better you know your students, the better success level you may achieve.

This study was carried out not without limitations, such as homogenous group, small number of respondents, time restriction, researcher's role etc. Therefore, there are some suggestions for future research as follows: (1) a comparative study could be conducted to investigate different types of groups (such as EFL/EFL. Large

class vs. small class, (2) a prolong study on peer feedback, throughout a semester or more, to investigate the effects and perception in students writing, and (3) a deep exploration of learner's response and beliefs towards the different types of peer feedback, and how they are put into revision where the researcher endures a participative role.

