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Abstract: This research was aimed to investigate the effectiveness of peer feedback on students’ writing ability write English essays. A pre-experimental research was used as the research design and the students of the second semester of English Department who took the Academic Reading and Writing course was chosen as the sample of this study. A pretest was administered before the students started experiencing peer feedback as the research treatment while a posttest was conducted after the students got all the treatment of peer feedback. However, during the pandemic of Covid 19, all the research activities including pretest, treatment and posttest were done online. The pretest result showed that the students’ writing ability was quite low. The maximum score was 75, the minimum score was 35 while the mean score of the class was 54.83. After the students got a series of treatment of the peer feedback, the posttest result showed improvement. The maximum score was 88, the minimum score was 55 while the mean score was 72.38. It means that the posttest result was 17.55 points higher than the pretest result. Statistical analysis was also done to test the hypothesis testing. Based on the tests of assumption of homogeneity and normality testing, it showed that the data was homogeneous as well as normal so the parametric statistical analysis was used to analyze the data. The paired sample t-test was used in this test and it showed that the significant value obtained was lower than the level of significance of 0.05 (0.000<0.05).
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Abstract: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengevaluasi keefektifan dari peer feedback pada kemampuan mahasiswa dalam menulis esai berbahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain pre-experimental dengan sample mahasiswa semester dua Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris yang memprogram mata kuliah Academic Reading and Writing. Sebuah pretest dilakukan sebelum mahasiswa memulai penggunaan peer feedback sebagai treatment penelitian sedangkan posttest dilakukan setelah semua proses treatment dengan peer feedback selesai dilakukan. Karena penelitian ini dilakukan dalam masa pandemi Covid 19, semua proses penelitian baik pretest, treatment maupun posttest dilakukan secara online. Hasil dari pretest menunjukkan bahwa kemampuan menulis mahasiswa cukup rendah. Skor maksimal yang mampu didapat adalah 75 dan skor minimalnya adalah 35. Sedangkan rata-rata kelas adalah 54.83. Setelah semua mahasiswa menyelesaikan semua treatment peer feedback, hasil posttest menunjukkan peningkatan. Skor maksimal yang mampu dicapai mahasiswa adalah 88, skor minimal 55 sedangkan rata-rata kelas yang dicapai adalah 72.38. Disini terlihat bahwa rata-rata kelas pada posstest lebih tingi 17.55 poin daripada rata-rata kelas pada pretest. Analisis secara statistic juga dilakukan untuk menguji hipotesis. Berdasarkan uji asumsi homogenitas dan normalitas, diketahui bahwa data yang didapat adalah homogen dan juga normal. Oleh sebab itu, statistik parametric digunakan untuk menganalisis data. Paired sample t-test digunakan untuk menguji hipotesis dan ditemukan bahwa nilai koefisien yang didapatkan lebih kecil dari taraf kesalahan 5% (0.000<0.05). Demikian dapat disimpulkan bahwa hipotesis null dapat ditolak sehingga kesimpulan dari penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa memiliki kemampuan lebih baik dalam menulis esai berbahasa Inggris setelah mendapatkan treatment peer feedback. Dengan kata lain, peer feedback memiliki keefektifan yang signifikan pada kemampuan mahasiswa dalam menulis esai berbahasa Inggris.
Therefore, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis was rejected. In the other words, it can be concluded that the students got better ability in writing English essays after experiencing the peer feedback. It means that the peer feedback has a significant effect on students’ ability to write English essays.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Language is one of very important things for people to have in the world, especially English. The mastering of English is very essential for everybody. According Alfan (2012:1), English is an international language because all people use it as communication language in many countries in the world. There are many kinds of language in the world. Therefore, people should have global language to communicate. Here, English is used to express the emotion, feelings, and idea when meeting their friends from other countries.

People who want to increase their knowledge and understand technology should master English. It can help them to learn the scientific books which are written in English. They also can operate computer, mobile phone, and all technology so they will get many information and knowledge. English is used to share the information such as news, culture, etc. We can see that English is very important for communication in the world.

English has four basic skills, that is, listening, writing, reading and speaking. People have to acquire the four skills to support the mastery of English. The English skills to be achieved are divided into two parts of language function, namely oral and written English as a means of communication. In this case, listening and speaking are oral language; reading and writing are written language. However, for the students, the written one is the most difficult skill of language. It is caused Indonesian people prefer speaking to writing.

One of the four skills above that plays an important role in English is writing skill. Jozsef (2001:5) states writing is a complex activity since it requires students’ comprehensive abilities such as mastering grammar, vocabulary and punctuation. Besides to write well, the students are expected to be able to present their ideas in the form of writing as means of communication. Writing is a form of communication to express the thinking or feeling through writing after speaking. “The writing composition is a task which involves the students in manipulating words in grammatically correct sentence from a piece of continuous writing which successfully communicate the contents through any ideas on a certain topic” Heaton (1988). However, writing is not only delivering ideas to others but also share their thoughts when they are in the process of writing, they are thinking the ideas, preparing the outline, transferring the outline into
draft, editing and revising the draft, and finally proofreading the draft to prepare for the final outcome.

Feedback is the part of an Assessment for Learning Task. It is to provide feedback to both the teacher and learner regarding the learner's progress towards achieving the learning objective. Peer-feedback is a process assessment by student. Students give review of writing products other students who are in the same level. Peer assessment can be used to assist students in developing the ability to cooperate, criticized the process and the results of other people learning (formative assessment), receive feedback or criticism from others, provide insight to students about the criteria used to assess the processes and outcomes of learning and for summative assessment. Brown (2004) states, “The advantages peer assessment, namely, to encourage students to have a sense of responsibility for the learning process so that students can independently, training evaluation is useful skills for long learning and encourage deep learning”. Peer assessment process is begun with discussing the items and criteria for assessment by teacher and students. Then each student assess their friends who have been appointed and also provide feedback.

Based on the reasons above, the writer intended to conduct a research on the effectiveness of peer feedback on students’ ability to write English essays.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research was intended to find out the effectiveness of peer feedback on students' ability to write English essay. Due to the objective, a pre experimental research is carried out. Ary, et al. (2010) stated that pre experimental research is appropriate to test a new technique. Further, a pre experimental research was chosen since there was only one group who became the sample of this study, that is, the experimental group. Nunan (1992) stated that pre experimental research is an experimental research that lacks of control group. Furthermore, this research is carried in school setting in which it is difficult to assign the group randomly. In school setting, the classes have been established in the beginning of academic year. Since it is not feasible to choose the group randomly, pre experimental research can be carried out (Ross and Morison, 2005).

There are some types of pre experimental research. This research used one group pretest-posttest design. This can be illustrated as follow:
This design involves three steps; pretest, giving treatment and posttest (Ary, et al., 2010). Further, the differences before and after the treatment given will be measured by comparing the pretest and posttest score.

This research was conducted in English Department Universtias Bhinneka PGRI. The population is the students of English Department while the sample of this research was the second semester students of English Department who were officially registered in the Academic Reading and Writing course. There were 29 students who became the sample of this study and they were assigned as the experimental group. Here, the researcher did not use random sampling technique since the class had been established in the beginning of the semester. Instead, the researcher directly took whole class as the sample of this study.

Further, this research was started by choosing the sample of this study who then become the experimental group. After the experimental group had been established, the next thing to be done was preparing the research instrument as well as the procedure in giving treatment. Further, the research began by administering pretest to know students writing ability before they were given the treatment. After a pretest was administered, the treatment began. After given treatment, later, the researcher conducted a posttest. Posttest was done to know the effect of the treatment of peer feedback on students’ ability to write English essays. To know the effectiveness of peer feedback on students’ ability to write English essays, the mean score of the pretest compared to the mean score of the posttest.

In designing and developing a test to assess students’ skill and knowledge, it is important to make that the test is valid. It means that the test is aimed to measure what it has to measure. In the other words, the test provides true measurement of the particular skill which is intended to measure (Heaton, 1988). However, validity is something abstract. Therefore, it can be merely predicted through providing validity evidence (Latief, 2001).

The instruments in this research had construct and content validity. The construct validity was shown through the writing test. Since the test is aimed to measure students’ writing ability, the students were asked to write an essay in English consisting of 500 words. While the content validity, in the Academic Reading and Writing course the students learnt about English essay, the test of writing was on writing English essay.

Table 1. The One Group Pretest-Posttest Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing test</td>
<td>Peer feedback</td>
<td>Writing test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the pretest as well as posttest administered, the next to do is analyzed the data. Here, the result of the writing will be scored for further being analyzed using statistical analysis with SPSS IBM 23. First, the primary data deals with writing ability analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis. It was conducted to see minimum score, maximum score, mean, median, mode and standard deviation. This convenient way of summarizing data is called central tendency measurement (Ary, et al., 2010). Further, the data was presented in the graphic forms so that it is easier to be described.

After being analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis, the primary is analyzed using inferential statistical analysis. However, test of assumptions should be done first to choose what statistical analysis that can be used. Test of homogeneity and normality should be conducted to determine whether parametric or non-parametric statistical analysis that can be used. The fulfillment of the two test means that the researcher can use parametric statistics. Unless, non-parametric statistics should be used if the tests of assumption are not fulfilled (Peers, 1996).

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Findings**

The data in this research was taken during pandemic Covid-19. Therefore, both pretest and posttest of writing were done from home and submitted online through WhatsApp group who consisted of all of the members of the class. There were 29 students who joined the Academic Reading and Writing in which the research was conducted. The result of the pretest and posttest were as follows:

a. The Result of the Writing Test

The score obtained from the pretest was one of the main data in this research. The test was administered before the students got treatment of peer feedback while the posttest was administered after the students finished the treatment of peer feedback. Table 2 showed the summary of the pretest and the posttest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54.83</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that among 29 students, the maximum of the pretest which can be obtained was 75 while the minimum score was 35. In the pretest, the mean score was 54.83. It means that there were students who have lower score than the average score of the class. In table 3.1, it is also shown that among 29 students who took the posttest, the
maximum score was 88 and the minimum score was 55. Moreover, the mean score of the posttest was 72.38. Still, there were students who scored lower than the average score of the class.

Furthermore, from table 2 we can see that there are some differences on mean score of the pretest and the posttest. The mean score of the posttest was 17.55 points higher than the mean score of the pretest. The differences can be seen in Figure 1.

b. The Tests of Assumption

Before conducting the hypothesis testing, it is important to conduct the tests of assumption so that the researcher can choose the statistical test to be used to analyze the hypothesis. It is important to know whether parametric statistics or non parametric statistics that should be used. There are two kinds of assumption test which are conducted, that is, normality testing and homogeneity testing. If these assumptions were fulfilled, then a parametric statistics was used to test the hypotheses. If these assumptions were not fulfilled, then a non-parametric statistics was used to test the hypothesis.

1. The normality testing

The data was normally distributed if the significant value obtained was greater than the level of significance 0.05. Table 3. demonstrates the result of Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests using IBM SPSS Statistics.
Table 3. Normality Testing
Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING TEST</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

From Table 3, it can be seen that the result of normality testing shows that the significant value of both groups (pretest and posttest) were greater than the level of significance 0.05. It means that the data was normally distributed.

2. Homogeneity Testing

The data was homogeneous if the significant value obtained from the testing was greater than the level of significance of 0.05. Table 4 shows the result of homogeneity testing.

Table 4. Homogeneity Testing
Test of Homogeneity of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRITING TEST</th>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the significant value obtained from the homogeneity testing was greater than the level of significance of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data was homogeneous.

To summarize, based on the result of the normality testing and the homogeneity testing, it can be known that the data gotten from the pretest and posttest were normally distributed and homogeneous. Therefore, it can be concluded that statistical analysis used to test the hypothesis was parametric statistical analysis.

c. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing in this research was based on the fulfilment of the test assumptions of normality and homogeneity testing. Since the two tests showed that the data were normally distributed as well as homogeneous, the hypothesis testing was done using parametric test.

Here, the paired sample t-test was used to test the hypothesis. Cronk (2008) stated that paired sample t-test is suitable to test related samples of pretest and posttest. The result of the paired sample t-test can be seen in Table 5.
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Table 5. The Result of Pair Sample T-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mea Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>PRETES T- POSTTEST</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the data from the pretest and posttest was analyzed using the paired sample t-test, the next thing to be done is test the hypothesis.

Ha = The students have better writing ability after experiencing peer feedback
Ho = The students do not have better writing ability after experiencing peer feedback.

Ho would be accepted if the significant value is greater than the level of significant 0.05. From the data presented in Table 5, it can be seen that the significant value obtained was 0.00. It means, it was lower than the level of significance 0.05. In the other, it can be concluded that the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, the students have better writing ability after experiencing peer feedback.

Discussion

This research was aimed at investigating the effectiveness of peer feedback on students’ writing ability. There were two variables in this research, the independent variable and dependent variable. The independent variable in this research was the peer feedback while the dependent variable was students’ writing ability.

The research findings in this research was got from the data which were taken from the pretest and posttest. The pretest was administered before the treatment of peer feedback. The result of the posttest show that there were 29 students who joined as the sample of this research. From the pretest, it can be seen that the mean score of the pretest was low, that is, 54.83. The maximum score of the pretest was 75 while the minimum score was 35.

Further, the posttest was conducted after the students finished all of the treatment of peer feedback. The posttest was also joined by 29 students. From the posttest, it can be seen that the mean score of the posttest had improved compare to the pretest. The
mean score was 72.38. The maximum score of the posttest was 88 while the minimum score was 55.

In the pretest and posttest, it can be seen that there were score differences between those two tests. The mean score of the posttest was 17.55 points higher than the pretest. It can be one factor of the rejection of null hypothesis. In the other word, it can be seen very clearly that the students’ writing score after experiencing peer feedback were higher than the students’ writing score in the beginning of this study.

Further, based on the result of the hypothesis testing, it can be seen that the null hypothesis was rejected so that it can be concluded that the students have better writing ability after experiencing peer feedback. This findings was in line with the findings of (Muthoharoh & Anita, 2018) & (Patchan & Schunn, 2016). Both studies found that peer feedback has effectiveness on students’ writing ability. In (Muthoharoh & Anita, 2018), it was found that the students who experienced peer feedback during their writing class had better writing score than those who did not experienced peer feedback. However, in this study, the researcher did not compare the result of students' writing test to the students who did not experience peer feedback because the researcher aimed at investigating the effectiveness of peer feedback on writing ability before and after it became the treatment to be experienced by the students.

In this study, the peer feedback was done by the students online because it was conducted during the learning from home due to the pandemic of Covid-19. However, although it was done online, the researcher still believes that the peer feedback is really effective in helping the students to improve their writing ability. Sometimes, students are easier in getting comment and suggestion from their friends rather than the teacher. In addition, by experiencing peer feedback, students can improve their learning through social sharing and interaction (Patchan & Schunn, 2016). Moreover, peer feedback usually gave students opportunities to learn from each other (Muthoharoh & Anita, 2018).

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions
This research was aimed at investigating the effectiveness of peer feedback on students' writing ability. Based on the research findings, it can be seen that the students’ score in the posttest were higher than the students’ score in the pretest. In the pretest, the mean score was 55.83 while in the posttest, the mean score was 72.38. So, the average score in the posttest was 17.55 points higher than the average score in the pretest.
Moreover, after conducting statistical analysis of paired sample t-test to test the hypothesis, it was found that the null hypothesis was rejected. It was happened because the significant value obtained from the paired sample t-test was 0.000 that is lower than the level of significance 0.05 (0.000< 0.05). Therefore, it can be concluded that the students have better ability in writing English essays after experiencing peer feedback during the writing class.

Although the peer feedback was done online because the class was conducted during the learning from home due to the pandemic of Covid-19, it still can be seen that peer feedback is effective in improving the students’ ability in writing English essays. It is proven by the improvement of the students’ score in the posttest which was higher than the students’ score in the pretest.

Suggestions
Some suggestions are to be offered in this research. Practically, peer feedback should benefit the teacher in teaching writing because by getting suggestion to the peer and vice versa, students can improve their ability and knowledge. Moreover, students can also accustomed to give feedback to others so it can improve their critical thinking. There, it is very suggested to the teacher to use peer feedback in his/her writing class.

While for the future researcher, it is suggested to conduct further research in the same field of peer feedback but deeper area. For example, it is suggested to find out the effectiveness of peer feedback across students with difference ability in writing.
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