CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of The Study

Students are expected to learn academic and professional information and skills. Writing and presenting skills are important talents that students learn during their higher education. While students can gain knowledge by studying textbooks, attending lectures, and passing tests, skill development requires a different approach. Practice is a key component of skill development. It is critical to investigate strategies for facilitating students' skill development.

To help students improve their skills, it is critical to provide feedback while they practice. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback should serve three purposes: informing students about their progress toward course goals (referred to as feed-up), evaluating their current performance (referred to as feed-back), and providing guidance on the necessary steps to improve their performance and achieve their goals. Several academics have investigated the aspects that lead to feedback effectiveness (Hattie and Timperley 2007; Shute 2008), highlighting the importance of feedback that focuses on the task or process rather than the recipient's talents.

Feedback should be offered as soon as possible, allowing students to implement it or seek more assistance while it is still relevant. The content should be in line with the assignment's objectives and requirements. Furthermore, it should be consistent with the students' understanding of learning, knowledge, and the specific subject. Finally, it is critical to monitor and respond to comments.

Teachers and peers may both provide evaluations. Topping (1998) suggests that Vygotsky's idea of scaffolded learning (Vygotsky 1978) could be used in a peer feedback system to identify both strengths and weaknesses. The practice of peer feedback frequently provides students with input that is targeted to their own requirements, assisting them in digesting the feedback. Gikandi and Morrow (2016) claimed that peer feedback can help students with self-regulated learning and reflection. Welsh (2012) found that students value peer feedback just as much as tutor input. Admiraal (2014), on the other hand, stated that students prefer instructor feedback over peer feedback and are more likely to implement professor-made suggestions.

Peer feedback is offered by students with similar levels of authority and serves as an ongoing assessment, similar to input from teachers (Topping, 1998). It also facilitates cooperative learning (Van Gennip, Segers, & Tillema, 2010; Webb, 1991). In terms of judging progress, the primary distinction between teacher and peer assessment is that peers, unlike instructors, lack specific understanding in the subject matter. The accuracy of peer feedback varies correspondingly. Peer judgments or advise can range in accuracy, ranging from extremely precise to utterly incorrect, or even purposely deceptive. Furthermore, the person being evaluated generally does not regard the peer assessor as an authoritative authority in terms of expertise. This frequently results in an inability to acknowledge a colleague's judgment or advise.

Nonetheless, peer feedback may be advantageous to the process of information acquisition, partly because it differs from feedback provided by

instructors (Topping, 1998). The absence of a clear 'knowledge authority' (such as the instructor) changes the significance and impact of the input. Bangert-Drowns et al. (1991) contend that the instructional value of feedback is dependent on how effectively the recipient pays attention and thinks about it. They argue that the uncertainty produced by a peer's relative position can help with this. Yang, Badger, and Yu (2006) discovered that revising one's work based on feedback from peers was more successful than revising based on feedback from teachers, possibly because peer feedback induced a sense of uncertainty. Teacher input was recognized, but it resulted in perplexity and misinterpretations. Similarly, questions about the precision of peer feedback spurred discussions about its right interpretation. The students' uncertainty encouraged them to seek clarification by consulting instruction manuals, requesting assistance from the teacher, and/or engaging in additional self-corrections. As a result, students gained a more thorough comprehension of the subject matter. In contrast, teachers' input reduced the quantity of self-correction done by pupils. The students may have assumed that the teacher had previously addressed all difficulties and that no more adjustments were required (Yang et al., 2006).

Peer feedback not only enhances students' ability to receive information attentively, but it also increases the frequency, range, and timeliness of input while reducing instructor workload. Involving students in the assessment process expands the number of assessors and the variety of feedback options. Although the accuracy may be lower than feedback from professors, this trade-off can be

regarded acceptable in exchange for better monitoring of students' development (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004).

Projects in which students provide peer review on presentations also aim to improve students' presentation skills. For example, delivering peer feedback requires students to closely monitor their peers. Furthermore, the procedure of getting formative peer review mandates that students practice their presentations prior to being evaluated, as this type of feedback is typically offered during preliminary presentations. Patri (2002) demonstrated that students can evaluate their classmates' presentations at the same level of quality as instructors, if they are given a well-defined set of criteria.

Based on the foregoing, it is obvious that peer feedback is critical to both parties' skill growth. It also provides as a platform to examine lessons learnt and share them with feedback. The goal of this study is to determine whether students at SMK Telkom 1 Medan have successfully integrated and coordinated the peer feedback process. According to the presentation materials for the procedure text, approximately 20% of the students in the English class at SMK Telkom 1 Medan practiced accepting feedback from their classmates or peers. Although they were expected to provide constructive feedback to the presenter, their peer response included some jokes but no constructive feedback (negative peer feedback). Furthermore, the teacher maintained complete control, which encouraged students to comment on their colleagues' presentations. As a result of this initial observation, it is possible to conclude that the students of SMK Telkom 1 Medan do not have a comprehensive understanding of the concept of peer feedback.

Based on these issues, the researcher conducted this study to determine whether students use more negative peer feedback or if there are some variations in doing peer feedback.

1.2. Problems of The Study

Based on the background, there are two problems on this study:

1. What kinds of peer feedback used by the students in presentation performance at SMK Telkom 1 Medan?

2. How the teacher motivates students to give feedback to the presenter?

1.3. Objectives of The Study

In line with the problems of this study, the objectives of this study are:

1. To determine what kind of peer feedback used by the students in their presentation performance at SMK Telkom 1 Medan.

2. To find out the teacher's way to motivate students to give feedback to the presenter.

1.4. Scope of The Study

This research will be conducted to find out whether students at SMK Telkom 1 Medan conduct peer feedback in procedure text presentation material. The aspects considered in this study are whether students still need motivation from the teacher to be able to do peer feedback and what types of peer feedback do students use in giving feedback to friends who are presenting.

1.5. Significances of The Study

The researcher hopes that the results of this study can contribute to the practice of English language teaching and learning, the findings can be useful theoretically and practically as explained below:

1. Theoretically

   This study supports previous research that discusses the types of peer feedback used by students in English language learning, which is further narrowed down to presentation performance. The theoretical interest is further strengthened by the literature highlighting the types of peer feedback used by students and how teachers can motivate students to do peer feedback, emphasizing the steps teachers can take to motivate students in various roles such as counselor and facilitator. This research enhances the theoretical understanding of peer feedback as supporting students to understand more about the material being presented, highlighting whether students still need encouragement from teachers to do peer feedback.

2. Practically

This study is expected to be beneficial to these specific parties:

1. The teachers.

   The finding of this study can provide more information to teachers about the importance of students to do peer feedback and how the right steps to give understanding to students to do peer feedback.

2. The students.

    This study will provide an understanding of peer feedback and what are the benefits of doing peer feedback in presentation performance.

3. Future studies.

    This study can also be a reference for the future study for improving the use of peer feedback.