

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter explains about the conclusion of the whole research result and some suggestions related to this study.

5.1 Conclusion

From the research finding and the discussion above, there are some conclusions which can be taken:

1. Learners engaged with teacher written corrective feedback in 4 dimensions of engagement, including behavior, cognitive, social and affective (average of mean 3.94).
2. Learners engaged with peer written corrective feedback in 4 dimensions of engagement, including behavior, cognitive, social and affective (average of mean 3.42).
3. There was very strong positive correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability. It could be seen from the value of pearson correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and writing ability was 0.824 (very strong correlation) and sig. tailed was $0.000 < 0,05$ (significant correlation). It meant that the correlation between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability is important and real. So, learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback could be used as one of predictor factors of writing ability.
4. There was strong positive correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability. It could be seen from the value of pearson correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and writing ability was 0.645 (strong correlation) and sig. tailed was $0.000 < 0,05$ (significant correlation). It meant that the correlation between learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback and learners' writing ability is important and real. So, learners'

engagement with peer written corrective feedback could be used as one of predictor factors of writing ability.

5. There was significant difference between learners' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback and learners' engagement with peer written corrective feedback ($0.000 < 0.05$). It showed that the mean of learners' engagement with teacher WCF (35.5) was greater than the mean of learners' engagement with peer WCF (30.8). It indicated that students were more engaged and agree on the teacher WCF practice (mean 35.5) rather than peer WCF practice (mean 30.8) since teacher WCF had a bigger positive impact for learners' writing rather than peer WCF did.
6. The way learners engage with teacher WCF in behavior was by reading and revising their writing based on teacher WCF. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in behavior by using peer WCF as sole reference to revise their writing draft.
7. The way learners engage with teacher WCF in cognitive was by reading, thinking and understanding well about their errors in writing. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in cognitive by understanding their errors and thinking of revision based on peer written corrective feedback.
8. The way learners engage with teacher WCF in social was by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of teacher WCF. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in social by interacting with their teacher and classmates in the form of asking and discussing about the content of peer written corrective feedback.
9. The way learners engage with teacher WCF in affective was by feeling happy toward teacher WCF, because they believed that teacher WCF helped them to know about their errors. Meanwhile, related to peer WCF, learners engage in affective by feeling happy, enthusiastic, and interested in receiving and reading peer WCF.

5.2 Suggestion

1. Considering the importance of learners' engagement with both teacher and peer written corrective feedback in improving learners' writing ability, so the teacher may motivate and encourage learners' to become highly engagement learners with teacher and peer written corrective feedback by proposing good learning activities.
2. This research can be used as information, model, or reference to be developed for further studies, the researcher hopes that other researchers may evaluate, revise, reconstruct, or modify this study and write further studies for other levels and objectives

