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Abstract

The present study investigated the effects of oral peer feedback on students’ improvements in pronunciation skill and class situation. It is underpinned by a premise that peer feedback gives students chances to share evaluative comments with peers to improve pronunciation skill. The study took place in English Education Program of Galuh University, involving the subjects of 22 students. A three-cycle CAR study was intended to discover how oral peer feedback can improve students’ pronunciation skill. This problem was then broken down into five more specific sub-questions. To get the data, achievement tests, classroom observation, interview, and questionnaire were conducted and administered. Data from test were analyzed quantitatively by calculating the mean scores. Meanwhile data from observation, questionnaire, and interview were analyzed qualitatively by reducing and transforming data, displaying data, and drawing conclusion. The results showed that students became more active as the cycle progressed. They practiced dialogues in pairs, taking turns giving feedback to each other when mistakes were noticed. Corrective feedback was used to correct the errors made by their peers. This activity finally led to the improvement in the pronunciation skills. Oral peer feedback not only gave positive impact, but was also received positive responses from the pupils. Peer feedback motivated them to have better pronunciation, and they became more focused on practicing pronunciation because the teacher did not correct their mistakes directly. Playing a role as feedback providers made them more critical. Gradual improvements of students’ achievements were evident especially in the four features. Of the four pronunciation features taught, minimal pair sound and word stress were the most easily increased features. Meanwhile, the most difficult ones were linking sound and intonation. During the provision of oral peer feedback, teacher must play roles as teacher, controller, and sometimes a feedback provider because some students felt unsure with their own feedback.
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INTRODUCTION

To be able to communicate in English, students are required to master all the language skills and its elements. One of the English elements that is important and needs more attention to be improved is pronunciation. Since English is a language that has no consistency between the written codes and its saying, it is necessary for English students to recognize English pronunciation which is mainly focused on sounds, word stress, phrase stress, sentence stress, connected speech, and intonation.

In Pronunciation Practice I syllabus (English Education Program Syllabus, 2012), students are expected to recognize individual sounds or groups of sounds, weak and strong forms, intonation, and word linking. In dealing with intonation, students are also required to practice and to be well-trained to use different types of intonation, word stress, phrase stress, and sentence stress (intonation). Students are also required to practice everyday English in which meaning is normally understood, though its
pronunciation is often difficult, for example in saying names of a country, saying fractions, temperature, etc.

Ideally, the first grade students have to be able: (1) to pronounce the different sounds of minimal pairs in sentences; (2) to use the pronunciation features (e.g. word stress and phrase stress) in English to communicate with others, both in their daily conversation and in academic situation; (3) to pronounce the linking in words and sentences; and (4) to pronounce correct intonation in the sentences to show different type of expressions.

Regarding the purposes of the present study, a preliminary study consisting of pre-observation, pre-questionnaire and pre-test was conducted before the action research was implemented. Firstly, pre-observation was conducted to know the situation and condition of pronunciation practice class in class 1E, the research site. This pre-observation was carried out during the teaching-learning process. Through this observation, the writer (the teacher as researcher) found some problems encountered in the classroom atmosphere.

In the initial observation, the teacher taught pronunciation with the commonly used methods, namely lecturing and practicing. In the lectures, she explained the concepts related to aspects of pronunciation rules that would be practiced. Meanwhile, the practice was used to train students' pronunciation of the words being studied. In the learning process, not all students attended the lessons; there were also still many students who did not pay attention to the teacher’s explanation. Many of them still talked with their friends while some others practiced the pronunciation less-seriously.

From the pre-questionnaire, it can be drawn that almost all students sometimes faced difficulties to pronounce different sounds between two minimal pair. In the second statement, most students also sometimes found difficulties in pronouncing words with different sounds in sentences. In addition, some students often felt that they did not know how to pronounce stressed syllable in words and sentences. Some other students also sometimes experienced it. There was even one student who completely did not know how to practice intonation for different expressions. Further data also indicated that many students sometimes had found difficulties in practicing linking word in sentences and to practice intonation for different expressions. From those indications, it can be concluded that there were still many students who found difficulties in studying some aspects of pronunciation.

The next initial investigation was focused on the role of teachers in the learning process. For example, it can be seen that 27% of students were sometimes still afraid of practicing pronunciation because of the teacher's feedback or comments. In addition, some students felt that the teacher did not activate all students when the class was passive. Meanwhile, more than half of the students found that they could not focus on practicing their pronunciation because the teacher discussed not only the material, but also grammar and vocabulary. However, a small number of students sometimes lacked focus when the teacher discussed other aspects of learning pronunciation. 27% of the students thought that the teacher sometimes did not monitor all students when they practiced pronunciation. A very striking fact indicated that almost 50% of students felt neglected when the teacher explained all the time in the class. This means that students wanted a more pleasant teaching method rather than attending courses by lecturing. Other findings indicate that the teacher talked more in class than students did. Almost all the students were afraid of making mistakes because of their poor pronunciation. Moreover, most students felt that their friends had not paid attention to their performance. Other constraint experienced by the students is that they sometimes lacked motivation because of limited feedback given by their friends. Data from the questionnaire is also confirmed by data from the interview to examine more deeply about the students' knowledge in
Every aspect of pronunciation practice. Data from the interview indicated that students found difficulties in practicing linking sounds, word linking, and intonation.

Meanwhile, data from pre-test shows that the highest score for the overall aspects only reaches 28, it means that the average score was only 7. Meanwhile, the lowest score is 22 which is the average only reached 5.5. This score is still very low and did not reach the passing grade. To sum up, students' pronunciation needs to be improved.

In dealing with the students' problems in pronunciation, then writer tried to choose oral peer feedback as the solution to overcome them. As already known by some researchers, peer feedback or peer review can be used in improving English skills and elements including pronunciation. Peer feedback gives positive contribution to students in improving their pronunciation. This effect is not only for the students as the speakers, but also for the other students as the listeners and the reviewers. As the speakers, students can be more careful in pronouncing some words related to the topic.

The target of using oral peer-feedback is to make students aware of their competence in spoken language, in this case pronunciation. Oral peer feedback can provide students with some correction and feedback for making their spoken English better. Feedback from their friends can become a challenge for their further presentation.

The Features of Pronunciation

Pronunciation involves two distinctive features at the segmental (micro) level and the supra-segmental (macro) level. The first level, segmental level is the major focus for pronunciation teaching (for example, minimal pairs such as *fill*/feel). While these features are important, recent research has shown that when teaching focuses on supra segmental features, learners' intelligibility is greatly enhanced. It is important, therefore, to provide activities at both levels (Burns, 2003: 6). Burns (2003: 7) describes the features of pronunciation as follows:

1. Suprasegmental features

Suprasegmental features relate to sounds at the macro level. Advances in research have developed descriptions of the suprasegmental features of speech extending across whole stretches of language (prosody). Linking, intonation and stress are important features for effective pronunciation at the suprasegmental level.

1) Linking

Linking refers to the way the last sound of one word is joined to the first sound of the next word. To produce connected speech, we run words together to link consonant to vowel, consonant to consonant, and vowel to vowel. We also shorten some sounds and leave others out altogether.

2) Intonation

Intonation can be defined as the melody of the language (Burns, 2003: 7), or the music of the voice (Cunningham, 1991: xi) – the way the voice goes up and down according to the context and meanings of the communication.

3) Word stress

Word stress relates to the prominence given to certain words in an utterance. These focus words are stressed (made long and loud) to convey:

2. Segmental features

Segmental features relate to sounds at the micro level. They include specific sounds within words (for example, *l* as in lamp, *r* as in ramp, *a* as in hat). The sound systems of consonants, vowels or their combinations are called phonemes. Phonemes are sounds that, when pronounced incorrectly, can change the meaning of the word (Burns, 2003: 6).
Consonant sounds can be voiced (a part of the mouth is closed and the air behind it is released suddenly—for example, v as in van, b as in bun) or unvoiced (air is pushed through a narrow part of the mouth—for example, f as in fun, th as in thin). Vowels sounds are articulated as single sounds. They can be short (for example, æ as in cat) or long (a: as in cart). Diphthongs are two vowel sounds put together (for example, ei as in Kate or as in boy).

In line with Burns, Florez (1998: 2) differentiates aspects of pronunciation. She explains two groups of features are involved in pronunciation: segmental (vowels and consonants) and suprasegmentals (stress, rhythm, adjustments in connected speech, prominence and intonation).

The segmental features cover the learners’ ability in differentiating sounds, pronouncing vowel and consonant sounds and also the diphthong, whereas the suprasegmental features cover the learners’ ability in making the linking words, using correct intonation in the sentences, and word stressing in sentences. In this research, the indicators of pronunciation are as follows:

1) Students are able to pronounce the vowel sounds, consonant sounds, and diphthongs correctly, in this case, they are able to differentiate the sounds;
2) Students are also able to recognize stressing in word, whether it is in the first, second, third or fourth syllable;
3) Students are able to pronounce word linking in sentences;
4) Students are also able to pronounce the correct intonation in sentences, whether its intonation go up (rising) or go down (falling).

Oral Peer Feedback
Łęska as cited in Grombczewska (2010) provides the definition of feedback: “It is information concerning the comprehension and reception of the speaker’s message given by the listener.” On the basis of this definition writer assumes that feedback is the information given back to the speaker during a conversation. Everything that students perform and give some response to the speaker can be considered as feedback. There are many different ways of providing classroom feedback. It can be provided in verbal and non-verbal form. Verbal feedback can be expressed by positive or negative comments and corrections. Non-verbal is shown by, for example, gestures or facial expressions. Harmer (2003: 144) views that feedback as correction or assessment that can come from teacher and students. The correction or assessment can be in form of written or spoken.

In addition, Kepner (1991: 141) as cited in Grami (2005: 3) defines feedback in general as any procedures used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong. To support this view, Yang (in Zeng, 2006) defines peer feedback as feedback given by peer. It can be in written form or spoken/oral form. Feedback can be a critic, suggestion or even correction from their peer, in this research is oral feedback from peer to peer’s work or performance.

To sum up, it can be concluded that oral peer feedback is a kind of assessment or correction, given by peer or students toward their peer’s work or performance in spoken or oral form. In this research, the form of peer feedback is given by students to another orally in pronunciation practice.

Teaching Steps in Giving Oral Peer Feedback
This research adapted the steps of conducting peer feedback from Bitchener, et al. (2005: 6) as follows:
1. Students take their pronunciation practices sheet and work in pair.
2. Every pair reads the dialogue on their seats. His or her peer listens to their peer’s practice. By having the feedback sheets first, he or she has the opportunity to correct her or his peer’s errors and make the correction in written form.
3. Each performance is begun by asking the student practice the dialogue in front of the class.
4. When student make an error in pronouncing words, his or her peer gives corrective feedback orally in order they pronounce the correct sounds.
5. After all the performances, then writer draws particular attention to errors that were made in the indicators of sounds discrimination, word stress, word linking and intonation.
6. At the end of the performance, all four targeted indicators of error are discussed (if errors made in these categories) as teacher’s confirmation on the students’ work.

The Advantages of Oral Peer Feedback

The use of oral peer feedback in teaching pronunciation offers a number of advantages including: increasing the timeliness of feedback, providing new learning opportunities for both givers and receivers of feedback, humanizing the environment, and building community (Corgan, Hammer, Margolies, & Crossley, 2004).

By asking students to provide constructive feedback to each other, teacher invites them to participate in each other’s learning and thus achieve greater understanding and appreciation for their peers’ experiences and perspectives. Moreover, by engaging students in the feedback process, meaningful interaction increases—interaction with peers and interaction with the content of the discussion or presentation—which subsequently promotes students’ satisfaction with the course (Richardson & Swan, 2003) and with the instructor (Fulford & Zhang, 1998). If used effectively, both teacher and peer feedback have the potential to increase the quality of students speaking skill, and thus the quality of teaching learning process. Thus, feedback can raise self-esteem, encourage dialogue, clarify goals and standards, and empower students to improve their own learning (Dawson, Magne and Sentito, 2009).

In addition to the benefits of receiving adequate feedback, students may also benefit from giving peer feedback. Liu, et al. (2001) propose that when asked to offer feedback to peers, students progress beyond the cognitive processes required for completing a given task, as they must now "read, compare, or question ideas, suggest modifications, or even reflect on how well one's own work is compared with others". McConnell (2002) also suggests that collaborative assessment moves students away from dependence on instructors as the only, or major, source of judgment about the quality of learning to a "more autonomous and independent situation where each individual develops the experience, know-how, and skills to assess their own learning".

Review of Relevant Studies

Similar research was undertaken by some researches. Ertmer, et al. (2007) did “An Exploratory Study on Using Peer Feedback to Enhance the Quality of Student Online Postings.” This study investigated the impact of peer feedback used as an instructional strategy to increase the quality of students' online postings. Results suggest that the quality of students' postings was maintained through the use of peer feedback despite students’ preferences for instructor feedback.
Ware, et al. (2008: 1) did the relevant research on using peer feedback in language form of telecollaboration. They investigated specifically how and when postsecondary learners of English and Spanish provide corrective feedback on their partners’ use of the target language in weekly asynchronous discussions by assigning them to one of two conditions: e-tutoring, in which students were asked to provide peer feedback on any linguistic form they perceived as incorrect; and e-partnering, in which students were not required to provide peer feedback but could do so on their own initiative. The findings indicate that students in both conditions preferred an inclusion of feedback on form as part of their exchange, but such feedback only occurred when explicitly required in the e-tutoring condition. Pedagogical implications include the need to situate peer feedback on form within current models of telecollaboration and to assist students in using feedback strategies such as reformulations, which do not rely on a deep understanding of the target or native language grammar.

In another studies, Lin (2009) did “An Investigation into Effectiveness of Peer Feedback”. He focuses his study on investigating effectiveness of peer feedback from communal, cognitive, cooperative and pedagogical perspectives. The results of this study revealed that most participants believed that peer feedback positively assisted their learning in English writing.

Regarding to some researches above, most of researchers focused their studies on the use of peer feedback in speaking and writing class. Then writer differentiates her study in improving students’ pronunciation by using oral peer feedback. It is an action research to 22 students in a class of the first grade English students in Galuh University.

As already noted, teaching and assessing pronunciation can be done in various ways, one of the ways is using oral peer feedback. There are some reasons why I used oral peer feedback to improve students’ pronunciation. Firstly, oral peer feedback can help students to be confident in pronouncing the words because the assessor is their peer. In this case, students’ pronunciation in differentiating minimal pairs of sounds will be better because they prepare themselves with the feedback to their own work, and they are brave enough to practice because they are not monitored by teacher. Secondly, students will be able to recognize their peers’ error and automatically to correct it orally. Giving oral peer feedback will improve students’ pronunciation in making word stressing. Since they correct their peer orally, it will make them aware of avoiding the mistakes in their pronunciation. Then, through oral peer feedback, students will also improve their attention toward their own works. It helps students pay great attention towards their peer’s work. Furthermore, their confidence will increase rapidly because they have chance to evaluate and correct their pronunciation themselves before the practice is begun. I designed the research based on the following questions:

1) How do I use oral peer feedback to improve my students’ pronunciation skill in class 1E of English Department in Galuh University?
   a. How is oral peer feedback implemented by the students in order to improve their peers’ pronunciation skill?
   b. How intensive is oral peer feedback given by the students so that their peers’ pronunciation skill can be increased?
   c. How do the students respond towards oral peer feedback given by their peers?
   d. Among all pronunciation features, which one is the easiest and which one is the hardest to improve by means of oral peer feedback?
   e. What are my roles during the implementation of oral peer feedback to improve students' pronunciation skill?
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METHOD
The present study followed the classroom action research traditions. It promotes broad participation in the research process and supports action Kemmis and McTaggart (1988) as cited in Burns (2010: 8), action research typically involves four broad phases in a cycle of research. Data collection included test, questionnaires, interview, and observation.

The first grade students of English Program in Galuh University in Ciamis participated in the study. There were five classes, consisting of about 120 students. I only chose one class as a subject of the study, class E that consisted 22 students. This class is chosen purposively because it is the most complicated class in which the ranges of their achievements were strictly various, from the worst to the best.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Findings
Regarding the way students conducted the oral peer feedback, based on the observation, we found that students have been able to practice giving feedback in pairs. Besides, confirmation from the teacher encouraged them to have self confidence in practice class. Then, the provision of feedback has also been quite frequent in the last cycle. It was because Oral feedback creates challenging and active class because every student has their chance to practice. This intensive practice was also due to enough chance given by me to practice pronunciation with their friends.

In relation to the students’ responses towards feedback given by their peers, this last cycle showed that all students responded positively. They accepted the feedback from their peers; I also found that all students have been able to provide corrective feedback well. Several responses taken from the questionnaire can be seen below:
- Feedback from my peer motivates me to have better pronunciation.
- I can be more focus to practice my pronunciation because my teacher did not correct my mistakes directly.
- My friends give more attention to my performance because she/he has to give me feedback and so do I.
- I became more critical after learning pronunciation by using oral peer feedback.

From the overall sessions of observation in the last cycle, I conclude that all features are now not quite difficult to master. Surprisingly, the features that once were regarded difficult are no longer a hard thing to do. Based on the students’ answers from questionnaire items, all students got better understanding in all pronunciation features. In the meantime, during the provision of oral peer feedback, I reduced my role as a feedback provider. It was because my students have become more critical and knowledgeable about the subjects being discussed. However, of course I still taught and controlled the activity.

The study also proved that the use of peer feedback gave significant effects to students’ better improvements in pronunciation. The three cycles of the planned and designed treatment indicate gradual pronunciation improvements. The following table explains the comparative achievements of student pronunciation test of each cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>The Improvement of Pronunciation Score in Cycle 1, 2, 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation indicators</td>
<td>Cycle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal pair of sounds</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary and primary stress</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking sound</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion

Peer feedback activities are process-based collaborative improvements that can enable the students to get involved in self-generated and developed practice under the control of teacher (see Morley, 1991). The problematic barriers in teaching pronunciation with such conditions as students’ lack of practice and low motivation, less conducive classroom, and big size class, can be encountered by peer feedback since it can help stimulate each student in small groups (peer) to freely and collaboratively give evaluative comments to their peers’ ways of pronouncing English words/expressions properly.

The treatment in cycle 1 indicated the teacher’s endeavors to introduce the new strategies of using oral peer feedback so as to overcome the identified problems faced by the students and less productive and conducive classroom situations. Integrated and varied task-giving strategies seemed to be significantly helpful and fruitful, though there were still some problems in students’ mastery in certain aspects such as linking sounds and less conducive and cooperative classroom that was caused by high achievers’ class domination.

In cycle 1, to make sure that peer feedback was applicable and feasible, students’ familiarity with the concept of oral peer feedback needed enhancing. Therefore, writer firstly explained about the definition of oral feedback and peer feedback, the aspects, as well as the procedures of implementation. Throughout the comprehensively and systematically proposed and planned cyclic procedures of teaching by means of peer feedback, the gradual improvements of students’ pronunciation have been clearly exposed. Cycle 2 promoted the students’ better achievements in pronunciation and cooperative classroom interaction and atmosphere that led to increasing achieved betterments in cycle 3.

More specifically, in connection with the aforementioned research questions, this study found several worth-noting findings. First, the implementation of oral peer feedback reveals almost similar findings from the first until the last cycle. In the first cycle, due to the unfamiliarity of oral feedback, many students seemed uneasy in implementing the activity. They are used to getting teacher feedback in the previous lessons. In other words, a teacher-centered activity is quite common for them in teaching pronunciation. It was also noticed that in the first session of cycle 1, some pairs only used non-verbal communication during the observation; they frequently showed facial expressions that looked a little different when their friends made mistakes in pronunciation. Consequently, students did not understand their roles as feedback providers. However, the students became more active as the cycle progressed. They practiced a dialogue in pairs, taking turns giving feedback to each other when mistakes were noticed. Some pairs were sometimes confused with their feedback, so that I tried to give some clarifications. Most of the times, students tended to give corrective feedback directly to correct the errors made by their peers (AbuSeileek & Abualsha’r, 2012:76).

The provision of oral peer feedback has undergone some changes in terms of its frequency. In the very beginning of the first cycle, students got limited time to practice giving feedback. It was because they needed to understand first about what oral peer feedback is and how to implement it. In the subsequent sessions, the activity was more intensive, although some students tended to be dominant feedback providers. As a teacher, I realized that students must be given ample chances to practice giving oral feedback. To this end, I gave them more opportunities to practice in the classroom. It has fulfilled a requirement that “feedback should be sufficient in frequency” (Gielen, et.al., 2010:304).
Students’ responses towards oral peer feedback given by their peers are also necessary to discover. In this case, the observer and I noticed a gradual change from the cycles. At first, all students felt quite strange with the activity. Many of them showed disbelief towards the feedback given. They also preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback. However, since students’ knowledge of correct pronunciation also increased throughout the cycles, and they also began to know more about oral peer feedback, they finally gave positive responses. They accepted the feedback from their peers and they also tried hard to give feedback to their peers. They claimed that peer feedback motivated them to have better pronunciation. They also asserted that they became more focused on practicing pronunciation because the teacher did not correct their mistakes directly. In other words, the students no longer felt strange about the feedback given. They now used to getting feedback from friends. When they played a role as feedback providers, they also responded that this role made them more critical because they had to give oral feedback to their peers. This fact is in line with Janssen and Fernandes’ statement (2012:1) that “providing peer feedback is an activity that does not only support the receiver of the feedback in his or her learning process, it is also useful for those who provide feedback, as they have to critically analyze the work or performance of colleagues.”

From the four features applied during oral peer feedback, the results showed that minimal pair sound and word stress were the most easily increased feature through oral peer feedback. Meanwhile, the most difficult ones were linking sound and intonation. It was due to the fact that EFL learners do not usually consider the use of linking sound and intonation in speaking English. Even worse, minimal exposure to the target language and contact with native speakers could also be the causes (Gilakjani, 2012:124). Surprisingly, the features that once were regarded difficult are no longer a hard thing to do in the last cycle. All students always and often got better understanding in all pronunciation features.

Finally, during the provision of oral peer feedback, I played my roles as teacher and controller. I taught my students the pronunciation concept, I directed them to give oral feedback appropriately, and I controlled the activities of oral peer feedback. Sometimes, especially in the first cycle, I also became feedback provider. I gave feedback to some students who felt unsure with their own feedback. If students were let alone in giving feedback, I was afraid of the possibility of giving incorrect feedback. It is because “not all feedback leads to performance improvement” (Gielen, et.al., 2010:304). In the next two cycles, I reduced my role as a feedback provider. It was because my students have become more critical and knowledgeable about the subjects being discussed. However, of course I still taught and controlled the activity.

Peer feedback basically offers empowering process of students’ active roles, which is student-centered. The less powerful position of teacher can decrease students’ anxiety and other psychological barriers. The more empowering to students’ roles, the more the students feel secure and free in ‘enjoying’ the lesson/subject. The students’ active role in assessing their own improvements in learning leads to their higher language awareness.

In pronunciation class, students deserve sufficient moments to try to practice with their peers and at the time self-regulate themselves to learn and evaluate what they themselves have achieved. The indication of the effect of peer feedback at the research site to the classroom betterments was obvious. The evidences covered students’ bravery to try to do, and the chemistry of communicative relations in giving comments on their pronunciation practices among them.
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After being treated by peer feedback, the changes of continuous improvements in classroom atmospheres reflected the least (that indicated students’ low motivation and reluctance) to the most (that showed cooperative classroom).

The problematic approach to teaching pronunciation to the students at the research site has to do with the condition of big size class. It was difficult for me to proportionally and optimally pay attention to each student’s individual improvement. Peer feedback treatment has helped the writer get alternative solutions. Each student gradually got chances to share their evaluative inputs with their peers, and they deserved more rooms to have practices and non-threatening (self) evaluations.

The use of peer feedback in teaching pronunciation can pedagogically cater for each student’s different needs and growths in mastering the required skills. It is so because peer with their close relationship have less power in terms of their position in academic authority. Socially speaking, peer feedback techniques can enable the members of the classroom to strengthen their social relationship in- and out of the classroom.

Yet, peer feedback is time consuming, and needs careful planning in terms of strategies in making groups or certain pairs of collaborative works. Other pitfalls may be concerned with the domination of high level (or clever) achievers in classroom practice and evaluations that discourage the lower ones.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The findings of the present study, generated from a classroom action research, revealed that the use of oral peer feedback in teaching pronunciation can overcome students’ problems in mastering pronunciation aspects/elements as well as less conducive classroom atmosphere. More specifically, throughout the cyclic programs, the significant beneficial effects of the use of peer feedback on the improvements of teaching pronunciation include such points as pronunciation of minimal pairs, word stress, linking sounds, and intonation.

In addition, the more conducive classroom atmosphere suggested such following indicators as democratic classroom, non-threatening classroom interaction (among students, and between teacher and students), students’ self-confidence and high motivation in trying to express ideas, and student empowerment.

The present study is actually limited to the time allotment in giving the treatment, sophisticated technology, and the writer’s (the teacher as researcher) subjective perspectives in some cases. Therefore, the further study is suggested to focus more on longer time of giving treatment, the use of high technology (internet-based teaching, for example), and the influence of gender on the results of the study.
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