PAIRING IN PEER REVIEW TECHNIQUE ACCORDING TO STUDENTS' PROFICIENCY LEVELS ON IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT [1]

Yugestina [2], Patuan Raja [3], Mahpul [4]
Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP Universitas Lampung
email: tinayuges@gmail.com; Telp: 085368865859

Abstract: The objectives of the current study were to find out: i) different groups of pairing resulted in statistical different writing achievement, ii) the effect of different pairs on every single aspect of writing. The quantitative approach was used in this study. The subjects were 42 students of the tenth grade of senior high school level. Nelson English language test and writing test were used to collect the data. The data were analyzed using a rating scale of Jacob. The results showed that different groups of pairing resulted in different writing achievement. Furthermore, there was the statistically significant effect of different pairs on every single aspect of writing. This suggests that pairing students with similar or mixed levels can facilitate the students to improve their writing achievement.

Keywords. pairing, peer review technique, writing achievement.

PEMASANGAN DALAM TEHNIK TIMBAL BALIK BERDASARKAN PADA TINGKAT KEMAHIRAN SISWA DALAM MENINGATKAN PRESTASI MENULIS [1]

Yugestina [2], Patuan Raja [3], Mahpul [4]
Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP Universitas Lampung
email: tinayuges@gmail.com; Telp: 085368865859

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui: i) kelompok pasangan yang berbeda menghasilkan prestasi menulis statistik yang berbeda, ii) pengaruh pasangan yang berbeda pada setiap aspek penulisan. Pendekatan kuantitatif digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Subyek penelitian adalah 42 siswa kelas X SMA. Nelson English language test dan tes menulis digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data. Data dianalisis menggunakan skala penilaian Jacob. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa kelompok pasangan yang berbeda menghasilkan prestasi menulis yang berbeda. Selain itu, ada pengaruh yang signifikan secara statistik dari pasangan yang berbeda pada setiap aspek penulisan. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa memasangkan siswa dengan tingkat yang sama atau campuran dalam memfasilitasi siswa untuk meningkatkan prestasi menulis mereka.
.

Katakunci. pemasangan, tehnik timbal balik, pencapaian menulis.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most difficult and multifaceted skills for students to develop both in their native and foreign language is writing. Celce-Mercia as cited in Erkan and Saban (2011), expressing one's ideas in written form in a second or foreign language, and doing so with reasonable accuracy and coherence, is a major achievement. It means that writing requires thinking strategies that allow the individual to express him or herself competently in the other language, and is a complex activity that requires a certain level of linguistic knowledge, writing conventions, vocabulary, and grammar.

Brown (2001:337) states writing is a way to end up thinking something you could n't have started out thinking. Writing is in fact, a transaction with words whereby you free yourself from what you presently think, feel and perceive. In another word, writing can be considered as both process and product. Those cannot be separated since they are related to each other. The writing process allows the writers to boost up their ideas, their feeling, putting them into the draft and then the writer attempt to express those all things above in the final draft as a product. In addition, expressing feelings or ideas in the written form refers to a recursive process of writing including prewriting, drafting, editing, revising, and publishing. As noted by Zamel and Zhang as cited in Lee (2016) From a process perspective, writing is not seen as a one-time activity; rather, it is a recursive process through which meaning is created. Through the steps of prewriting, drafting, evaluating, and revising. It is in line with Applebee and Langer as cited in Niesyn (2011) Process-oriented instruction emphasizes extensive prewriting activities, multiple drafts, sharing of work with partners or small groups, and careful attention to writing conventions before sharing with others. It can be inferred that there is a link between giving feedback in the process of providing a chance for review their drafts in the process of writing which can develop the result of their writing for improving their writing achievement.

White and Arndt as cited in Hammad (2013), writing is a thinking process which demands intellectual effort, and it involves generating ideas, planning, goal setting, monitoring, evaluating what is going to be written as well as what has been written and using language for expressing exact meanings. By getting feedback in their writing which can present their writing be readable and comprehensible which accepted the messages, ideas, or thought as the intention of the writer by the readers.

As noted by Hu (2005), The potential benefits of peer review for writing development can be explain that Peer review can help students gain insights into the nature of writing and contribute to the creation of a supportive environment for learning to write (Villamil and de Guerrero), by providing opportunities for them to discover and negotiate to mean, to explore effective ways of expressing meaning, to practise a wide range of language and writing skills, and to

assume a more active role in the learning process (Liu and Sadler, Mendonca and Johnson, Nelson and Carson). The second reason is that peer review meshes well with writing cycles, multiple drafting, extensive revision and pair/group work, all mainstay pedagogical activities of process approaches (Jacobs et, Paulus, Susser), which it can provide reason and content for or a natural follow-up to. it can be described that a connection between feedback and writing process which are explained from perspectives on how feedback support learning include feedback can be considered as an incentive for increasing response rate or accuracy, feedback can be regarded as a reinforcer that automatically connects responses to prior stimuli (focused on correct response), feedback can be considered as information that learners can use validate or change a previous response (focused on erroneous responses), and feedback can be regarded as the provision of scaffolds to help students construct internal schemata and analyze their learning processes.

However, several of the study focus on finishing a product of writing rather than the process of writing include individual differences or students proficiency in getting pairs or teaching effects in the writing process may have greatly influenced in students' writing achievement. The qualification "equal status students" in Topping's as cited in Strijbos, Narciss and Dunnebier (2010) definition might be retained in the sense of age or class-level of students, but there are evidently individual differences that affect perceived status and may impact peer feedback perceptions and subsequent performance. Due to the problem in the previous study, the current study is proposed which focus on improving writing by employing proficiency in getting a pair to provide the effect on students' draft revision.

In the current issues, Proficiency differences have been debated as one of the influential factors in the nature of peer feedback activities. As we know, in the naturalistic classroom settings, teachers usually have a group of students with different proficiency levels and may organize them into similar or mixed proficiency in pairs or groups. As Storch and Aldosari (2012) noted that the L2 proficiency of learners in any one class may vary, and thus decisions have to be made about whether to pair students with similar or different L2 proficiency. There is, however, a lack of research on how pairing students into similar or mixed proficiency levels in pairs may have an effect of their feedback on the result of their writing. The present study seeks to fill the research gap by pairing students in peer review technique according to the students' proficiency levels on improving students' writing achievement. In line with the background, the researcher would like to seek answers to research problems presented as follows.

1. Are different groups of pairing resulted in statistical different writing achievement?
2. What is the effect of different pairs of peer review on every single aspect of writing?

METHODS

This study was quasi-experiment and carried out quantitatively. Forty-two students in the tenth grade of senior high school level participated in this study. There are two kinds of the instrument employed by the researcher, they are Nelson English language test and writing test. For Nelson English language test was distributed to classify students' proficiency levels in terms of High, Middle, and low levels. Those levels were used to pair the students in similar or mixed proficiency levels which appropriate to the six types of pairs: two high proficiency learners (H-H), high and middle proficiency learner (H-M), high and low proficiency learner (H-L), two middle proficiency learners (M-M), middle and low proficiency learner (M-L) and two low proficiency learners (L–L). While writing test was required to compose a descriptive text. The students' writing submitted before the treatment began were considered as their first drafts. Meanwhile, the writing that had been produced after the treatment was considered as the students' final drafts.

Moreover, the Nelson English language test items were developed by Fowler and Coe as cited in Nejad and Shahrebabaki (2015). Nelson English language test was administered to determine the subjects' language proficiency levels. The test included 50 multiple-choice items testing grammatical points and knowledge of vocabulary. To answer the first research problem, the researcher analyzed the mean score of the students' first and final drafts through Paired-Samples T-Test.

Moreover, the researcher analyzed the data through One Way ANOVA to figure out the answer to the second research question.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The statistical result of students' proficiency levels showed that the minimum score was 16 and the maximum score was 50. The total score showed that the total of students who got a low score on the test of proficiency levels were 22 students, the middle was 12 students, and high was 8 students. The statistical result of students' proficiency test can be seen in Appendix 4. Then, three proficiency groups were paired into similar or mixed proficiency levels which were appropriate to one of six types of pairs. The pairs were two pairs of H-H, two pairs of H-M or M-H, two pairs of H-L or L-H, three pairs of M-M, four pairs of M-L or L-M, and eight pairs of L-L with the total students were 42 students.

1. The Results and Discussion of different groups of pairing resulted in statistical different writing achievement.

The results showed that there was a significant effect on three pairs of groups including of middle-middle learners (M-M), middle-low learners (M-L) and low-low learners (L-L), while three other pairs of the group had no significant effect. There was a significant improvement since the result of t-value in each pair was more than t-table. The hypothesis testing had also explained that H0 was accepted if t-value was lower than t-table. In this case, t-value was not lower than t-table, so that H0 was

rejected. It can be concluded Ha was accepted because H0 was rejected. Moreover, the probability level (ρ) which was under the column of significant two-tailed, in this case, $\rho=.005$.

Table 1. showed the result of posttest was higher than pretest with different changing of percentages score in each level. The improvement of each level indicated that the students' writing achievement was significantly improved after being trained with pairing in peer review technique according to students' proficiency levels.

Table 1. Students' Different Changing

Score Range	PreTest		PostTest		Description
	Frequecy (F)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (F)	Percentage (%)	
<56	22	52.4%	13	31%	Low
57-73	12	28.6%	16	38%	Middle
>74	8	19%	13	31%	High
Mean Score	59.19		64.38		
The Highest Score	76		83		
The lowest score	40		46		

The fifth pair of M-L learners had higher improvement than other pairs with the gain was 14.2. Then, the probability level (ρ) was not under the column of significant two-tailed, in this case, $\rho=.005$. The second pair was improved with the gain 12.5. But H-M had no relatively significant increase since the probability level (ρ) was not under the column of significant two-tailed. It was followed by pairs of H-H, H-L. Although, in the feedback activities, the students felt more serious in giving feedback of the activity and independent enough in revising stage in providing positive input and suggestion to their pairs' works, but statistical result still represented significant improvement.

Table 2. The Students' Writing Improvement of Each Pair

No.	Pairs	Total Students	Mean Score		Gain	T-value	Sig.2 tailed
			Pretest	Posttest			
1	H-H	4	74.4	78.9	4.5	4.333	0.23 =
2	H-M	4	63.7	76.2	12.5	3.382	043 ↰
	M-H		74.4	78.9	4.5		
3	H-L	4	45.5	51.7	6.2	3.109	0.53 =
	L-H		74.4	78.9	4.5		
4	M-M	6	63.7	69.0	5.3	6.885	.001 =
5	M-L	8	45.5	59.7	14.2	5.769	.001 ↰
	L-M		63.7	69.0	0.1		
6	L-L	16	45.5	51.7	6.2	11.466	.000 =

Note :

= : (No changes)
↰ : (There is a level change)

Furthermore, peer review was capable of providing positive input on students' work to make them aware of their mistake in their writing. So, peer review technique emphasized more on how to edit and develop strategies to generate their ideas, compose multiple drafts, deal with feedback and revise their written work.

The current research finding confirmed previous studies of Tsui and Ng (2000), they revealed that some students reported that they benefited from reading other students' work as they prepared to give feedback and suggestion. Using peer feedback may contribute to the development of learner autonomy. Lundstorm and Baker (2009)) revealed in his study which focuses to determine which is more beneficial to improve student writing: giving or receiving peer feedback. The results showed that there was a significant effect by getting feedback in their writing, but the data collected define that givers at the lower proficiency level made more gains than those at higher proficiency levels and that slightly more gains were observed on global than local aspects of writing. Thokwane (2011), based on their responses, participants generally agree that peer feedback is an informal process whereby students of the same age or study level help each other revise their written work. Peer review can provide several ways such as this technique improves students self-confidence, makes students accountable for their own learning, and minimizes grading workload on teachers' shoulder, helps students know about their writing weaknesses, builds a community of learners in writing ESL classes.

However, the result of improvement in pairs of two middle learners, middle-low learners, and two low learners revealed that different ways of forming students into similar or mixed proficiency levels can present the result in the variation of peer feedback effects on their draft revisions. This finding does not confirm the previous research since the finding of several research by Wang (2015), Colina and Mayo (2007) and also Storch (2007) found that the pairs with a collaborative orientation (collaborative and expert/novice) afford more opportunities for learning than the pairs with a non-collaborative orientation(dominant/dominant and dominant/passive).

However, the result of the study showed that the fifth pair of low students of Middle and Low pair could provide positive input to middle and middle level too. It can be concluded that both of the levels can give feedback on each other. Since in this study, the feedback given by the student of low proficiency was mainly oriented towards the local aspects of writing on improving Middles' writing.

2. The Results and Discussion of The Effect of Different Pairs of Peer Review Technique on Every Single Aspect of Writing.

Table 3. shows that there was an effect on every single aspect of writing. It could be seen from the progress of each aspect.

Table 3. The Result Score in Writing Aspect of Each Pair

Pairs	Total students	Writing Aspect Differences					Total
		Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	
H-H	4	79.50	83.50	73.50	80.00	70.00	77.30
H-M	4	77.50	76.75	78.25	81.50	75.00	77.80
H-L	4	68.75	79.75	71.75	70.50	72.50	72.65
M-M	6	67.00	71.33	64.83	63.33	76.67	68.63
M-L	8	60.88	74.75	67.38	58.00	77.50	67.70
L-L	16	50.88	50.69	48.13	40.50	73.75	52.79

In this research, the mechanic was the most significantly improved with the gain of 14.0. and the total score was 89.0. It was also found that when students of similar proficiency levels were paired together, the pairs of H-H, M-M, and L-L in the present study, they held mostly positive perceptions of the peer feedback received. However, when students of high and middle proficiency levels (H-M), high and low proficiency levels (H-L) and middle and low (M-L) proficiency levels formed a pair in this research, the students of high and middle proficiency levels held mostly negative perceptions of the feedback from his low proficiency partner. In this sense, the results have more or less verified Strijbos (2010) viewpoint that feedback from a person with a high level of expertise is assumed to be perceived as more positive than from a person with low expertise. It is supported by Sotoudehnama and Pilehvari (2016) which focus on comparing two groups of participants to determine whether the most advantageous effects of peer review can be found in giving or receiving feedback at two proficiency level (high vs. Low).

The current research finding did not confirm the previous study (Sotoudehnama & Pilehvari (2014), Ozmir & Aidyn (2015) = Global Aspect (Organization & Content). The mechanic was the most significantly improved with the gain 14.0. Because the majority of students focused on formatting their written work and the majority of students often forgot about mechanical things in writing. They were more pay attention to the other writing aspect. Meanwhile, the students had to have the ability to use graphics conventional of the language, i.e., the steps of arranging letters, words, sentences, paragraphs by using knowledge of the structure and some others related to one another. Mechanics refers to spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and general formatting.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the results of the research, it can be concluded that the implementation of pairing in peer review technique according to students' proficiency levels which group them into similar or mixed proficiency learners can facilitate students to make some positive development in their writing achievement. In other words, the students can refine the progress of their writings and become better than before. Furthermore, it can be

concluded that the students express a willingness to help their friends improve the quality of their writings by providing beneficial feedback when they give and receives positive input in pairs.

With regard to the results of the research, the researcher provides several suggestions for English teachers. Firstly, the researcher suggests the English teachers implement pairing students in similar or mixed proficiency learners in peer review technique in teaching writing since its implementation influences students' writing achievement positively. Secondly, the teachers should be as early as possible to apply peer review technique to enhance students' writing achievement with combining in other technique of cooperative learning which suitable to the most need for the students so that the various skills can be developed.

Additionally, the researcher provides some suggestions for other researchers who are interested in conducting relevant research. First of all, It is recommended for the further researcher to find out how the process of each pair in providing a quality improvement of feedback in their writing by considering the same number of each pair. It will be interesting to add other factors that may possibly contribute to writing achievement (e.g. language proficiency, gender, motivation, anxiety etc.). In addition, it is necessary to emphasize that this study needs to be repeated with a larger sample in another program study which learns English as one of their subjects. Finally, it is recommended for further researchers who are interested in improving the students writing achievement, it should be continued and make better in order to get more satisfying results. Furthermore, the other researchers can use this activity and method for other higher grades, so they can make the best out of this technique.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles an interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Addition Wesley : Longman.

Colina, A. A., & Mayo, M. D. (2007). Attention to form across collaborative tasks by low-proficiency learners in an EFL setting. *Multilingual Matters Clevedons, England,* 91-116.

Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. I. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The asian EFL journal quarterly, 13 (1),* 1738 – 1460.

Hammad, E. A. R. (2013). Palestinian EFL university-level students' use of writing strategies in relation to their EFL writing performance. *Journal of basic and applied scientific research, 3(10),* 214-223.

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language teaching research, 9 (3),* 321–342.

Lee, G. (2016). Korean college students' reflections on peer reviews and variables involved in the review process. *English teaching, 71(1),* 97-117.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of second language writing, 18 (9),* 30-43.

Nejad, B. S., & Shahrebabaki, M. M. (2015). Effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on the reading comprehension of English language learners through cognitive academic language learning approach (CALLA). *International journal of languages' education and teaching, 3 (2),* 133-164.

Niesyn, M. E. (2011). Collaborative planning and prewriting : The effects of structured peer collaborations on primary-age students' writing development. *Theses , Dissertations, Capstones and Project,* 286.

Ozdemir, E., & Aydin, S. (2015). The effect of blogging EFL writing achievement. *Procedia - social and behavioral sciences, 199 (15),* 372-380.

Sotoudehnama, E., & Pilehvari, A. (2016). The impact of peer review on EFL learners' writing proficiency: Global and local aspects. *Porta linguarum, 25 (6), 1697-7467.*

Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language teaching research, 11 (2),* 143-159.

Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2012). Pairing learners in pair work activity. *Language teaching research, 17 (1),* 31-48.

Strijbos, J. W., Narciss, S., & Dunnebier, K. (2010). Peer feedback content and sender's competence level in acacademic writing revision tasks: Are they critical for feedback perceptions and efficiency?. *Learning and instruction, 20 (3),* 291-320.

Thokwane, D. (2011). Using peer review to promote writing development in ESL classes. *Unpublished theses, dissertations, and other capstone projects. Minnesota state university: Cornerstone:* 282.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments?. *Journal of second language writing, 9 (2),* 147-170.

Wang, W. (2015). How proficiency-pairing affects students'

peer-mediated revisions of EFL writing: *Three case studies. English Language Teaching, 8 (5),* 22.