



A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching & Literature

ISSN 1414-3320 (Print), ISSN 2502-4914 (Online)

Vol. 17 No. 1; July 2017

Copyright © Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

Students' Perception toward the Implementation of Peer-Assessment in Writing: Before and After Revision

Husni Mubarok

English Education Department, Tarbiyah Faculty and Education Sciences
Islamic University of Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara, Indonesia

email: husni@unisnu.ac.id

Received: 02-08-2016

Accepted: 20-07-2017

Published: 11-08-2017

Students' Perception toward the Implementation of Peer-Assessment in Writing: Before and After Revision

Husni Mubarok

husni@unisnu.ac.id

English Education Department, Tarbiyah and Teachers
Training Faculty, Islamic University of Nahdlatul Ulama
Jepara, Indonesia

Abstract: This study was aimed at elaborating students' perception toward the implementation of peer assessment in writing class either before or after revision. Writing becomes one of skills which should be mastered by students in order to get higher level of literacy. Writing is a productive skill which asks students to arrange words and organize them into good writing which could be understood by readers. The success of writing is determined by the writing process itself starting from planning, first draft writing, revising, and editing. One of the strategies used in teaching writing is by implementing peer assessment. Peer assessment strategy becomes one of important parts in the process of writing because there will be feedback or suggestion from peers in doing a review. The number of the subject of this research was students in second semester of the English Education Department of UNISNU Jepara. This research was conducted on even semester. The total number of the students, which became respondents, was 37 students of English Education Department. The research design used was qualitative research which measured students' perceptions of the implementation of peer assessment in writing: before and after revision. The result showed that before revision, students had negative perception toward their own writing. After revision, they had positive perceptions toward peer assessment strategy. Those included usefulness and meaningfulness, nature of feedback, reality of feedback, precision, validity, fairness, and personal goal-setting. Besides that, the score after revision (7.9) was higher than the score before revision (6.62). It meant that the result showed the increasing of students' score after revision.

Key words: assessment, peer-assessment, writing

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menjabarkan persepsi siswa terhadap penerapan penilaian sebaya dalam kelas Writing baik sebelum dan sesudah revisi. Menulis menjadi salah satu keahlian yang harus dikuasai oleh siswa untuk mencapai tingkat literasi yang lebih tinggi. Menulis merupakan keahlian produktif yang meminta siswa untuk menyusun kata-kata dan mengaturnya kedalam tulisan yang bagus yang dapat dipahami oleh pembaca. Kesuksesan menulis ditentukan oleh proses menulis itu sendiri yang dimulai dari perencanaan, draf pertama, revisi, dan edit. Salah satu strategi yang digunakan dalam mengajar menulis adalah dengan menerapkan penilaian sebaya. Penilaian sebaya menjadi salah satu bagian penting dalam proses menulis karena akan terjadi timbal balik atau masukan dari teman sebaya ketika melakukan review. Subjek dalam penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa semester dua prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UNISNU Jepara. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan pada semester gasal. Jumlah mahasiswa yang menjadi responden adalah 37 mahasiswa PBI. Desain penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif yang mengukur persepsi mahasiswa terhadap penerapan penilaian sebaya dalam menulis baik sebelum dan sesudah revisi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa sebelum revisi, mahasiswa mempunyai persepsi negatif terhadap tulisan mereka sendiri. Setelah revisi, mereka mempunyai persepsi positif terhadap strategi penilaian sebaya yang mencakup kegunaannya, manfaatnya, hakikat timbal balik, kenyataan timbal balik, ketepatannya, kesahihannya, kejujurannya, dan tujuan personal. Disamping itu, hasil penelitian juga menunjukkan peningkatan nilai mahasiswa; sebelum revisi (6,62) dan setelah revisi menjadi (7,9). Hasil tersebut menunjukkan naiknya nilai siswa setelah revisi.

Kata kunci: penilaian, penilaian sebaya, menulis

INTRODUCTION

In English skills, there are two kinds of skill in general; receptive skills and productive skills. Receptive skills include listening and reading, while productive skills include speaking and writing. In productive skills, students want to make interaction to the audiences or readers through oral or written communication. According to Harmer (2007, p. 247), one of the advantages of production activities is that they provide evidence for students and their teachers to assess how well things are going. By understanding these two kinds of English skill, educators or teachers should know how to implement it in a teaching and learning process.

Writing is one of skills that should be mastered by students in order to make communication between writers and readers. Although in a real practicing, writing would be taught after students are familiar with listening, speaking, and reading. In writing, the writers want to express their ideas, thought, and opinions what they want to write. The writers should consider the writing rules like coherent and cohesion. Besides that the writers also pay more attention to the genre they use. According to Harmer (2007, p. 246), coherent writing makes sense because you can follow the sequence of ideas and points. Cohesion is a more technical matter since it is here that we concentrate on the various linguistic ways of connecting ideas across phrases and sentences. Based on the statement, it is known that writing is a communication tool to express or deliver one's opinion, thought, or idea.

Written language is simply the graphic representation of spoken language. Written products are often the result of thinking, drafting, and revising procedures that require specialized skills, skills that not every speaker develops naturally (Brown, 2001, p. 335). According to Yang (2011, p. 144), there are six basic elements in the writing process: 1) generating ideas; 2) defining a focus; 3) organizing ideas into various thinking patterns; 4) drafting; 5) revising, editing, and proofreading; and 6) collaborating. In writing a good paragraph, a writer should implement a good strategy. A writing strategy would help the writer to gather the idea and then formulate it into good composition. In writing, a writer wants to communicate with readers and gives information to them. According to Carter & Nunan (2001, p. 29), In the field of creative writing in TESOL classrooms and in the context of literature in language teaching, approaches to writing have been taken that involve strategies such as; re-writing from different viewpoints; shifting registers to explore changing communicative effects; writing predictions and completions to texts as part of a process of detail text study; and cross-genre writing. Vygotsky as cited by Puegphrom & Chiramanee (2011, p. 1) suggested that an appropriate instructional method can enhance complex thinking development. This is why in teaching writing; teachers or educators need to implement appropriate strategy which is in line with students' need.

Writing is a personal act in which writers take ideas or prompts and transform them into self-initiated topics (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996, p. 136). In order to write well, students should incorporate the purpose of their writing to develop one main idea. In writing essay students will rely on at least four types of knowledge; knowledge of the content, procedural

knowledge to organize content, knowledge of convention of writing, and procedural knowledge required to apply the three other types of knowledge in composing a written product (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996, p. 136). In the knowledge of content, students are required to do a memory search and call prior knowledge and experience.

In writing a good paragraph, students often face some difficulties. One of them is gathering the idea and constructing it into good composition. Some of students develop more than one idea in their writing, so that they could not focus on one main idea. When they do this, they could not realize the mistakes they made. This is why in writing; students are required to maximize all the time and effort in learning and practicing how to organize the idea coherently and cohesively. Besides that, they are reluctant to re-read their writing, so that there is no second edited draft or final edited draft. Another problem is the lack of time for teachers to evaluate or give feedback to students' writing. Sometimes, teachers should evaluate more than one class at the same time. So they do not have enough time to read students' writing deeply and give detail feedback directly or indirectly to their writing.

Yang (2011, p. 144) investigated the perspectives of using peer evaluation and teacher's feedback in terms of implicit and explicit correction in a writing class on one internet platform from 50 third-year students. The results of the study showed that most students had positive comments on peer evaluation. Mubarok (2012, p. 163) conducted a research on the use of peer feedback strategy to motivate students. Based on the research, it was found that the implementation of peer feedback, students had low motivation. After the implementation of the strategy, students' motivation increased. Wang et al. (2014, p. 233) investigated a mix-mode peer response, the E-Peer Response (EPR), to overcome the bias of a single mode, and examined how students with different levels of ability react to the EPR. The results revealed that students in the experimental group performed better than those in the control group. Puegphrom & Chiramanee (2011, p. 1) found that after experiencing the writing instruction with peer assessment and being assessed by peer the subjects' writing ability improved significantly, at .01. Highly positive attitudes towards the teaching technique were also found, in particular on the following aspects: the writing ability development, self-directed learning, co-operative learning, and self-confidence.

There are two kinds of assessment in writing. The first is self-assessment. Then the second is peer assessment. Self-assessment in writing encourages the type of reflection needed to gain increased control as a writer.

Self-assessment encourages students to think about their purpose in writing and to reflect on what and how much they are learning (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996, p. 151). In conducting this kind of strategy, students need to encourage themselves through dialogue-journal, learning log, and checklist of writing skills. Self-assessment is a process in which students are responsible to evaluate their own writing. Both self-assessment and peer assessment could be used to measure students' cognitive and affective domain. In cognitive domain, students would try to evaluate based on their competences in giving critical comment or feedback. While in affective domain, they are faced to give comment and feedback fairly based on actual fact or not.

According to Spiller (2012, p. 2) self-assessment is a process of formative assessment during which students reflect on and evaluate the quality of their work and their learning, judge the degree to which they reflect explicitly stated goals or criteria, identify strengths and weaknesses in their work, and revise accordingly. In implementing self-assessment, students would get some benefits. There are some benefits of self-assessment. It builds on a natural tendency to check out the progress of one's own learning. Self-assessment can promote learner responsibility and independence. Self-assessment tasks encourage student ownership of the learning. Self-assessment encourages a focus on process. If a student can identify his/her learning progress, this may motivate further learning. Self-assessment tasks shift the focus from something imposed by someone else to a potential partnership (Spiller, 2012, p. 3).

One of the appropriate strategies in teaching writing is by implementing peer assessment. Peer assessment is a kind of strategy in writing in which a student checks his/her peer's writing. The checking here means that the student reads, evaluates, and gives comment or feedback toward his/her writing. Pueghrom & Chiramanee (2011, p. 1) state that peer assessment has been considered an important part of writing process that helps improve writing ability. Having a friend express opinions and provide certain guidelines to improve the writing is analogous to a mirror reflecting the ability of the reviewer and the reviewed.

Peer assessment could become an alternative strategy in teaching writing because it needs participation among students. The participation could be in the form of giving feedback, suggestion, or critical response in the form of evaluation. According to O' Malley & Pierce (1996, p. 156) students can evaluate each other's writing through peer assessment as they participate in student writing conferences. Students are sometimes reluctant

to share impressions with their peers for fear of hurting the other person's feeling. One way to overcome this reluctance is to make the student whose paper is being assessed responsible for finding out how the paper can be improved. Another way is to have students pair up and read their papers to each other. Every student is encouraged to respond to the other student's paper by answering three questions; what did you like about the paper?, what facts or ideas could be added to the paper?, and what changes could be made to improve the paper? (O' Malley & Pierce, 1996, p. 156).

Peer assessment requires students to provide either feedback or grades (or both) to their peers on a product or a performance, based on the criteria of excellence for that product or event which students may have been involved in determining (Spiller, 2012, p. 10). There are some reasons why peer-assessment could be well implemented in learning a language especially writing skill. First, peer learning builds on a process that is part of our development from the earliest years of life (it is the practice of formal education and the centrality of the teacher that makes us lose sight of this). Secondly, Peer feedback can encourage collaborative learning through interchange about what constitutes good work. Thirdly, Students can help each other to make sense of the gaps in their learning and understanding and to get a more sophisticated grasp of the learning process. Next, Students can help each other to make sense of the gaps in their learning and understanding and to get a more sophisticated grasp of the learning process. Students receiving feedback from their peers can get a wider range of ideas about their work to promote development and improvement (Spiller, 2012, p. 11).

Peer assessment is a kind of assessment by asking peers to elaborate or respond the weaknesses and strength of the writing. If it is connected to the 2013 curriculum (which was canceled the implementation), peer assessment could be defined as assessment technique by asking peers to evaluate each other writing. This kind of assessment could be done by; a) each student should be responsible to give response and evaluate their peers' writing, 2) designing a team which is consisted of some students which are responsible to assess skills of all students in the class, and 3) each student are given responsibility to assess three or four peers' writing.

In order to peer assessment can be done properly and effectively, it requires a supportive and conducive learning environment. Students are required to feel comfortable and trust each other in order to provide fair feedback, structured, and constructive. Therefore, the role of the teacher or

lecturer is extremely important in helping students to develop mutual trust among them.

This study was aimed at elaborating students' perception toward the implementation of peer assessment in writing class either before or after revision. Students would write based on the topic given, and their peers were asked to give comment, response and feedback constructively. After students did peer-assessment, they were asked to give their opinion toward the implementation of peer assessment in writing class.

METHODOLOGY

This study used qualitative approach to investigate students' perception toward the implementation of peer-assessment before and after revision. According to Wallace (1998, p. 32) qualitative is used to describe data what are not amenable to being counted or measured in an objective way, and are therefore subjective. Descriptive study is a kind of study which seeks to describe the phenomenon of object or subject of the study (Sukardi, 2013, p. 58). This kind of approach was used to gain the data deeply toward the implementation of peer-assessment. It meant that there was no data manipulation in this study. The result of the study could not be generalised to the wider subject of research.

The subject of the study was second semester students of Islamic University of Nahdlatul Ulama (UNISNU) Jeparu. This study was conducted on the 2015/2016 academic year. The subject consisted of 32 students. The students had got Intensive Writing course when they were in first semester. This research was applied in Writing I course in second semester.

In collecting the data, the researcher used questionnaire to know students' response and opinion toward the implementation of peer-assessment in writing class. The questionnaire consisted of eleven questions. Cohen et al. (2007, p. 245) state that the questionnaire is a widely used and useful instrument for collecting survey information, providing structured, often numerical data, being able to be administered without the presence of the researcher, and often being comparatively straightforward to analyze. Each question represented various indicators. The indicators were the usefulness and meaningfulness of peer-assessment, nature of peer-assessment, reality of peer-assessment, precision of peer-assessment, validity of peer-assessment, fairness, and personal goal-setting. The questionnaires were given

to the students as respondents. The type of the questionnaire was closed-questionnaire in which students did not have a chance to give or share their opinion, but they should choose the option given by the researcher. Besides using questionnaires, this study also used test to investigate students' score before and after the implementation of peer-assessment. This was used to know students' improvement after they were taught by using the strategy. Analytic scale was used in this study.

In conducting peer-assessment, the researcher provided a guideline for students. The students should focused on some aspects in their friend writing. The aspects were:

Table 1:
Indicators of Peer-assessment

No	Aspects	Indicators
1	Overall paper (organization)	Having a main idea Supporting the idea Logical and making sense Organized well
2	Word/sentence use	Complete and having one verb Having variety of vocabulary Using paragraph well Using tense correctly
3	Mechanism	Using periods Using question marks Capital letters at the beginning of sentence Capital letters for proper nouns
4	Spelling	Using spelling words correctly

RESULT

The result of the study showed that peer-assessment was good to be implemented in teaching writing as an alternative strategy. The implementation of peer-assessment in writing was 1) students were asked to gain ideas based on the topic given, 2) students were asked to write a composition based on the idea developed, 3) students were asked to read their writing by the mean of checking their writing, 4) students were asked to do peer-assessment, 5) students were asked to read the feedback given by their peers, and 6) students were asked to revise their writing after they read their feedback given by their peers. In implementing peer-assessment, students were given and provided a form of paper. So that it would make students and their peers were easy to give feedback or comment.

Scoring rubric which was used in this study was analytic scoring rubric. This scoring rubric was divided into some categories. Analytic scales separate the feature of a composition into component that each are scored separately. The analytic scoring rubric used was based on O' Malley & Pierce (1996, p. 145) rubric. The components were composing, style, sentence formation, usage, and mechanism.

Table 2:
The Students' Score

	Composing	Style	Sentence Formation	Usage	Mechanism
Before Revision	6.6	6.5	6.7	6.4	6.9
After Revision	7.6	7.7	8.1	7.9	8.2

Based on the students' score of pre-test, it was known that students had weaknesses in almost all components. In composing component, students got 6.6 in their writing. Students found difficulty in generating the developed ideas in the form of a topic sentence and then supported by supporting sentences. This difficulty was caused in one paragraph there was more than one idea. After they were given a written feedback from their peers, they could increase their writing components which were still lacking. This is

because they knew the location of their lack of writing. It was shown the average score of composing component increased than before (7.6).

Students also faced difficulties in style component. Style component consisted of some criteria like vocabulary choice, sentence variety, information and voice to affect readers. The students' average score was low because most of students wrote their writing by using basic vocabulary and sometime inconsistent with the vocabulary they used. After the implementation of peer assessment, there was an improvement of style component. It was proved with the students' average score which was 7.7. The third component was sentence formation. In sentence formation component, students faced difficulties in the aspect of making good sentence based on correct grammatical rules. Students got 6.7 in the component. After the implementation of peer-assessment, students score was higher than before. It was shown by the average score which reached 8.1. In this aspect, students could write complete sentences which consisted of one single idea.

Besides that, students could make full sentences which consisted of subject, verb, and object correctly. Besides that, students used coordinators appropriately and applied transition effectively. The fourth component was usage. In this component, students got 6.4 for their average score before the implementation of peer-assessment. This was because some students were still making mistakes in the form of grammar. After the implementation of peer-assessment, students score was improved. It was shown by the table above which indicated 7.9 for students' average score. The improvement occurred in the aspect of the form of plural of a word and subject and verb agreement. The last component was mechanism. Students' score in the pre-test was 6.9. They made mistakes in the form of punctuation, capitalization, spelling, and paragraph format. After the implementation of peer-assessment, the score was higher than the score before revision which was shown 8.2 in mechanism aspect. Students realized the weaknesses so they could improve it in their next writing.

Table 3:
The Average of Students' Score

	Before Revision	After Revision
Mean	6.62	7.9

Based on the table above, it was known that there was an improvement

of students' score before revision and after revision. Before revision, students got 6.62 in their average score. After revision, they got 7.9 in their average score. By implementing peer-assessment, students got feedback from their peers. The feedback was used to revise their writing. They knew the mistakes and weaknesses of their writing, so that they would pay more attention to the feedback given by their peers. The feedback given by students was sometimes in the form of words, phrases, or sentences or even they directly give a correction. For their first draft / draft before revision, students' mistake was found the in the aspect of developing main idea and supporting sentences. Their idea was overlap with another idea. In the grammatical aspect, students sometimes made mistake in verb and subject agreement and plural form.

Table 4:
The Recapitulation of Questionnaire before After

No	Aspect	Options			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Personal belief	12.5%	40.6%	31.25%	15.62%
2	Own checking	21.8%	50%	18.75%	9.3%
3	Own editing	25%	40.6%	21.8%	12.5%
4	Writing organization	9.3%	34.3%	56.2%	-

Based on the table above, it was known that all students did not believe that their writing was good and could be understood by readers. Some of them hesitated toward their own writing although it had been supported by their own checking and editing. They still faced difficulties in finding what aspect of their writing that had mistakes and weaknesses. They were not able to diagnose their writing in the aspect of organization. They only checked and edited in the aspect of grammar and spelling. Some of them missed in checking the aspect of mechanism component. So it could be summarized that students had negative view toward their own writing before the implementation of peer-assessment.

Table 5:
The Recapitulation of Questionnaire After Revision

No	Aspect	Options			
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My feedback					
1	Usefulness and meaningfulness	40.62 %	50%	9.37 %	-
2	Nature	34.37 %	53.12 %	12.5 %	-
3	Reality	43.75 %	50 %	6.25 %	-
4	Precision	40.62 %	46.87 %	12.5 %	-
5	Validity	25 %	43.75 %	25 %	6.25 %
My peer's feedback					
6	Usefulness and meaningfulness	37.5 %	53.1 %	9.37 %	-
7	Nature	37.5 %	56.25 %	6.25 %	-
8	Reality	46.8 %	46.8 %	6.25 %	-
9	Precision	37.5 %	43.75 %	18.75 %	-
10	Validity	21.87 %	46.87 %	21.87 %	9.37 %
11	Fairness	37.5 %	46.87 %	15.6 %	-
12	Personal goal-setting	50%	50%		

Based on the table above, it was known that the feedback students wrote was useful and meaningful. They did not give feedback which was out of theme and the feedback directly helped their peers to revise and improve their writing. It could be said that the feedback given by the writers (students) was useful and meaningful which was shown by more than 90% of students' response was 'strongly agree' and 'agree'. Besides that, the students' response also showed that the nature of students' feedback so critical and detailed. It happened because students had known the scoring criteria before giving feedback to their peers. The critic they gave was meant to give positive sight

for students' further writing. It was proven by the percentage more than 85% of students chose 'strongly agree' and 'agree'. The feedback or suggestion which was written by students was based on real weaknesses or mistakes found from their friends' writing. In this case, students were asked to be fair in giving feedback. They were not allowed to do the different thing in their friends writing. Besides that, the precision of feedback also showed high response. The last thing discussed was the validity of the feedback. Validity here meant the consistency of feedback given by friends in improving peers' writing. When peers provided feedback or suggestion, they always referred to the correct grammar and spelling of words. This allowed students' feedback or suggestion would be similar if another student read the same paper.

From the above questionnaires, it was found that the aspects of questionnaire were not only from the side of a reader (a student who gave a feedback) but also from the side of a writer. Thus, there would be balance information toward the implementation of peer-assessment strategy. After students got feedback and then revised their writing, they had positive point of view toward their own writing. They thought that their writing was better than before.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the finding and discussion above, it could be concluded that there was an improvement of students' score before and after revision and students had a positive point of view toward the implementation of peer-assessment in teaching writing. Students' perception was measured from different aspects which included students' feedback and peer's feedback. Each of the aspects was categorized into usefulness and meaningfulness, nature of feedback, reality of feedback, precision of feedback, and the validity. The students' response was influenced by the implementation of the teaching strategy; peer-assessment. The usefulness and meaningfulness were coming from the significant aspect of the feedback. The feedback gave students enlightenment to the mistake and weaknesses of their writing. Nature of feedback given was critical and detailed. The reality of feedback meant that the feedback given was based on real mistakes and weaknesses from students' writing. The precision of the feedback meant that the feedback given could help students to revise their writing. Finally, the validity of the feedback meant that the feedback might be similar if the paper read by

another student. It was meant that the feedback or suggestion showed the consistency of the feedback.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We thank all the students of English Education Department who participated in this study. We also express our gratitude to the Head of Department of for supporting this research.

REFERENCES

Brown, D., (2001). *Teaching by Principles; An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*, New York: Pearson Education International.

Carter, R. & Nunan, D., (2001). *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K., (2007). *Research Methods in Education*, New York: Routledge.

Harmer, J., (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, London: Pearson Education International.

Mubarok, H., (2012). The Use of Peer Feedback Strategy to Motivate Students in Narrative Text Writing. *English Education Journal*, 2(2), pp.99 - 211.

O' Malley, J.M. & Pierce, L. V., (1996). *Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners. Practical Approaches for Teachers*, Virginia: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Puegphrom, P. & Chiramane, T., (2011). The Effectiveness of Implementing Peer Assessment on Students ' Writing Proficiency. In *Factors Affecting English Language Teaching and Learning*. Faculty of Liberal Art, Prince of Songkla University, pp. 1-17.

Spiller, D., (2012). Assessment Matters: Self-Assessment and Peer Assessment Assessment. *Teaching Development Unit*, (February), pp.1-

19.

Sukardi, (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan; Kompetensi dan Praktiknya*, Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Wallace, J., (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, J. et al., (2014). Effects of a Mixed-Mode Peer Response On Student Response Behavior and Writing Performance. *Journal Educational Computing Research*, 51(2), pp.233-256.

Yang, S., (2011). Exploring the Effectiveness of Using Peer Evaluation and Teacher Feedback in College Students ' Writing. *The Asia-Pasific Education Researcher*, 20(1), pp.144-150.

