

Peer Response in an Indonesian EFL Writing Class: A Case Study

M. Zaini Miftah

State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya, Central Kalimantan, Indonesia, miftahmzaini@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article explores peer response in an Indonesian EFL writing class. It reports on the findings of a study conducted at the State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya in Central Kalimantan Indonesia to investigate: (a) what areas of peer response were focused on; (b) why the points of peer response were incorporated or not incorporated into revisions; (c) the suitability between peer response and writer expectation; and (d) what aspects of writing were improved with peer response. Research methodology included examining and analyzing drafts of peer response activities (the first and revised versions of student writing) of each session, questionnaire result, and interview transcription from peer response sessions. Results show that the areas of peer response gained from each session of peer response activities were focused much on the idea development, grammar, and mechanic. The points of peer response were incorporated into revisions because of its advantages to the developments of an essay in terms of grammar, essay structure and coherence, and were not incorporated into revisions because of irrelevant feedbacks. The suitable area between peer response and writer expectation was in terms of grammar accuracy. During peer response activities students engaged in the improvement of their writing ability, and the most improvements of the writing aspects were content and grammar.

Key Words: *peer response, written feedback, EFL writing class, writing ability, expository essay.*

1. Introduction

Various issues concerning peer response in the teaching of writing of first and second or foreign language settings have been examined. The studies attempted to develop a structured method of using peer response group in teaching writing (Bell, 1991), to investigate the value of peer response in writing class (Mangelsdorf, 1992; Tang & Tithecott, 1999), to examine the impact of peer response on EFL Writing (Wakabayashi, 2008; Al-Jamal, 2009; Farrah, 2012; Jahin, 2012), to investigate how much peer feedback was incorporated into revision, its quality, and its types (Ting & Qian, 2010), and to examine the actual focus of peer review and the types of corrective feedback provided in L2 composing process (Salih, 2013). However, few studies have been conducted in the Indonesian context. As Widiati's (2003) study showed that trained peer response succeeded in the changes of students' attitude into positive one, and improved their writing ability. In addition, Mubarak (2009) did a research applying peer feedback; the result showed that ability of the students in writing narrative text could improve.

The various findings showed that some of these give enthusiastic claims and positive findings of peer response, but some others do not. Conflicting findings have been reported on its effectiveness and helpfulness. A study conducted by Nelson & Murphy (1993), for example, found that L2 students tend to have a distrust of their peers' response since they consider their peers no more knowledgeable than themselves in providing sensible feedback and thus do not incorporate peer feedback into their writing. Also, Nelson & Carson (1998) carried out a research revealed that students incorporated teacher feedback in their revisions much more frequently than peer feedback. Some student writers were even reported to be unsure of their own power as competent readers while reading others' writings (Lockhart & Ng in Ting & Qian, 2010:88). Additionally, Ting & Qian (2010) reported that though peer response could lead improvement of students' writing with respect to accuracy, but no significant differences were found with respect to grammatical and lexical complexity.

On the other hand, studies reported that peer response gives a great impact on EFL writing such as peer reviews had helped writers revise the content of their drafts, but sometimes it was not

able to give useful advice (Mangelsdorf, 1992), peer feedback could solve problems focusing more on content level problems than on surface level problems (Wakabayashi, 2008), peer response technique affected the participants' attitude positively in a way that enhanced the development of students' writing skill (Al-Jamal, 2009) and writing apprehension (Jahin, 2012), and peer feedback offered students an opportunity for social interaction and improved their writing skills, critical thinking, confidence, creativity, motivation, and assignments (Farrah, 2012). Of these findings, peer response in the writing classroom still presents problems to solve. Despite peer response yields profits and drawbacks as alternately reported by researchers, the practice of peer response has been widely applied in writing class. Moreover, the studies on peer response need further exploration and that more studies are still needed.

Studies on peer response have shed insights on several aspects of peer response. As a case study conducted by Ting & Qian (2010), the aspects cover how much peer feedback, what kinds of revisions, and whether the revisions can lead to writing improvements in terms of accuracy, fluency, grammatical complexity, and vocabulary complexity. Moreover, a research by Salih (2013), the different aspects include the actual focus of peer review and the types of corrective feedback provided. Of the prior research, it still rises to issues on peer response to solve. Therefore, it needs similar studies in different contexts to contribute to understanding of the issue of peer response in the process and pedagogy of writing.

At the English Department of State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya in Central Kalimantan Indonesia where English is taught as EFL, the process approach to teaching writing has been put into practice quite recently by the writing lectures. It shows that peer response activities in which peer feedback given to the classmates' writings before the lecturer feedback showed symptoms categorized as problem indications of the implementation of peer response in writing class. Some students had desire to give feedback on their classmates' writings while some others did not. The students as the reviewers giving feedback seemed that they had more writing ability than those gave no feedback. Moreover, the reviewers' feedbacks were out of focus. Though they were equipped with peer editing sheet, the reviewers' response points given to peers' writings were unclear. In addition, few of student writers had revised their drafts even though their peers as reviewers put up response. As a result, their ability in writing paragraph or essay was not maximally improved. It appears here that the pattern of peer response in writing class is very interesting to research.

However, despite the development body of research on peer response and its positive impacts in ESL/EFL writing setting, more research is needed on the patterns of peer response to student writing in Indonesian EFL context, more specifically at State Islamic Institute of Palangka Raya in Central Kalimantan Indonesia. Thus, it is very much necessary to research peer response in the process of writing. The study then addresses the following questions: (a) What areas of peer response are focused on? (b) Are the points of peer response incorporated into revisions? Why are the points of peer response incorporated or not incorporated into revisions? (c) Is there any writer expectation to peer response? If so, does peer response suit their expectation?, and (d) Do the revisions lead to improvement of their writing skill? If so, what aspects of writing are improved?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Peer Response

Peer response sometimes referred to as 'peer review', 'peer editing', or 'peer feedback' can be defined as the use of learners as sources of information, and interaction for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing (Liu & Hansen, 2002:1). It has been claimed that peer readers can provide useful feedback (Rollinson in Ting & Qian, 2010), and by reading others' writing as critical readers, students could become more critical readers and revisers of their own writing (Rollinson, 2005). In this way writers can revise effectively on the basis of peer response, and peer response might be

seen as complementary to teacher feedback. It can help student writers focus on writing as a process and on revision, and has become a common feature in EFL classrooms where the process approach to teaching writing is used. For this to happen, however, the writing class has to be set up properly with the prior plan of grouping–peer group response and its procedure.

2.2 Steps to Implementing Peer Response in EFL Writing Class

The process steps of applying peer response group in the study should follow the stages of the writing process–prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing (Smalley *et al.*, 2001:3). It only focuses on the revising (Liu & Hansen, 2002) and editing stages (Stone, 1990) in which peer response group is applied after conducting prewriting and drafting activities. The process steps began with assigning the students to do writing task through the writing process. It was initiated with prewriting activities followed by outlining, and then writing their first drafts inside or outside of class. They were required to bring their drafts to the next class for peer response. The procedure of implementing peer response in the writing class is adapted from Tang & Tithecott (1999:24-25) as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 The Procedures of Peer Response Activities

No	Steps
1	Teacher groups students in a group of 3 or 4.
2	Teacher divides the time equally for peer response activity to each group member.
3	Writer (student writer) tells group members how they may best help him/her give response to his/her draft.
4	Writer reads his/her draft aloud while peers (group members) listen attentively without interruption.
5	On the first reading, peers do not make any comments or take notes. They just listen and try to understand what the writer is saying.
6	After the first reading is completed, teacher shares peer response sheet adapted from Smalley <i>et al.</i> (2001:383).
7	Writer reads the draft again, fairly slowly.
8	On the second reading, peers take few minutes to write one or two sentences on the space in peer response sheet starting their general impression of the essay's strong and confusing points.
9	After the second reading is completed, peers take turns giving response (feedback/comments) by answering questions in peer response sheet. The draft is handed in for the peers' review.
10	Peers discuss their responses with the writer.
11	Peers submit their response to the writer.
12	Repeat this process of item number 3 till 11 for each member of the group.
13	Writer revises his/her draft based on the peers' feedback as home assignment (submitted in the following meeting)

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design applied in this study was a case study categorized as qualitative research. Qualitative research refers to 'research based on descriptive data that does not make (regular) use of statistical procedures' (Mackey & Gass, 2005:162), and 'research termed the constructivist approach or naturalistic' (Creswell, 1994:4). Meanwhile, a case study centered on 'an in-depth description of a single unit which can be an individual, a group, a site, a class, a policy, a program, a process, an institution, or a community' (Ary *et al.*, 2010:454). Within this framework, the current study fitted with those characteristics. It investigated peer response in the writing class by describing the patterns of peer response in the process of writing particularly in the revision and editing stages. Moreover, the study explored peer response applied by a group of students in particular class–Writing class–as a natural situation in which interesting topics were investigated deeply.

3.2 Setting and Subjects of the Study

This study was conducted in a course entitled “Writing III”. The course met once a week for 16 weeks with each class lasting 150 minutes. The objective of the course was to help students fully develop their abilities in writing various types of essay in English as proposed in the course syllabus. In the class, there were 18 students, who were randomly divided into 6 groups, 3 in each group. To probe into the students’ revision process, the researcher randomly chose four groups (totaling 12 students) from the six original groups as participants in this study.

3.3 Data Sources

The study utilized three sources of data: drafts of student writing in peer response activities (first and revised versions) of each session, questionnaire result, and interview transcription from peer response sessions.

3.4 Research Instruments

The instrument in this context was the researcher himself who was considered as the key instrument. As said by Bogdan & Biklen (1998:4), the researcher himself who was present in the setting of the study was considered as the key instrument which was called as Human Instrument. In this study the researcher equipped himself with some research instruments consisting of observation checklist, questionnaire, interview, and documentation (Creswell, 1994:149).

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The procedures for data collection were as follows. First, the participants were trained on peer response activities (the procedures of peer response are shown in Table 2.1) before they were asked to write in each session an essay on a different topic of their own interest in the expository text. The rationale behind selecting expository writing was that it was a rhetorical mode the students who were familiar with as it was often used in academic writing, and was to provide topics of interest for the students.

After training on peer response activities, the teacher-researcher assigned the students to do writing task conducted through the writing process. It was initiated with prewriting activities followed by outlining, and then writing their first drafts inside or outside of class. They were required to bring their drafts to the next class for peer response as prior training, after which they were given a week to revise their first drafts based on their peers’ feedback. When the revised versions were finished, they were handed in the teacher. The participants’ first drafts containing their peers’ written feedback and the peer response sheet containing peers’ response, comments, and suggestions, and their revised versions were collected for analysis.

When peer response activities were conducted in the classroom, the students were observed during interaction for the peer response sessions. It was conducted in four sessions of peer response activities as shown in the research schedule in Table 3.1. Then the questionnaire was distributed to the participants after they had completed the peer response sessions. Finally, the researcher held interview with the participants at the end of peer response sessions.

Table 3.1 Research Schedule

Weeks	Sessions of Peer Response	Types of Essay Writing	Topics
The 7 th week	I	Argumentative	<i>Provided topic</i> (it is provided by the teacher)
The 10 th week	II	Process	<i>Free topic</i> (it is based on students’ interest)
The 14 th week	III	Comparison and Contrast	<i>Free topic</i> (it is based on students’ interest)
The 16 th week	IV	Example	<i>Free topic</i> (it is based on students’ interest)

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

After collecting the data, the researcher then analyzed the data. The procedures for data analysis are through three steps of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verifying (Miles & Huberman, 1994:10).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 The Focused Areas of Peer Response

The analysis of the drafts of peer response revealed that the areas of peer response gained from each session of peer response activities focused on the students' error detection focusing much on grammatical aspects such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, etc., mechanic, and the essay structure such as introductory paragraph, body paragraph, concluding paragraph, and coherence as shown in Table 4.1.

Also, the observation result showed that when implementing peer group response the discussion between the writer and reviewer almost focused on the grammar aspect areas such as tenses, vocabulary, verbs, etc. In fact, verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, word order, mechanic, singular or plural form, spelling, and paragraph coherence were among the aspects that posed difficult for the students.

Additionally, the most aspect to be reviewed in peer response activities revealed in the students' responses to both the questionnaire (Table 4.3) and interview is about peer response in the area of grammar, as stated by ZA, "Yes, because grammar is the important thing in writing." Besides, an analysis of the interview transcription about the gains of participating in peer response revealed that the students preference for grammar correction and other grammatical aspects such as vocabulary as mentioned by MS, "Yes, because actually when my friend writes, there is some vocabulary not appropriate with the context. So, I repair it."

Table 4.1 The Focused Areas of Peer Response Activities

No	Focus	Session I	Session II	Session III	Session IV	Total Points
		Points	Points	Points	Points	
1	Introductory paragraph	12	6	11	6	35
2	Body paragraph	8	7	9	5	29
3	Concluding paragraph	6	1	5	2	14
4	Coherence	11	12	20	7	50
5	Unity	2	1	6	0	9
6	Verb tenses	22	21	9	7	59
7	Subject-verb agreement	24	10	18	8	60
8	Prepositions	5	5	0	7	17
9	Sentence structure	2	1	2	5	10
10	Vocabulary	8	6	1	2	17
11	Word order	7	7	10	10	34
12	Mechanic	18	8	16	18	60
13	Clause	7	4	2	3	16
14	Object of preposition	6	7	6	0	19
15	Modality	9	1	0	0	10
16	Verb phrase	4	3	0	0	7
17	Singular or plural form	3	10	9	6	28
18	Spelling	5	3	8	6	22
19	Article	2	1	2	2	7
20	Diction	1	3	0	0	4
21	Parallel structure	1	0	0	0	1

The findings suggest the idea that the students have felt grammar and essay structure were their major areas of difficulty in writing essay and the most important aspects of revision as well. As stated by Salih (2013:45), much of the attention of writer was given to grammar correctness. Also, as stated by Oshima & Hogue (2007:147), to have good essay student writers should master the concept of essay structure. Therefore, EFL students need to have a wider perception on language use in writing essay, to understand that grammar as an element in the text creation process, and to understand the concept of essay organization.

4.2 The Incorporation of Peer Response into Revisions

4.2.1 The Points of Peer Response Incorporated or not Incorporated into Revisions

The analysis of the revised version of the students' product in peer response activities showed that generally the students revised their drafts based on the peer response, so the points of peer response incorporated into revision in each session of peer response focused on grammatical aspect corrections and essay structure. As shown in Table 4.2, the points of peer response incorporated into revision were mostly in grammatical aspects and essay structure. In addition, few points of peer response were not incorporated into revision in each session of peer response. Most of the student writers had very much attention to the feedback from the peer response activities. A few points of peer response not incorporated into revision were in the aspects of mechanic, introductory paragraph, coherence, and clause. The students still got problems with these aspects.

Table 4.2 The Points of Peer Response Incorporated or not Incorporated into Revisions

No	Focus	Session I		Session II		Session III		Session IV		Total of Incorporation Points	
		Incorporation Points		Incorporation Points		Incorporation Points		Incorporation Points		Yes	No
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No		
1	Introductory paragraph	10	2	5	1	9	2	5	1	29	6
2	Body paragraph	7	1	6	1	7	2	5	0	25	4
3	Concluding paragraph	5	1	1	0	4	1	2	0	12	2
4	Coherence	8	3	10	2	18	2	6	1	42	8
5	Unity	2	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	8	1
6	Verb tenses	20	2	20	1	9	0	7	0	56	3
7	Subject-verb agreement	21	3	10	0	17	1	8	0	56	4
8	Prepositions	4	1	5	0	0	0	5	2	14	3
9	Sentence structure	2	0	1	0	2	0	4	1	9	1
10	Vocabulary	6	2	4	2	1	0	2	0	13	4
11	Word order	6	1	7	0	8	2	9	1	30	4
12	Mechanic	16	2	7	1	14	2	15	3	52	8
13	Clause	4	3	2	2	1	1	2	1	9	7
14	Object of preposition	5	1	6	1	6	0	0	0	17	2
15	Modality	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	2
16	Verb phrase	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	1
17	Singular or plural form	3	0	8	2	8	1	6	0	25	3
18	Spelling	4	1	3	0	8	0	5	1	20	2
19	Article	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	7	0
20	Diction	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
21	Parallel structure	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0

4.2.2 Why the Points of Peer Response are Incorporated or not Incorporated into Revisions

The analysis of interview revealed that points of peer response were incorporated into revision because it helped them write better in English and gave advantages in terms of grammar and essay structure. As said by ZA, *“Yes, I revise my essay in terms of grammar, structure, tenses, transitional words, because my friend helps me write better to improve my skill in writing.”* Other students said that the points of peer response were incorporated into revision because they respected feedback from her friend. As said by MS, *“Yes, I revise the grammatical pattern, vocabulary, and sentence structure. Because I respect it, it is my friend’s suggestion.”*

Meanwhile, the points of peer response were not incorporated into revision because it is not relevant with the students' writing. As said by MS, *“No, not all. Some of the suggestions of my friends are not used in my writing because they are not relevant with my writing. For example, my friend underlines the sentence of my writing, but my sentence is true. I think that my friends still*

don't understand the sentence."

4.3 The Suitability between Peer Response and Writer Expectation

The analysis of the questionnaire showed interesting findings of suitability between peer response and writer expectation. The findings pertain to students' or reviewers' response focus and students' or writers' expectation of peer responses to drafts. The results were shown and discussed under the following categories.

4.3.1 Tasks Performed by Reviewers

Table 4.3 delivers the respondents' score on tasks reviewers had to do in the peer response activities. It shows that in responding to item (1), the result reveals that all of the reviewers clarified about their ideas and meanings of their essay to the writers. In item (2), it is indicated that most of the reviewers evaluated by mainly focusing on grammar accuracy correction. Then analysis of item (3) says that the reviewers mostly commented on their peers' ideas and meanings and extend them as well. In exploring the clarity of their response to peers' writing and ideas (item 4), majority of the reviewers provided a set of clear correction by giving review symbols to peer's drafts. This result suggests that the students have developed positive attitude on peer response activities. Next, the reviewers evaluated peers' vocabulary use and suggested the corrections (item 5), and evaluated their peers' essay structure (item 6). Finally, the analysis of item (7) shows that they focused on correction of mechanical errors in the peer response activity. This finding provides evidence of the tendency of the focus when they are reviewing peer drafts in peer response activities.

Table 4.3 Reviewer Questionnaire Frequency Count and Percentage Equivalent

No	Tasks Performed by Reviewers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	Ask about peers' ideas and meanings of an essay	3 (25%)	9 (75%)			
2	Focus on grammar accuracy	6 (50%)	5 (42%)	1 (8%)		
3	Comment on peers' ideas and meanings, and extend them	2 (17%)	9 (75%)	1 (8%)		
4	Provide a set of clear correction by giving symbols	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	2 (17%)		
5	Evaluate peers' vocabulary use and suggest corrections	3 (25%)	7 (58%)	2 (17%)		
6	Evaluate peers' essay structure	4 (33%)	6 (50%)	2 (17%)		
7	Correct mechanical errors	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	1 (8%)		

4.3.2 Writer Expectation to Peer Response

Table 4.4 presents the respondents' score on the writer expectation to peer response on essay drafts. The analysis of the questionnaire has also focused on specific areas expected by the student writers to be evaluated by reviewers (items 8-14).

In terms of clarification of ideas and meanings (item 8), the result reveals more evidence of the tendency of the student writers to have their ideas of an essay evaluated by peers. For grammatical correctness (item 9), the result reveals that many of the respondents expressed their need for more response on grammar correction. For expectancy of idea development (item 10), it shows that ideas expansion and how to develop an essay are important aspect to be shared with peers. Meanwhile, in terms of provision of clear correction and review symbols (item 11), the finding indicates the importance of feedback clarity. This is very important in a sense that clear correction clues are deemed to facilitate revision and peer response incorporation. On the other hand, when peer response is provided in an ambiguous manner, the required points of peer response incorporation might not be fulfilled (Ferris & Rollinson in Salih, 2013:47).

Table 4.4 Questionnaire Frequency Count of Writer Expectation to Peer Response and Percentage Equivalent

No	Tasks Expected by Writers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8	Ask writer about ideas and meanings of an essay	2 (17%)	9 (75%)	1 (8%)		
9	Correct the grammatical errors	3 (25%)	8 (67%)	1 (8%)		
10	Comment on ideas and meanings, and extend them	6 (50%)	6 (50%)			
11	Provide a set of clear correction by giving symbols	4 (33%)	8 (67%)			
12	Evaluate vocabulary and make corrections	5 (42%)	6 (50%)	1 (8%)		
13	Evaluate the way to organize ideas	2 (17%)	9 (75%)	1 (8%)		
14	Correct mechanical errors	4 (33%)	8 (67%)			

In addition, when exploring the expectancy of the vocabulary use (item 12), the result indicates the student writers' willingness to share ideas with peers about the use of vocabulary. In terms of the way to organize ideas (item 13), the respondent stressed the importance of knowing how to organize ideas and develop a structured essay. In fact, idea development was ranked first in respondents' preference for receiving response from peers (Table 4.6). Finally, the study also investigated (item 14) the student writers' expectation of peer response on the mechanical features. This is also important for polishing essay drafts as asserted by Oshima & Hogue (2007:18), the emphasis on mechanical correction is one of the aims to polish the drafts of writing.

4.3.3 Writer Response to Peer Response

Table 4.5 indicates the respondents' score on the writer response to peer response on essay drafts. The analysis of the questionnaire has also focused on specific areas of writer response to peer response: rereading the ideas and meanings of an essay, correcting grammatical errors, paying attention to a set of clear correction and review symbols, checking and revising vocabulary use, reorganizing essay structure, and correcting mechanical errors (items 15-20).

Item (15) was designed to look into the student writers' response to peer response on ideas and meaning. The result indicates evidence of the tendency of the student writers to revise their ideas of an essay evaluated by peers. Moreover, in responding to item (16) about the grammar, most students paid great attention to grammar correction. The result reveals that the respondents' tendency to place grammar an important aspect in their essays. Meanwhile, responding to item (17) about attention to correction symbols, all students give great care. The finding indicates the importance of response clarity.

Table 4.5 Questionnaire Frequency Count of Writer Response to Peer Response and Percentage Equivalent

No	Tasks Responded by Writers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15	Reread ideas and meanings of an essay	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)		
16	Correct the grammatical errors	4 (33%)	7 (58%)	1 (8%)		
17	Pay attention to a set of clear correction by revising	4 (33%)	8 (67%)			
18	Check vocabulary use and revise	2 (17%)	9 (75%)	1 (8%)		
19	Reorganize the ideas of an essay	3 (25%)	7 (58%)	2 (17%)		
20	Correct mechanical errors	4 (33%)	8 (67%)			

Additionally, item (18) was designed to explore student writers' response to peer response on vocabulary use. The result really indicates the student writers' attention to the peers' evaluation about the use of vocabulary. In responding to item (19), the finding tells that the writer gave attention to reorganizing the idea after feedback given. Finally, it was investigated item (20), the student writers' response to peer response on the mechanical features. The result shows that the writers pay attention to correct their mechanical errors such as spelling, punctuation, etc.

4.3.4 Reviewer Focus and Writer Expectation of Peer Response

Table 4.6 presents reviewer focus and writer expectation of peer response. By combining the respondents' frequency in both "strongly agree" and "agree" in the questionnaire items (1-7) for reviewer focus and items (8-14) for writer expectation, the data were tabulated to show the rating of peer response patterns based on reviewer focus and writer expectation.

Table 4.6 Score and Percentages Rating of Reviewer Focus and Writer Expectation of Peer Response

No	Points	Reviewer		Writer	
		Strongly Agree and Agree	Rank	Strongly Agree and Agree	Rank
1	Respond to ideas and meanings of an essay	12 (100%)	1	11 (92%)	2
2	Focus on the grammatical errors	11 (92%)	2	11 (92%)	2
3	Advise idea development	11 (92%)	2	12 (100%)	1
4	Clear correction by giving symbols	10 (83%)	3	12 (100%)	1
5	Respond to vocabulary use	10 (83%)	3	11 (92%)	2
6	Evaluate essay organization	10 (83%)	3	11 (92%)	2
7	Correct mechanical errors	11 (92%)	2	12 (100%)	1

The table shows that the reviewers have selected responding to ideas and meanings of an essay as prime area of focus while the same areas were ranked second by student writers. The prime area of reviewer focus and as the second priority of the writer to responding ideas and meanings justify the instances negotiations of essay writing the researcher observed during the peer response sessions. This findings indicate that how the idea and meanings of a writing should be an important aspect in writing. On the other hand, students writers have selected advice of idea development, peer response clarity, and mechanic correction as the most important aspects expected to be evaluated by peers; giving them in the first rank in rating. The same areas were ranked second and third by response providers.

This result is interesting because it serves the study's question of whether there is writer expectation to peer response and whether peer response suits student writers' expectation. In fact, there is no perfect suitability of student writer expectation and response provided by peers as shown by the table. Although there is no perfectness of suitability of peer response and writer expectation, in an area they matched each other in terms of focusing on grammar accuracy. Additionally, rating grammar second between the areas of peer response and writer expectation is deemed realistic in a sense that L2 learners always perceive grammar as the most difficult area in the target language (Salih, 2013:47). As research in L2 reported grammar to be a difficult area for L2 learners (Sinyor in Salih, 2013:47). The L2 students of writing tend to be far for the conference in peer response activity and far for the collaborative writing in the writing class.

The table also tells that out of the grammar accuracy there were areas the reviewer focus on peer response such as focus on the idea development, and mechanical features were

in the second ranks. Meanwhile, in the same areas were ranked first by the student writers. This rating also showed that feedback for idea development and mechanical features becomes the respondents' expectation in peer response activities.

4.4 Writing Ability Improvement and Aspects of Writing Improved

4.4.1 Improvement of Students' Writing Ability

The scores gained by two raters were analyzed in terms of writing aspects—content (C), organization (O), grammar (G), and vocabulary (V). Based on the analysis, the findings show that the student' writing ability slightly improved. It was found that in writing expository essay the student writers achieved the mean score 56.00 in session I, 62.17 in session II, 71.08 in session III, and 80.50 in session IV (Table 4.7). From these findings, it means that the students' writing skill in writing expository essay in session I to session IV improved. It was shown from the students' achievement in producing essay indicated with the mean score of each peer response session.

In addition, the findings of the improvement of students' writing ability give evidence that the process of revisions using peer response activities led to the improvement of the student writers' writing ability. This improvement might be as result of their activities in producing essay through the process of writing supported by the technique of peer response in the stages of revising and editing. It is as stated by Stone (1990) and Liu & Hansen (2002), peer response is really applicable in the writing process particularly in the revising and editing stages.

Table 4.7 Score of the Students' Writing Products

Session	Writing Aspects	Students											
		AR	GR	TA	SN	MS	YU	TK	ZA	SF	ER	HAS	YUW
I	C	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	11	17
	O	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	17
	G	11	11	11	11	11	11	17	11	11	11	11	17
	V	17	17	11	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	17
	Total Score	62	62	56	44	62	62	50	44	62	44	56	68
	Mean	56.00											
II	C	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	22
	O	17	17	17	11	22	17	11	11	22	11	17	17
	G	11	11	17	11	22	11	11	17	17	11	17	17
	V	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	11	17	17
	Total Score	62	62	68	50	78	62	50	56	73	44	68	73
	Mean	62.17											
III	C	17	17	17	17	22	17	17	17	17	17	22	22
	O	17	17	17	17	22	17	11	17	22	17	22	22
	G	17	11	17	11	22	17	17	17	22	17	22	22
	V	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
	Total Score	68	62	68	62	83	68	62	68	78	68	83	83
	Mean	71.08											
IV	C	22	22	22	17	22	22	22	17	22	22	22	22
	O	22	22	22	17	22	17	17	17	22	22	22	22
	G	17	17	22	17	22	17	17	17	22	22	22	22
	V	17	22	22	17	22	17	22	17	22	17	17	22
	Total Score	78	83	88	68	88	73	78	68	88	83	83	88
	Mean	80.50											

4.4.2 Aspects of Writing Improved with Peer Response

The analysis of the improvement of each aspect of writing is shown in Table 4.8. It shows that most of the components of writing improved. It was indicated with the mean score of each component. The component of content was well improved from the mean score 14.50 in the first session to 21.17 in the last session. The percentage of improvement was about 55.56%. The component of organization was improved from the mean score 15.00 in the first session to 20.33 in the last session or about 44.44% of improvement. Meanwhile, the aspect of grammar was slightly improved from the mean score 12.00 in the first session to 19.50 in the fourth session or 62.50% of improvement. However, the aspect of vocabulary was little improved. It was from the mean score 14.50 in the first session to 19.50 in the last session. The percentage improvement was about 41.67%. This result serves evidence of the study’s question of what aspects of writing improved. In fact, the most aspect of writing highly improved was the aspect of grammar.

From these findings, it shows that the aspects of writing improved in all areas. However, they slightly improved in the aspects of content and grammar. It is in line with the peer response areas of the student writer focus. The areas are in ideas and meaning development and grammar accuracy.

Table 4.8 The Improvement of Writing Aspects of Students’ Writing Products

Writing Aspects	Session	Students												Mean Score	Improvement of Session I to IV
		AR	GR	TA	SN	MS	YU	TK	ZA	SF	ER	HA S	YU W		
Content	I	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	11	17	14.50	55.56%
	II	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	22	15.42	
	III	17	17	17	17	22	17	17	17	17	17	22	22	18.25	
	IV	22	22	22	17	22	22	22	17	22	22	22	22	21.17	
Organization	I	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	17	15.00	44.44%
	II	17	17	17	11	22	17	11	11	22	11	17	17	15.83	
	III	17	17	17	17	22	17	11	17	22	17	22	22	18.17	
	IV	22	22	22	17	22	17	17	17	22	22	22	22	20.33	
Grammar	I	11	11	11	11	11	11	17	11	11	11	11	11	12.00	62.50%
	II	11	11	17	11	22	11	17	17	17	11	17	17	14.92	
	III	17	11	17	11	22	17	17	17	22	17	22	22	17.67	
	IV	17	17	22	17	22	17	17	17	22	22	22	22	19.50	
Vocabulary	I	17	17	11	11	17	17	11	11	17	11	17	17	14.50	41.67%
	II	17	17	17	17	17	17	11	17	17	11	17	17	16.00	
	III	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17.00	
	IV	17	22	22	17	22	17	22	17	22	17	17	22	19.50	

5. Conclusion

It was found that the patterns of peer response to the peers’ works for revision were very interesting. The areas of peer response gained from each session of peer response activities focused much on the idea development, grammar, and mechanic. The points of peer response were incorporated into revisions because of its advantages to the developments of an essay in terms of grammar, essay structure and coherence, and were not incorporated into revisions because of irrelevant feedbacks. The suitable area between peer response and writer expectation was in terms of grammar accuracy. During peer response activities students engaged in the improvement of their writing ability, and the most improvements of the writing aspects were content and grammar.

Future research should examine other various patterns of peer response in writing class. Exploring various patterns of implementing peer response and teacher feedback is such kind of a topic to be investigated. Furthermore, applying media focusing on the use of ICT-based media in writing class seems to be interesting and more challenging to research.

References

- Al-Jamal, D. (2009). The Impact of Peer Response in Enhancing Ninth Grader's Writing Skill. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational & Psychologic Sciences*, 1(1): 13-40.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education*, 8th Ed. New York: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Bell, J.H. (1991). Using Peer Response Groups in ESL Writing Classes. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 8(2): 65-70.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative Research in Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cresswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. New York: International Educational and Professional Publisher.
- Farrah, M. (2012). The Impact of Peer Feedback on Improving the Writing Skills among Hebron University Students. *An-Najah University Journal Research (Humanities)*, 26(1): 180-210.
- Jahin, J.H. (2012). The Effect of Peer Reviewing on Writing Apprehension and Essay Writing Ability of Prospective EFL Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(11): 60-84.
- Liu J. & Hansen, J.G. (2002). *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mackey, A. & Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classroom: What do the Students Think. *ELT Journal*, 46(3): 274-284.
- Miles, M.B & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd Ed. California: Sage Publications.
- Mubarak, M.F. (2009). *Improving the Ability of the Third Year Students of MA Tarbiyatul Wathon Gresik in Writing Narrative Text through Peer Feedback*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Nelson, G.L. & Carson, J.G. (1998). ESL Students Perceptions of Effectiveness in Peer Response Groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(1): 113-131.
- Nelson, G.L. & Murphy, J.M. (1993). Peer Response Groups: Do L2 Writers Use Peer Comments in Revising their Drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1): 135-142.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing*, 3rd Ed. New York: Longman.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1): 23-30.
- Salih, A.R.A. (2013). Peer Response to L2 Student Writing: Patterns and Expectations. *English Language Teaching*, 6(3): 42-50.
- Smalley, R.L., Ruetten, M.K. & Kozyrev, J.R. (2001). *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric and Grammar*, 5th Ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Stone, J.M. (1990). *Cooperative Learning and Language Arts: A Multi-Structural Approach*. California: Resources for Teachers.
- Tang, G.M. & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer Response in ESL Writing. *TESL Canada Journal/La Revue TESL Du Canada*, 16(2): 21-38.
- Ting, M. & Qian, Y. (2010). A Case Study of Peer Feedback in a Chinese EFL Writing Classroom. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Bimonthly)*, 33(4): 87-98.
- Wakabayashi, R. (2008). The Effect of Peer Feedback on EFL Writing: Focusing on Japanese University Students. *OnCUE Journal*, 2(2): 92-110.
- Widiati, U. (2003). *Training EFL Writing Students in Indonesia in the Use of Strategies for Peer Response*. Unpublished Thesis. Monash: Monash University.



ISBN : 978-979-028-799-0

***Trends and Challenges
toward Asian Economic Community***

PROCEEDING

December 5th, 2015

**Auditorium
Prof. Slamet Dajono
Gedung D1 Lt.3 FMIPA**

Kampus Unesa Ketintang
Jl. Ketintang, Surabaya
Jawa Timur 60231

<http://icerd.unesa.ac.id>



ICERD 2015
International Conference
on Educational Research
and Development



***Trends and Challenges
toward Asian Economic Community***

PROCEEDING

December 5th, 2015

Auditorium
Prof. Slamet Djono
Gedung D1 Lt.3 FMIPA

Kampus Unesa Ketintang
Jl. Ketintang, Surabaya
Jawa Timur 60231

<http://icerd.unesa.ac.id>

Preface

Dear all ICERD participants, welcome to Surabaya, Indonesia. Welcome also to Universitas Negeri Surabaya. We are very glad to have you all, to participate in this conference.

In celebrating its 51st anniversary, The State University of Surabaya/Universitas Negeri Surabaya, proudly presents "The 2015 Internasional Conference on Educational Research and Development". The conference is conducted to bring together diversified ideas of researchers, educators, lecturers, teachers, students, and those who have interests in research on education and its development as well as on science and technology.

We are very honored to have Prof. Dr. Muhammad Nuh, DEA (former Republic of Indonesia Minister of Education and Culture, 2009 – 2014), Prof. Dr. Muchlas Samani (Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia), Prof. Dr. Fou-Lai Lin (National Taiwan Normal University), Prof. Dr. Bill Atweh (Adjunct Professor of Curtin University, Australia, and visiting Professor at Philippines Normal University), and Prof. Dato' Abdul Rahman B. Abdul Aziz, Ph.D (Universiti Utara Malaysia), and Dr. Zeny Reyes (Philippines Normal University) as keynote and plenary speakers.

To all our sponsors for this conference, Bank Tabungan Negara (Universitas Negeri Surabaya branch) and Telkom Divre 5 Surabaya, our thanks are also for you.

On behalf of the Organizing Committee and Steering Committee, I wish you all a blessed and productive time in our ICERD conference. God bless you all.

December 1, 2015
Surabaya

Arie Wardhono

Program Committee

Rooselyna Ekawati

Shofan Fiangga

Luqman Hakim

Rita Ismawati

Muhammad Jacky

Ibnu Febry Kurniawan

Dimas Maulana

Ali Mustofa

Arinto Nugroho

Didik Nurhadi

Agus Ridwan

Arie Wardhono

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

The State University of Surabaya

Table of Contents

Dormitory Teachers Education System: Improving the Education Quality of Students Teacher in Indonesia to Answer the Challenges of Asian Economics Community (AEC)	1
<i>Immanuel Adhitya Wulanata</i>	
The Analysis of English Language Education Students' Basic Teaching Skills during Listening and Speaking Microteaching in Groups	14
<i>Atalya Agustin and Asihlya Sandu</i>	
Literature Research in Indonesia, Ecopsychology Perspective	23
<i>Anas Ahmadi</i>	
Modiste: A Novel Method for Enhancing Video Streaming in E-learning	28
<i>Yeni Anistyasari</i>	
The Effect of Problem Based Learning Model for High School Student Geography Learning Outcomes	35
<i>Bejo Apriyanto</i>	
SIBI and BISINDO Which One is Better For Deaf and Mute People Education?	47
<i>Diyah Fatwati Arifah, Dian Eko Wicaksono, Quwwatun Azimah Mustajab and Miftah Wahyudia</i>	
CLIL and Its Feasibility to be implemented in Indonesia towards ASEAN Economic Community	56
<i>Silfia Asningtias</i>	
'Reform' Magazine: A Medium in Reforming Student-Author's Motivation In Writing English	57
<i>Prima Beauty Kartikasari</i>	
Surabaya Hinterland Area Development In Asean Economic Community	63
<i>Hendry Cahyono, Suci Rohayati, Achmad Yasin and Luqman Hakim</i>	
Industrial Area Development in East Java	70
<i>Norida Canda Sakti</i>	
Utilizing Business Model Canvas (BMC) to Develop Innovative Analysis in Culinary Business	71
<i>Clarashinta Cangghih, Sista Paramita and Tias Andarini Indarwati</i>	
The English Presentation on Business Plan Delivered by Economics Student of Unesa (A Case Study)	72
<i>Nur Chakim</i>	
The Role of "Ma'had Aly" in Building Students' Characters	87
<i>Haris Dibdyaningsih and Hendra Sudarso</i>	
Metacognitive Activity in Conjecturing Process in Problem Solving of pattern Generalization	91
<i>Intan Dwi Hastuti, Sutarto, Subanji, Toto Nusantara and Hery Susanto</i>	
The Analysis of Multimedia Elements in PowerPoint Presentation (A Study towards Student Teachers of Economics Education)	103
<i>Yanuard Dwikristanto</i>	
Develop Learning Equipment Using CTL (Contextual Teaching And Learning) Model Assisted By PhET Software	112
<i>Friske Fazet and Nahindi Putra Gitama</i>	
Synthesis Al-UiO-66-NH2 with Acetic Acid Modulator by Solvothermal Method	119
<i>Embun Rachma Haqiqi and Ratna Ediati</i>	
Improving Soft Skills by Applying Model Centered Learning the Students For Students to SMK Kartika 1 Surabaya Program Accounting Expertise	126
<i>Han Tantri Hardini, Susanti Susanti and Mohammad Taufiq</i>	

Short Movie as tools for Learning Sociology	135
<i>Grendi Hendrastomo, Poerwanti Hadi Pratiwi and Garry Cantona</i>	
Trends and Challenges of Integrated Mentoring Support for Novice Teachers' Professionalism: A Case Study of a "Lesson Study" Program in an Indonesian Secondary School	149
<i>Siti Nurul Hidayah, Noelene Weatherby-Fell and Meeta Chatterjee Padmanabhan</i>	
Optimizing the Existence of Micro, Small, Medium Business Entrepreneurs as the Central of Industry in Facing ASEAN Economic Community Based on Local Wisdom (Optimizing Micro, Small, Medium Business of Madura's Snacks Business)	160
<i>Yetti Hidayatillah</i>	
Synthesis and Characterization UiO-66 and Sn-UiO-66 by Solvothermal Method	173
<i>Dwi Ima Hikmawati and Ratna Ediati</i>	
Some Contributing Factors to the Students' English Achievemenent	181
<i>Tanzil Huda</i>	
The Influence of Problem Based Learning Model to Geography Learning Output of Senior High School Students	191
<i>Fahrudi Ikhsan</i>	
Nutritional and Quality Analysis of Kelor (Moringa oliefera) Beverage	206
<i>Rita Ismawati</i>	
21st Century English Education: High Order Thinking Skills and Technology Support	215
<i>Uswatun Khasanah</i>	
Multicultural Learning Model	225
<i>Masri Kudrat, Mohamad Jahja and Tirtawaty Abdjul</i>	
The Intercultural Sensitivity of Vocational High School English Teachers	228
<i>Dian Maya Kurnia and Nine Febrie Novitasari</i>	
The Influence of Group Investigation Learning Model towards the Learning Motivation of Geography Students in Senior High School	229
<i>Fahmi Arif Kurnianto</i>	
The Effect students' perceptions of teachers teaching style and student learning styles of student learning outcomes on economic subjects	243
<i>Riza Yonisa Kurniawan, Sukma Nur Andita, Luqman Hakim and Retno Mustika Dewi</i>	
The Study of Ruthenium Dyes Endowed with Alkyl Chain for DSSC Sensitizer	251
<i>Yuly Kusumawati, Thierry Pauportè, Muhamad Abdulkadir Martoprawiro, Bambang Prijamboedi and Cynthia Linaya Radiman</i>	
Teacher Performance Based on Stress and Organizational Commitment	259
<i>Nur Laily and Dewi Urip Wahyuni</i>	
Influence Perceived of Usefulness of Self-Efficacy With Attitude to Mediation Aplicom	271
<i>Agung Listiadi</i>	
Analysis on the Abality of Elementary School Student Who Had High Mathematics Ability in Making The Equation of Fractions	287
<i>Syarifatul Maf'ulah, Dwi Juniati and Tatag Yuli Eko Siswono</i>	
The Quality of the Production of Methyl Ester from Jatropha Curcas lin Using Catalyst of H ₂ SO ₄	296
<i>Muhaji Mangil</i>	
Development Material Teaching Subject of Introduction of Administration and Management in University	304
<i>Novi Marlana and Renny Dwijayanti</i>	

Developing Instructional Program of Public Economic Subject Using Exelsa Moodle	319
<i>Kurnia Martikasari</i>	
Peer Response in an Indonesian EFL Writing Class: A Case Study	320
<i>M. Zaini Miftah</i>	
Use of Project Based Learning Model to Improve Creativity Class XI Subject to the Installation of Electricity 5 SMKN in Surabaya	332
<i>Akhmad Mujibur, Mohammad Taufiq, Ainur Rois and Nisa Rahmaniya</i>	
Biology Teachers' Self Perception on Pedagogical Competence	339
<i>Kukuh Munandar and Tanzil Huda</i>	
A Critical Review of Empirical Research in Enviromental Education	345
<i>Uning Musthofiyah and Malikhatul Lailiyah</i>	
Toward a Bright Future of Socio-Political Trends in Literary and Cultural Studies in Asia: Its Development and Impacts In Asian Educational Backgrounds	352
<i>Ali Mustofa</i>	
Facilitating Authentic Language Learning Through Theatrical Activities	357
<i>Lailatul Musyarofah and Muhammad Fadeli</i>	
"Let's Speak!": Utilizing Voxopop to Enhance Speaking Skill	365
<i>Arif Nugroho</i>	
Exploring Students' Use of Communication Strategies	373
<i>Him'Mawan Adi Nugroho and Nur Chakim</i>	
Prosocial and Risk-Taking Level on Teaching Intentions in Remote Areas (A Study on Students of Elemantary School Teacher in East Java)	385
<i>Sakinah Nur Rokhmah, Suciatma Umiasih and Ummu Imaroh</i>	
The Implementation of Metacognition-Based Information and Communication Technology (ICT) In Vocational Education	391
<i>Luthfiyah Nurlaela and Igp Asto Buditjahjanto</i>	
Zone of Promoted Action (ZPA) of Elementary School Teacher in Mathematics Learning	398
<i>Jauhara Dian Nurul Iffah, Akbar Sutawidjaja, Cholis Sa'Dijah and Subanji</i>	
The Urgency of Gen Z Economic Education	407
<i>Finisica Patrikha</i>	
Board Game as a Media to Increase Students' Speaking Skill	412
<i>Fitra Pinandhita and Rahardian Kusumawardhani</i>	
Developing Taxation Learning Model by Using Animated Media to Enhance Students' Comprehension	424
<i>Dewi Pratiwi, Made Dudy Satyawana and Eko Wahjudi</i>	
"Let's Write a Caption!": Utilizing Instagram to Teach Generation Y	448
<i>Dian Pratiwi and Miftachul Rohmah</i>	
Social Studies Teacher Role in the Development of Pattern Learning System Facing AEC 2015	456
<i>Jossapat Prijanto</i>	
Developing Language Games for Teaching English to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 1 Tulungagung	467
<i>Anik Purwani</i>	
A Proposed Syllabus for Computer and Networking Technology Students of Vocational High School at Jember	475
<i>Areta Puspa and Pebrina Pirmani</i>	