

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING WRITTEN PEER RESPONSE TO TEACH WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT IN ELEVENTH GRADER OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Deny Yanuarseh

092084005

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya

email: deny.yanuar91@gmail.com

Dosen Pembimbing:

Dr. Oikurema Purwati, M.Apl

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Menulis merupakan salah satu aspek penting dalam pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris. Namun realitanya di Indonesia, kemauan dan kemampuan menulis siswa SMA belum mencapai level yang maksimal sehingga nilai siswa pada tugas menulis dalam Bahasa Inggris lebih rendah jika dibandingkan dengan kemampuan siswa pada aspek berbicara, mendengarkan juga membaca. Berdasarkan masalah tersebut, studi ini dirancang untuk mengetahui keefektifan penggunaan teknik respon tertulis dari teman sebaya pada pembelajaran menulis teks *hortatory*. Studi ini termasuk dalam studi eksperimental kuantitatif dan penelitian statistik dengan menggunakan rumus *t-test*. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan dalam studi ini adalah nilai dari *pre-test* dan *post-test*. *Pre-test* dilaksanakan sebelum teknik tersebut diaplikasikan sedangkan *post-test* dilaksanakan setelah teknik tersebut diaplikasikan. Setelah melalui tahap penghitungan secara statistik pada nilai siswa, hasil menunjukkan bahwa kemampuan menulis siswa lebih baik dari pada sebelumnya.

Kata Kunci: Menulis, Respon tertulis, Teks *Hortatory*

Abstract

Writing is one of important skill in English learning. The reality in Indonesia, the willingness and ability of students' writing in Senior High School are not in the excellent level so the students' score in English writing task is lower than in speaking, listening and reading. Dealing with the problem, this study was designed to find out the effectiveness of using written peer response in the teaching writing hortatory exposition text. This study is experimental research which uses quantitative data and statistical form using *t-test* to calculate the result. The instruments of this study were *pre-test* and *post-test* scores. *Pre-test* is administered before the treatment and *post-test* is administered after the treatment. From the statistic calculation on students' score, the results showed that the students' writing ability is better than before.

Keywords: Writing, Written Peer Response, Hortatory Exposition Text

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, globalization demands Indonesian students to be able to master English. From four English skills, writing is the most difficult skill to learn. It is because writing consists of some process they are gathering ideas, drafting, reviewing, revising and writing again. The student need to express their idea into an English good composition and understandable by the readers. The problem is the teacher has limited time to look at the detail of students' writing, give feedback and return the draft immediately. For consequences, the

students can not revise their writing and produce better writing because of less feedback.

Feedback in writing is important part, considering the fact above some techniques is needed as the solution of that problem. One of them is peer feedback. Peer feedback is defined as feedback that is given by peer (Yang in Zeng 2006). In this research, since the writers are the students, peer feedback is understood as having other students to read and to give comments, corrections, criticism, and suggestion on what other students have written (Zainurrahman 2010).

The use of peer feedback or peer response can reduce

the teacher's load in the class and very valuable in helping the writers get the reviewer or reader to their written work (Nation 2009). There are two kinds of peer feedback: oral and written peer feedback. For writing class the most relevant feedback is in the written form (Harmer 2002) Written peer feedback encourages the writer to produce better writing based on their peer comments and suggestions.

Regarding the objective of teaching English in senior high school in Indonesia, the students have to be prepared for higher education level in the university. The students have to be able to develop communication competence in oral and written form (Pusat Kurikulum 2003). In the writing activity the students how to compose a good written text based on the context and genre. There are many kinds of genre which is taught in senior high school but the students mostly get the difficulties in composing hortatory exposition text. Hortatory exposition text is taught in the eleventh grader.

This study was design to find out the effectiveness of using written peer response in the teaching writing hortatory exposition text. Because of some positive influence of written peer response in writing which has conducted in the previous researched, the researcher hopes this technique success to be applied in this study. Especially in the senior high school level.

Hortatory exposition text is the exposition text that argues about something should be or should not be done (Pardiyono, 2007). The generic structure of the text consists of thesis, argument and recommendation. The thesis states the writer's statement of her/ his position about certain problem. Elaborate the background reasons of the problem. The argument; usually more than two arguments elaborate the facts to support her/his statements in the thesis. The recommendation contains a suggestion, advice, recommendation or statement of what ought to or ought not to happen (Pardiyono, 2007).

The procedures of written peer response in writing hortatory exposition text are adapted from the process of writing. The first step is planning stage, the students gathering the ideas based on the topic given and make outline. The second step is drafting stage, the students elaborate the outline become a rough draft composition. The third step is responding stage where the peer gives the written feedback of their peer draft. Besides, peer also gives comments and suggestions to compose better written composition later. The forth step is revising and editing stages, in this stage the writer evaluate their mistakes and errors based on their peer's written response from the previous stage. The final step is evaluating stage where the teacher is able to give comments and instructive response to the students writing. The teacher is able to give the score then give it back to the writer

immediately.

A number of studies reported that the providing peer feedback increase the motivation to produce better writing because there was the presence of audience who helps the writer recognizing the mistakes and errors from the draft. As Kamimura (2006) states the advantages using peer response are: peer feedback had a positive effect on both high and low-proficient students' writing performance, peer comment brought significant improvement to the rewrites produced by the students with high as well as low English proficiency levels as compared to their original drafts. Peer comments led the low-proficient students to produce longer rewrites compared to their original drafts.

Another study is done by Bartels (2003), he stated that written peer response has many advantages, they are: It creates an interested audience for students' writing. The best reason to provide peer response in written, rather than spoken, is to create an opportunity for communicative writing. The writers' receive the written peer comments because they want to do better on their second draft. Thus, there is a sense of audience felt by both writers and reviewers that enables all of the students to understand the purpose of the writing process more profoundly, perhaps, than they do with most of their writing assignments. It provides instant response and negotiation of meaning. Bartels (2003:35) finds that when students get written response to their writing, they spontaneously request clarification, ask question and eve argue about the response, giving their peer instant response and excellent opportunity for negotiation. Every student gives and receives peer response. If a student misses class the day that oral peer response is dine, she does not receive any response on her writing and misses the opportunity to give feedback to her peers. With written peer response, students can still give and receive response, even if they miss class. Giving this responsibility to students may also foster learner independence. Monitoring peer response is easy with written response. Using written peer response makes it much easier to monitor what each student says, which helps the teacher spot areas where a student need practice and improvement, either in their writing or their response. Written peer responses also help teacher check if the students are giving the proper type of response and can provide actual examples of positive and negative response.

This study will be advantageous for English lecturers and teachers as well as educational practitioners. For English lecturers and teachers, this study will give input to teach writing in any level especially in Senior High School. By describing how the results of the use of peer response in writing ability, English teachers will know

how to apply the technique in the classroom. For educational practitioners and researchers, this study will be a reference to other researches on teacher's teaching strategy. Teaching English will be more interactive and innovative in the class.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A research method used in this study is experimental research. It is conducted to find out whether there was significant writing ability for eleventh graders students' written text of hortatory exposition. Ary, et al (1985:247) states that the experiment is the event planned and carried out by researcher to gather evidence relevant to the hypothesis. The data is presented in quantitative manner. And the hypothesis is tested using t-test technique.

Furthermore, pre test- post test control group design is considered to be the most appropriate design in the experimental research. This design includes three activities; they are administering the pre test, applying the treatment to the group, and then administering the post-test (Mc. Millan, 1992:174). The result of the design is the comparison between the scores in the pre test or the scores got before the treatment is done to the group and the scores gained after the treatment is applied to the group.

Population and Sample

The population of the research is a group of people which share the same of characteristics. Mc. Millan (1992: 69) states that the population is a group of persons to which the researcher intends to generalize the result of the research. Ary, et al (1985: 138) states that the small group that is observed is called sample and the larger group about the generalization is made is called population. The population of this research is the eleventh grader students of the Senior High School students in Mojokerto. The researcher takes eleventh graders of natural science 1 and 3 as the sample of the research.

Research Instruments

The instruments of this study were pre-test and post-test scores. The first instrument in this study was pre-test which was used to obtain the writing scores from the students before the treatment. The students were asked to write hortatory exposition text. The topic that has been determined by the teacher is about smoking, the students were given chances to finish their essay in 50 minutes.

Second, there was post-test scores. The post-test scores were used to compare the significance different of

students' ability after the treatment given. The topic was the same topic as the pre-test.

Data Collection Technique

The way to collect data in this research was by administering test. In this research, the data were collected in two phases of time. The first phase, the instrument which is used to collect the data is pre test. This pre test is conducted by the researcher to know the scores of subjects before the treatment is given to them. The pre test is also administered to the control group. After the pre test was given to the students, the next was to give the treatments that were the use of the written peer response to teach writing hortatory exposition text to the experimental group. The treatment was given in two meetings. The control group was also given the treatments, but without the use of written peer response. The control group also got the treatment that was the process of learning as usually they got in the class. The second phase, the instrument which was used to collect the data was post test. The post test was administered after the treatment given to the experimental and control group as well. The aim of administering post test was to know the progress of students' writing performance of experimental group after the treatment was given to them.

In both pre test and post test, students were asked to write hortatory exposition text. The time needed in these two different times of test was ninety minutes. After the test was administered to the students, the next step to collect the data was scoring the students result of the test. The last step of data collection was calculating students' scores. After the data were calculated, the next was comparing the students' scores in the pre test and post test of experimental group and control group by using statistical analysis.

Data Analysis Technique

The data in this research is analyzed in the quantitative way which means the data is described in the form of number. The data are analyzed based on the data collected from the instruments of the research. From the result of the pre test and post test that have been done by students, the researcher get the students' scores gained from the writing test in the form of Hortatory Exposition text. The data analysis technique uses t-test formula.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This research was conducted to find out whether there is significant difference between the students' writing ability which taught writing hortatory exposition text using written peer response and those taught without

written peer response in Senior High School.

Therefore, the results presented were the results of the students' pre-test and post-test of both control and experimental groups. Later, based on the results of the pre-test and the post-test of both groups, the effectiveness of "Written Peer Response" in teaching writing hortatory exposition text to the eleventh graders was examined. In this study, the results of both pre-test and post-test were divided into five areas: in terms of content, organisation, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. It was done to find more specific result of the effectiveness of this technique.

The Result of Pre-test of Experimental and Control Group

A pre-test was conducted to assess the students' writing ability before the treatment. It was given for both experimental and control groups. The result of the pre-test of the experimental and the control groups was presented in the following table.

Table 1. Pre-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

G	N	\bar{X}	S	S_{Dx}	t-value	Df	t_{05}	Explanation
E	33	73.7	5.07	1.45	1.17	63	2.0	Not Significant
C	32	72.0	6.52					

The table above shows that the means of experimental group was higher than control group in pre test (See Appendix 7). The mean score of experimental group was 73.7 while the mean score of control group was 72.0. However, the pre test mean score of both groups were nearly the same as the difference only 1.7 with the t-value (1.17) that was lower than the t-table (2.00). Those indicate that the students' ability of both groups was not significantly difference in the students' ability of both groups before the treatment was given.

The Result of Post-test of Experimental and Control Group

After the treatment was done, the researcher conducted the post-test. The post-test was administered for both experimental and control group. It was conducted to find out the students' achievement after the experiment was given to them. The result of the post-test of the experimental and the control group was presented in the following table.

Table 2. Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups

G	N	\bar{X}	S	S_{Dx}	t-value	Df	t_{05}	Explanation
E	33	84.94	4.36	2.1	2.98	63	2.0	Significant
C	32	78.69	11.4					

Based on the table the mean of the experimental group was 84.94. It increased 11.24 point from 73.7 to 84.94. The mean of control group also increased 6.69 point from 72.0 to 78.69. It concluded that the scores of both groups had improved. However, the increasing mean of the experimental group was higher than the control group.

Results of The Elements of The Students' Composition

The terms of content consisted of the development of ideas, assigning topic and rational material. In the written work of students' hortatory exposition text the researcher calculated the t-value of both group in terms of content, the t-value of pre-test and post-test (2.55) was higher than the t-table (2.00) which is meant that there was significant different between the students' writing ability of experimental and control group after the treatment. It indicates that the written peer response is effective way to teach writing hortatory exposition text. The technique helps the students compose better writing in the post test in experimental group.

The organization is about the unity and coherence. Every good paragraph has unity, which means that only one main idea is discussed, and the movement and transition from one sentence to another (or from one paragraph to the next) must be logical and smooth. The terms of organization itself contain the structure of hortatory exposition text (thesis, arguments, and recommendation). From the calculation the researcher found that the t-value of both group in terms of organization, the t-value of pre-test and post-test (2.79) was higher than the t-table (2.00) which is meant that there was significant different between the students' writing ability of experimental and control group after the treatment. It indicates that the written peer response is effective way to teach writing hortatory exposition text. The technique helps the students compose better writing in the post test in experimental group in the terms of organisation.

The vocabulary assessment is about the sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, and appropriate register which used in the text. The researcher calculated the t-value of both group in terms of vocabulary, the t-value of pre-test and post-test (3.33) was higher than the t-table (2.00) which is meant that there was significant different between the students' writing ability of experimental and control group after the

treatment. It indicates that the written peer response is effective way to teach writing hortatory exposition text. The technique helps the students compose better writing in the post test in experimental group in the terms of vocabulary.

. In the terms of language use, the assessment focus on the effectiveness, complex construction, few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition used in the written work. The most important point in language use in hortatory exposition text is the use of modal (should, must and so on) as the words of suggestion in the recommendation. The researcher calculated the t-value of both group in terms of language use, the t-value of pre-test and post-test (2.93) was higher than the t-table (2.00) which is meant that there was significant different between the students' writing ability of experimental and control group after the treatment. It indicates that the written peer response is effective way to teach writing hortatory exposition text. The technique helps the students compose better writing in the post test in experimental group.

Mechanics assessment focus on demonstrates mastery of conventions, error of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing in the written work. The researcher calculated the t-value of both group in terms of language use, the t-value of pre-test and post-test (2.29) was higher than the t-table (2.00) which is meant that there was significant different between the students' writing ability of experimental and control group after the treatment. It indicates that the written peer response is effective way to teach writing hortatory exposition text. The technique helps the students compose better writing in the post test in experimental group. For

the writers to write. As Kamimura (2006) stated, peer feedback had a positive effect on both high- and low-proficient students' writing performance in terms of overall essay quality.

Therefore, in order to prove the theory of the positive effect of "Written Peer Response Technique" used in the writing classroom, the researcher had conducted en experimental research related to that technique. This design includes three activities; they are administering the pre test, applying the treatment to the group, and then administering the post-test (Mc. Millan, 1992:174). At the beginning of this study, the researcher did the pre-test to both experimental and control groups. Then, based on the result of t-calculation of the pre-test scores, it showed that the t-value was lower than $t_{.05}$ (See Appendix 7). It means that there was not significant difference in the students' writing ability between the experimental and the control groups.

The treatment called "Written Peer Response Technique" to teach writing hortatory exposition text was given to the experimental group. Meanwhile, the control group was taught by using direct writing in which the researcher asked them to them to write directly at that time and submitted the work to the researcher and then was assessed.

Finally, at the end of this study, the researcher administered the post-test. The post-test was done to investigate the effect of the treatment that has applied in the teaching process, whether there was an improvement or not. Then, based on the t-test calculation of the post-test scores, it showed that the t-value was higher than $t_{.05}$ (See Appendix 8). It means that there was a significant difference in the writing ability between the experimental and control groups.

Table 3. The Increasing Score of Students' Writing

Element of Writing	Control		Experimental		t-value	t-table	Difference
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
Content	22.73	24.66	23.12	25.85	2.55	2.0	SIGNIFICANT
Organization	15.18	16.53	15.84	17.58	2.79		
Vocabulary	14.56	15.84	14.94	17.51	3.33		
Language Use	16.75	18.56	16.88	20.33	2.93		
Mechanics	2.66	3.06	2.91	3.64	2.29		
Total score	72.00	73.73	78.69	84.94	2.95		

Discussion

Some researches findings reported that the use of "Written Peer Response Technique" in writing activity contributed positively towards the students' achievement in writing. It would increase the ability and motivation of

The significant improvement of the experimental group was influenced by the treatment which was given to the students' writing ability. It was necessary to analyse how the treatments work so that it was effective to improve the students' ability in any components of writing. In the next meeting, the researcher introduced and explained to the students how "Written Peer Response Technique" was. This technique focused on the collaboration between peer to response each other written work in order to produce better writing for the next task. Written Feedback is considered as effective way to give response to the written work. Giving responds help the student write more successfully in the next stage. When we respond, we say how the text appears to us and how successful we think it has been and sometimes, how it could be improved (Harmer 2002).

In this study, the researcher applied the technique to teach writing hortatory exposition text which needs logical reasons and critical thinking to elaborate the thesis

into several arguments, and then provide the appropriate recommendation in the end of the text. The students was divided into five groups consist of five to six members. They were given sheet to write the responses and comments of their peer written work then give it back to the original writer. The original writer revised the work based on the response sheet which has filled by their peer in the group.

The latest step of “Written Peer Response Technique” was the teacher’s evaluation. The students submitted the work and the teacher scored them. From the evaluation, the researcher found that significant improvement in applying the technique in the writing class. Teo (2006) in <http://iteslj.org/> states that peer response activity consists of several steps and the last step is teacher’s evaluation.

Written peer response technique helps the students to revise their work in writing hortatory exposition text into better one especially in terms of organization and vocabulary. In terms of organization, the students improve their ability to state their ideas clearly and use logical sequencing on their revised work after the treatment. In the terms of vocabulary, the students also achieved better performance. At first, the students’ common errors are they choose inappropriate word to express their ideas but they are able to use effective word/idiom choice and usage, word form mastery, appropriate register in their writing after the treatment. The students also improved their ability in writing in the terms of language use and mechanics as explained before. As Kamimura (2006) stated peer comment brought significant improvement to the rewrites produced by the students with high as well as low English proficiency levels as compared with their original drafts.

In this study, there were some factors that might influence the success of the study. The first was the preparation before the treatment was given to the experimental group. It made the teaching process had done effectively and efficiently.

The second factor was the social interaction built by the students. In this research, the students had known each other and felt comfortable working together. They responded their peer’s work enthusiastically.

The third factor was they were motivated to do the new technique used in writing text because the teacher had not applied this technique. The teacher used to applied direct writing technique to teach the students. And they rarely get the feedbacks of their writing; they only get the score and less feedback in their paper. By applying written peer response technique, the students get the feedback immediately and revise their work soon.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

After conducting the research on the effectiveness of “Written Peer Response Technique”, it could be seen that there was a different result between the experimental and the control groups. The students who were taught writing hortatory exposition text by using that technique achieved higher scores than those who were taught without using that technique.

Based on the result of this study, the researcher concluded that the t-value in terms of content (2.55), organisation (2.79), vocabulary (3.33), language use (2.93) and mechanics (2.29), were higher than the t-table (2.00). It means that there was a significant difference of writing ability between the students who was taught writing hortatory exposition text using written peer response and those who was not in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics.

Overall, the difference of both groups’ scores was significant difference since the t-value (2.95) was higher than the t-table (2.00). Thus, the researcher concluded that the treatments had influenced significantly on the students’ achievement. It can be concluded that the use of “Written Peer Response Technique” for teaching writing was effective, especially in teaching writing hortatory exposition text to the eleventh graders of senior high school.

Suggestions

Based on the results, after conducting the experiment, analyzing the data and discussing the result, the researcher gives some suggestion to those who are related to the result of this study, the English lecturers and teachers, educational practitioners and future researchers.

The study proved that “Written Peer Response Technique” was effective to improve the students’ writing ability. So, the researcher suggests that the English teacher use this technique in teaching writing, especially hortatory exposition text. However, before deciding to apply this technique, the teacher might deal with some considerations. The first consideration is that the teacher has to prepare the lesson plan, time management, and well-prepared procedure related to the written peer response technique. It is because the researcher found that one of the major successful keys of applying this technique was design the steps such as in the previous explanation about the procedures of written peer response technique. The second consideration is the procedures to apply the whole activities of written peer response technique. There will be a tendency that the students are bored. Thus, the teachers should be creative to encourage the students keep writing and follow the instructions.

Besides, the teacher should choose the appropriate topics based on their level of difficulty and interests and in line with the curriculum.

For English lecturers, this technique could be applied in higher level because it considered enhancing the writing ability of the university students. Another suggestion for educational practitioners and researchers concerns that a research on the use of written peer response technique will be conducted again. It is recommended that they use different kinds of text and also different level of students.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D. et al. (1985). *Introduction to Research in education, third ediion*. New York: CBS College Publishing
- Bartels, Nat. (2003). *Written Peer Response in L2 Writing*. English Teaching Forum
- Harmer, J. (2002). The Practice of English Language Teaching. England, Longman.
- Kamimura, T. (2006). "Effects of Peer Feedback on EFL Student Writers at Different Levels of English Proficiency: A Japanese Context." TESL CANADA JOURNAL 23(2).
- McMillan, James H. (1992). *Educational Research, Fundamental for The Consumer*. Virginia: Harper Collins publisher
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York, Routledge: 184.
- Pardiyono. (2007). *Pasti Bisa! Teaching Genre-Based Writing*. Yogyakarta: ANDI
- Pusat Kurikulum, B. D. (2003). "STANDAR KOMPETENSI." 1-93.
- Teo, A. L. K. (2006). "Using a Peer Assisted Writing Activity to Promote ESL/EFL Students' Narrative Writing Skills." The Internet TESL Journal XII(8)
- Zainurrahman. (2010). *Teaching Writing through peer feedback*. Retrieved March 3, 2013 from <http://www.articlesbase.com/languages-articles/teaching-writing-through-peer-feedback-2731309.html>
- Zeng, Yanhong. 2006. *Peer Feedback in College SLW Classroom*. *Sino-US English Teaching*, ISSN 1539-8072, USA. Mar. 2006, Volume 3, No.3 (Serial No.27)