

Peer Editing Strategy: Key to Successful Academic Writing

Airis Kim M. Codiñera

Abstract: This study assessed the effectiveness of peer editing strategy for Senior High School students engaged in English academic writing classes at University of Cebu-Banilad Campus, Banilad, Cebu City, S.Y. 2019-2020.

The study employed a quasi-experimental design. There were 40 Grade 12 STEM students involved in this study. These subjects were grouped into two heterogeneous groups: the control and experimental groups. The experimental group was intervened with the use of peer editing strategy while the control group was taught with the traditional method of teaching or the usual class discussion. The instrument utilized was the standardized scoring rubric to assess the performances of both groups of subjects. There is a significant difference between the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups. The findings showed that students who were intervened by peer editing strategy had *very good* performances; while the students who had traditional method of teaching had *good* performances. Thus, peer editing has significantly enhanced the students' performances in academic writing.

The study concluded that the peer editing strategy helps to improve one's academic skills in writing with the integration of collaborative effort is effective. Furthermore, not only is this strategy a tool for engaged learning activity but also a technique to improve students' cognitive and metacognitive skills.

Keywords: Academic Writing, Peer Editing, Heterogeneous groups, Quasi-Experimental

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a mode of communication that allows students to express their feelings and ideas on paper, to establish their understanding and principles into substantial arguments, and to convey meaning through well-constructed text. Writing skill plays an important role in communication. Good writing skill encourages students to communicate their message with clarity and simplicity to a far larger audience than through personal or telephone conversations.

In communicative language teaching, writing holds a key part of learning a language because students sit down for analysis to prove their competency by writing accurately. As students learn the process of writing from simple to complex sentences, there are also things that students need to consider. Spelling, vocabulary, grammar and organization stand together to help the student exhibit more advanced writing skills. However, the union of skills is a very complex process and there are few for whom these skills develop easily.

In some countries, English is taught as a compulsory subject from primary to higher secondary level. Even the English language has been adopted as a medium of instruction in all private universities because English has become the medium of a great deal of the world's knowledge. Nonetheless, the frustrating news is that, most of the students at the secondary level are very weak in writing skills. Many private universities offer different English language courses along with the core courses in various departments to teach writing as a skill. The objective of these courses is to sharpen learner's language skills for academic, professional or personal purposes.

However, the outcome is unsatisfactory. Most of the students are unable to write effectively. It is more challenging teaching writing in English language especially to students who would like to get average marks in this course. It shows their lack of interest that hinder their academic progress. They are unmotivated, feel burdened and daunted in the English language classroom. The reasons above justify that writing skill to high school students is really problematic.

Writing plays a crucial role in the field of work especially to senior high school STEM students who have writing classes in English. In this way, they will be more motivated to take any course they would like when they go to college. They have to inculcate in their minds that a professional individual should know how to validate and write everything properly. Proper writing shows that students can communicate in a professional manner. An individual should know how to express thoughts about his or her observations through professional writing. For instance, a lot of nursing students and professional nurses have experienced some problems in such type of writing as it requires special writing skills. Besides perfect knowledge of this discipline, they should establish their notions and observations appropriately.

According to the National Association of Colleges and Employers (2016), 73.4% of employers want a candidate with strong written communication skills. That is because being a good writer is about more than having clear writing. Clear writing is a sign of clear thinking. Great writers know how to communicate. Recent research proves that written communication skills are at the top of employers' wish lists. Written communication was the number three most desired quality overall, behind leadership skills and ability to work as a team member.

Thus, this study is undertaken to determine the effectiveness of peer editing strategy in improving students' writing skills where they learn a great deal about how to lay information together and express ideas excellently. The researcher, who is a teacher by profession, has been teaching academic writing throughout her teaching career. It has been observed that students are struggling to organize and grammatically structure their ideas in writing. Therefore, the researcher would explore the effectiveness of peer editing strategy, as means to improve students' organizational skills in academic writing. The findings of this study will be used as basis for a proposed program level intervention plan to improve their academic performance in writing.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Writing is considered to be a productive skill and useful tool for learning process. It is the most utilized skill in assessing students' performance in almost all levels of education. The researcher would like to deal more on the effectiveness of peer editing strategy in order to improve students writing skills. Peer editing has been defined as a process in which students pair up or work in groups to edit each other's writing after having successfully completed the prewriting, drafting and revising stages of writing. Peer editing generally helps students to edit, improve and revise a piece of writing.

In the field of teaching, scaffolding aims to help students acquire independence for it guides them to do what they cannot do yet by themselves. Teachers act as the facilitator of learning like training them on wheels on a bicycle or water wings for swimming. For Weaver (2010), scaffolding means sincere teaching, not merely assigning and grading: managing apprentice learners in developing knowledge and skills. In writing instruction, scaffolding includes guiding writers in the process of discovering new ideas through editing and sharing work with a broader audience until they can do this eventually with feedback and editing that published writers enjoy.

Maybin, Mercer and Stierer (2008) mentioned that if the child is not able to advance by being under the guidance of an adult or a more competent peer, then the tutor or the aiding peer serves the learner as a vicarious form of consciousness until such time as the learner is able to master his own action through his own consciousness and control. When the child achieves that conscious control over a new function or conceptual system, it is then that he is able to use it as a tool. Up to that point the tutor in effect performs the critical function of 'scaffolding' the learning task to make it possible for the child, in Vygotsky's words, to internalize external knowledge and convert it into a tool for conscious control.

Sanders and Welk (2005) demonstrated the discourse between a teacher and an individual pupil is usually contextualized by other discourse, whereby the pupil relates to the teacher as part of a group or whole class. Teacher-pupil discourse will inevitably be influenced by the institutional norms of schools and the peculiar power relations within classrooms. What the notion of scaffolding offers, then, is a way of conceptualizing the process whereby one person in the role of 'teacher' mediates the progress of another person, the 'learner', by reducing the scope for failure in the task the learner is attempting.

According to Thompson (2009), cognitive scaffolding leads and supports the student in making correct and useful responses, while motivational scaffolding provides feedback and helps maintain focus on the task and motivation.

On the other hand, cooperative learning as a writing process approach changes the traditional role of the teacher. Cooperative classrooms change the view of the teacher from evaluator to adviser so the correction is not an evaluation but

feedback. Therefore, cooperative learning and the process approach of writing can work together in the achievement of a common goal when writing a text. Both promote self-confidence, low levels of anxiety, high opportunities to make achievements and, also, both are stressed on the reflection of how students can improve their concentration on a specific learning task (Aldana, 2005).

Writing can be viewed as a recursive process involving both cognitive and metacognitive processes. Task, environment, individual cognition and affective processes all impact on producing written text. Mahmoud (2005) emphasized that motivation, attitude, cognitive style, and personality are some factors that greatly influence someone in the process of learning grammar. Those factors give a more dominant contribution to learners variedly, depend on who the learners are, like how they behave toward the language, their cognitive ability, and also the way they learn.

Hafernik (2010) showed some recent studies that support the application of peer editing strategy in the regular activities of a writing class. It has the advantages like adding perspective to students' perception of the writing process both their own and others, stimulating student self-confidence, improving the class atmosphere by involving them, and providing an additional diagnostic and teaching tool. It is essential for teachers applying peer editing to establish a conducive classroom that has a climate of trust, implement activities leading to the first editing exercise, give students clear reasons for employing the process, designate regular peer editing days, have specific tasks and questions for peer editors to use to build on previous work an editing sessions in class, work with groups of students, set a time limit for student editors, have student editors explain comments to their peers as well as time for note-taking, have students rewrite their compositions and incorporate the suggestions made, and include an editor self-evaluation component. Common questions about peer editing in English as a second language (ESL) concern its effectiveness for grammatical errors, reinforcement of errors by peers, whether or not students take peer editing seriously enough, the opportunity for cheating and plagiarism, and the time consumed in the process.

Schwieter (2010) highlighted statistical analyses that revealed the significant improvement within the four essays demonstrating writing development of subsequent revisions of a single essay. There was a significant improvement between the four essays revealing a linear, continuous writing development. In all, these results support a notion that scaffolding writing techniques and feedback debriefing sessions within the ZPD effectively develops writing skills in second language learning when contextualized through a writing workshop involving the creation of a professional magazine designed for an authentic audience.

Yarrow and Topping (2001) mentioned that as a result of their study on the pre- and post-project analyses of the value of individual writing, all groups displayed statistically momentous improvements in writing. However, the prepost gains of the children who wrote interactively were significantly greater than those of the single writers. There were some evidences that the partners had more positive self-esteem as writers. The operation and permanency of the peer editing system in writing were also conversed.

Fajri, Inderawati and Mirizon (2015) found that there is a significant difference in recount writing achievement between those who were taught through peer editing strategy and those who were not. Peer editing technique was effective in improving students recount writing achievement.

Amores (2012) focused on the new perspective of peer editing and evaluated the performance of undergraduate students in a third-year Spanish composition and grammar review course. The results revealed a strong motivation among informants to define social and emotional aspects of the peer editing process even if some results did not support the previously held views regarding the effectiveness of this strategy. The author's findings challenge common beliefs about the effects that audience awareness and response may have on students' writing and students' attitude toward writing, and suggest implications for the classroom.

Karegianes, Pascarella and Pflaum (2014) determined the effects of a highly- structured peer editing treatment on the essay-writing proficiency of low-performing grade ten students by employing quasi-experimental design. The results have implications both for the time spent by teachers in grading essays as well as the use of peer editing as a potentially effective instructional strategy in proficiency writing.

Rosnida, Deni and Zainor (2011) assured that the analysis of data gathered revealed that peer editing practice profited both the teacher and most of her students as it exposed important information that could improve her teaching of writing

and her students' writing practices. However, it reveals that peer editing practice may have adverse effects on students' motivation and improvement in writing if they are not deployed properly.

Galvis (2010) highlighted peer editing as a strategic source in EFL students' writing process. It has been purposely used in order to develop and gain insight on the effect of peer editing on students' writing and social skills. It has been defined that this strategy optimizes classroom time, allowing students to learn both from the feedback they receive and from the process of revising others' work.

Galvis' study (2010) showed that when students were engaged in peer editing sessions, they created zones of proximal development in which powerhouse students provided linguistic scaffolding and empowered low achievers. The result also indicated that students applied some strategies that made them think such as noticing and explaining the identified errors related to the formal aspects of the language.

The theories and literatures presented have provided insights to the researcher. Hence, this research on peer editing would be a great use as strategy in improving the students' academic writing skill. Through the help of these theories and related studies, the researcher is motivated enough to pursue this research on peer editing to find out whether it helps develop students' writing skills.

3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research methods that is applicable and will be used in response of the problem statement in Chapter 1, which is about the effectiveness of Peer Editing Strategy in improving the writing skill among the Grade 12 students of University of Cebu-Banilad Campus. It presents the various procedures and strategies in identifying sources of needed information on the analysis and evaluation of the data the researchers have gathered. It contains the research design, research environment, research subjects, research instruments, data collection procedure, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design

Schilderman (2012) has described the quantitative research methods very well. According to them "Quantitative research is an inquiry into a social problem, explain phenomena by gathering numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods e.g. in particular statistics".

This study used the quasi-experimental method of research in utilizing the performance score of two groups of participants belonging to a class where traditional teaching is used and the second class where peer editing strategy is used.

Research Environment

The research locale is vital in every study's process because of the need to make decisions on what specific subject the researchers are studying. It is highly important to plan when and where the researchers are going to do the portion of this study. This study was conducted at University of Cebu-Banilad Campus, Banilad Cebu City.

The school is located in Banilad, Cebu City with 65 Senior High School teachers and 3,600 Senior High School students. The Senior High School Department offers courses under Academic Track like ABM, STEM, GAS and HUMSS. It also offers courses under the Technical-Vocational-Livelihood Track like Programming/ICT, Tour, Cookery, Technical Drafting/Animation, and this school offers Arts and Design Track. The school has various facilities like 2 Computer Laboratories, 2 Speech Laboratories, Cookery Laboratory, Chemistry Laboratory, Physics Laboratory, Robotics Laboratory, Multimedia Laboratory and other facilities like Library to ensure that students can acquire, discover and improve their skills in various disciplines for them to be globally-competitive.

Research Subjects

The research subjects of this study were the Grade 12 STEM students under the Academic Track of the S.Y. 2019-2020. Subjects consisted of 40 students. Twenty students served as the control group while the remaining twenty students served as experimental group. For comparability, they were matched using their age, gender, and final grade in English 2.

Table 1: airing of the Research Subjects

Control Group				Experimental Group			
Student	Age	Gender	Final Grade in Engl 2	Student	Age	Gender	Final Grade in Engl 2
A1	18	F	88	AA1	18	F	89
B2	18	F	90	BB2	18	F	85
C3	17	F	86	CC3	17	F	86
D4	17	F	85	DD4	17	F	86
E5	17	F	85	EE5	18	F	85
F6	17	M	85	FF6	17	M	86
G7	17	M	86	GG7	17	M	85
H8	17	M	88	HH8	18	M	87
I9	17	M	86	II9	17	M	86
J10	17	M	85	JJ10	17	M	87
K11	17	M	90	KK11	18	M	88
L12	18	M	86	LL12	18	M	86
M13	20	M	85	MM13	17	M	88
N14	18	M	88	NN14	18	M	90
O15	18	M	86	OO15	19	M	85
P16	18	M	86	PP16	18	M	85
Q17	18	M	85	QQ17	18	M	87
R18	19	M	87	RR18	20	M	85
S19	17	M	89	SS19	18	M	88
T20	19	M	85	TT20	19	M	86
Total/ Ave.		F=5				F= 5	
M=17.7		M= 15	M=86.55		M=17.9	M= 15	M=86.5
SD	0.83		3.14	SD	0.63		2.50

Table 1 shows the pairing of the research subjects of the study. They were paired according to age, gender and final grade in English 2 subject. The table shows that the majority of the subjects in the control and experimental groups were males. Only five females from each group are involved in this study. Most of the research subjects are in the age range of 17-20 and with a final grade range of 85-90.

Research Instruments

The main instrument that the researcher utilized in this study was a standardized peer editing scoring rubric and peer editing checklist. The researcher prepared a rubric because she believed that it was a good piece of measuring the critical thinking skills of the subjects in evaluating the expository essay. The researcher would like to let the subjects write an essay based on the chosen theme of the researcher and afterwards, the researcher ensured that they followed the writing process, evaluated the essay and applied the peer editing strategy. Rubric was also used for peer editing or evaluation of the essay in terms of content, organization, format, and grammar. The researcher assigned the subjects to write an essay about the multiple effects of social media to juveniles in this generation, in a short bond paper as springboard and means to practice students to think critically and evaluate the essay objectively. The same rubric was utilized by the researcher in evaluating the essay (see Appendix B for the rubric).

The rating and categories use were as follows:

Score Ranges

13-16

9-12

5-8

1-4

Description

Very Good

Good

Poor

Needs Improvement

Data Collection

Before conducting the study, the researcher processed the transmittal letter and sought permission to conduct the study from the principal of Senior High School Department. The researcher coordinated with the teacher and subjects so that the researcher could start preparing the research instrument for the pretest both in the control and experimental groups. Afterwards, the 40 subjects were divided randomly into two groups: one experimental and one control. The two groups were instructed by the same teacher. The course consisted of 5 sessions of 1 hour spanning over a period of approximately one week.

After that, both the control group and experimental group were exposed to pretest. In phase 1, the researcher conducted the pretest by giving the subjects a standardized scoring rubric and assigning the subjects to write an expository essay based on the chosen theme of the researcher which was about the multiple effects of social media to juveniles in the 21st century without any intervention. The researcher coordinated with the two evaluators: Evaluators 1 and 2, to evaluate and critic the essay output with the standardized scoring rubric prepared. Right after the pretest, the scores were evaluated with the help of the statistician.

In phase 2, the researcher started to discuss the essence of the writing process and introduced the types of essay mainly focusing on how to write the expository type of essay effectively. After the discussion, the students from the control group and experimental group were assigned to write an expository essay of any chosen academic topics: (1) hobbies and interest of 21st century learners, (2) relationship of parents and children in the 21st century, (3) how technology affects humans in the 21st century. They were given the peer editing checklist as their guide in writing the essay. The subjects in the control group received normal instruction and a formal, teacher-centered writing lesson. After the whole session, the researcher conducted the posttest to the control group (same in the pretest) where she assigned the subjects to write about the multiple effects of social media to juveniles in the 21st century.

In phase 3, the teacher collected the students' essays in the control group and the researcher coordinated with the two evaluators: evaluators 1 and 2, to evaluate and critique the essay output with the standardized scoring rubric.

In phase 4, the researcher was ready to do the intervention in the experimental group and started to introduce the peer editing strategy. The students were ready to execute the peer editing strategy with the checklist prepared by the researcher. They were divided into four groups and the researcher prepared a tracker to ensure that each member in the group had contributed something as they executed the peer editing strategy. They followed the process that the teacher had discussed like they were given three to five minutes to exchange and edit the essay given to them.

After five minutes, they exchanged the essay to another member and gave their respective feedback on it again until all of the five members in the group had successfully given their comments and ratings based on the peer editing checklist. After that process, the subjects were ready to assess, evaluate and reflect on the comments or feedback that they had received and another ten minutes were given for the group discussion about the feedback on their essays with the use of the collaborative peer tracker. After that, the subjects submitted their outputs to the researcher. By the next day, the researcher gave her feedback based on the outputs and shared it to the subjects. The researcher also gave some tips for them to improve their expository essay. After the whole session, the researcher conducted the posttest (same in the pretest) wherein she assigned the subjects to write about the multiple effects of social media to juveniles in the 21st century.

In phase 5, the teacher collected the students' essays and the researcher coordinated with the two evaluators: evaluators 1 and 2, to evaluate and critique the essay output with the standardized scoring rubric.

The data results that were accumulated were analyzed using a T-test. This is a significant tool in knowing the effectiveness of the peer editing strategy as one way to improve students' writing skills.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The following statistical tools were used in the study:

Frequency Count and Percent were used to summarize, analyze and interpret the pretest and posttest performances of control and experimental groups, in making thematic analysis;

The **t-test Correlated Samples for Means** was used to determine the significance of the differences between the pretest and posttest performances of the control and experimental; and

The **t-test for Two Independent Samples** was used to determine the significance of the difference between the posttest performance of the control and experimental groups.

4. RESULTS

This chapter presents and proves the proposition of the data gathered by the researcher on the effectiveness of the peer editing strategy in teaching English academic writing among STEM students of the University of Cebu-Banilad Campus-SHS Department. The sources of data were scores garnered by the research subjects in the expository essay outputs that they have created based on the themes that the researcher has chosen. The researcher utilized a standardized scoring rubric to evaluate the research subjects' scores. The results were presented in tabular form with corresponding analysis and interpretation.

Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 2 presents the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 2: Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Categories	Scoring Ranges	Group of Research Subjects	Very Good		Good		Poor		Mean Range	Mean Score	Description
			F	%	f	%	f	%			
Content	13-16	C	13	65	5	25	2	10	3.26-4.00	3.7	Very Good
	VG	E	13	65	5	25	2	10		VG	3.25
Organization	12-9	C	8	40	11	55	1	5	2.51-3.25	3.65	Very Good
	G	E	9	45	9	45	2	10		G	3.05
Format	8-5	C	4	20	14	70	2	10	1.76-2.50	3	Good
	P	E	5	25	12	60	3	15		P	2.85
Grammar	4-1	C	6	30	12	60	2	10	1.00-1.75	2.9	Good
	NI	E	6	30	8	40	6	30		NI	2.6
Overall Writing Performance		C	9	45	11	55	0	0		2.94	Good
		E	9	45	11	55	0	0		2.94	Good

Overall, the writing performance of both groups fell under *good* performance. The similarity of results drawn from the table contributed additional signs that the two groups are valid samples and some of them were struggling in improving their performance in some aspects. This also brought enlightenment and realization that some of the research subjects especially in the experimental group lack the confidence, focus, motivation, and autonomy to express and write. Hence, it further acknowledges the necessity of implementing peer editing as an intervention to boost their writing performance to the highest level. This shows that learners cannot learn that much without the demonstration and guidance of more experienced person in the initial phases of learning. Students have to work with more experienced ones and bring them into an active participation of the tasks with some others to develop cognitive and metacognitive skills and processes (Weaver, 2010).

Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 3 shows the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 3: Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Categories	Scoring Ranges	Group Of Research Subjects	Very Good		Good		Poor		Mean Range	Mean Score	Description
			F	%	F	%	F	%			
Content	13-16	C	12	60	8	40	0	0	3.26-4.00	3.6	Very Good
	VG	E	19	95	1	5	0	0	VG	3.95	Very Good
Organization	12-9	C	6	30	13	65	1	5	2.51-3.25	3.25	Good
	G	E	20	100	0	0	0	0	G	4	Very Good
Format	8-5	C	0	0	19	95	1	5	1.76-2.50	2.95	Good
	P	E	12	60	8	40	0	0	P	3.6	Very Good
Grammar	4-1	C	0	0	16	80	4	20	1.00-1.75	2.8	Good
	NI	E	4	20	16	80	0	0	NI	3.2	Good
Overall Writing Performance		C	6	30	14	70	0	0		3.15	Good
		E	20	100	0	0	0	0		3.69	Very Good

It can be clearly observed from the results that the experimental group portrayed the utmost improvement of the posttest performance among the research subjects. Majority of the subjects in the experimental group have achieved the *very good* performance and improved in all aspects or categories of writing. Nobody got *poor* performance. This explains that most of the subjects' scores under this group have increased significantly. This shows that as a learner is being assisted in the phase of learning through scaffolding, there is a rapid development of his self and his capacity of learning increases (Weaver, 2010).

This can be attributed to two reasons- the time allotted for the discussion and the reflections shared by the students. Only four (4) subjects (20%) from the experimental group got the *very good* performance in grammar while 80% of them fell under the *good* performance of the same category. This only means that some factors could really influence or affect when someone writes especially in acquiring and learning grammar.

The utmost improvement of the results among subjects under experimental grown as shown in table 3 positively implies the effectiveness of the peer editing strategy in improving writing skills. This is the advantage of the peer editing strategy. The teacher can serve as a mentor or facilitator to guide the students through coaching the possible interpretations or analysis.

For teachers using peer editing, it is useful to establish a classroom climate of trust, design activities leading to the first editing exercise, give the students clear reasons for using the process, designate regular peer editing days, have specific tasks and questions for peer editors to use to build on previous work in class and on previous editing sessions, work with groups of students, set a time limit for student editors, have student editors explain comments to their peers as well as write them down, have students rewrite their compositions and incorporate the suggestions made, and include an editor self-evaluation component (Hafernik, 2010).

It can add students' perception of the writing process, both their own and others, promoting student self-confidence, improving the class atmosphere by active student involvement; and providing an additional diagnostic and teaching tool (Hafernik, 2010).

Significant Difference Between the Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 4 presents the results of the test of significance of the differences between the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 4: Significant Difference Between the Pretest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Categories	Computed T-test Value	Df	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	2.2	38	0.0334	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Organization	2.8	38	0.0079	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Format	0.58	3	0.5587	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
Grammar	1.29	38	0.2048	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
Overall Writing	0.99	38	0.3284	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant

Overall writing performance, the computed t-value is 0.99 with a corresponding p-value of 0.3284. The p-value is greater than 0.05 level of significance, hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. As a whole, there is *no significant difference* between the pretest performances of the control and experimental groups. The research subjects of both groups yielded similar results or mean scores and similar performance from the given pretest. This further validates that the subjects were equally divided according to their age, gender, and final grade in English 2 subjects. Both subjects as well driven from the result, do have the same writing ability or skill to express their thoughts and ideas based on the various themes being selected for expository type of essay writing.

This indicates that exposing students to some kind of activities that promote social interaction and small-group collaboration will enable students to improve their performances especially when it comes to writing. It is in this way that students' retention is best achieved and their social skill is developed (Hertz-Lazarowitz et al., 2013).

Significant Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 5 tabulates the results of the test of significance of the differences between the pretest and posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 5: Significant Difference Between the Pretest and Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Categories	Group	Computed t-test value	Df	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	C	0.7	19	0.4924	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
	E	2.63	19	0.0165	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Organization	C	3.56	19	0.0021	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
	E	4.33	38	0.0001	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Format	C	0.37	19	0.7155	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
	E	2.94	19	0.0084	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Grammar	C	0.81	19	0.428	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
	E	1.16	19	0.2604	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
Overall Writing Performance	C	0.99	38	0.3284	Accept Ho	Not Statistically Significant
	E	4.61	19	0.001	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant

The results presented in Table 5 showed that the overall performances of the control group during the pretest and posttest have not changed or increased significantly. The research subjects' scores of writing skill have not improved after the traditional approach in teaching writing has been implemented during the research process. The subjects in the control group maintained their good performance in the content, format and grammar categories of writing but in the organization category there is a significant difference. This entails that some of them organized their ideas well in writing their expository essay. Based on the data gathered, the lecture-based approach utilized in the control group has not much created a big impact on refining subjects' academic writing skills. Hence, subjects' scores do not show a *significant difference* in their performance between pretest and posttest.

On the other hand, the result garnered by the subjects under the experimental group posted a *significant difference* between their pretest and posttest performances. This implies that the scores obtained in the experimental group in the three categories: content, organization and format show a significant increase after the peer editing strategy in improving writing skills has been implemented. In one aspect, however, some factors could influence or affect when someone writes especially in acquiring and learning grammar. Learning grammar is not easy and it takes time. It follows an intensive process that encourages an individual to be active, smart and be able to cultivate the value of patience in achieving it. With this notion, the strategy used in the experimental group helped in boosting subjects' performance as well as the essential skills in writing. This also showcased the effectiveness of the peer editing strategy compared to the traditional approach of teaching writing.

The results further confirm the idea of Galvis (2010) who emphasized that peer editing optimizes classroom time, allowing students to learn both from the revisions they receive and also from the process of revising others' work. In addition to the idea of Galvis (2010), Rosnida, Deni and Zainor (2011) mentioned that peer editing is beneficial to students as it increases their awareness of the complex process of writing, it improves their knowledge of and skills in writing and helps them become more autonomous in learning.

Significant Difference Between the Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Table 6 shows the results of the test of significance of the differences between the posttest performances of the control and experimental groups.

Table 6: Significant Difference Between the Posttest Performances of the Control and Experimental Groups

Categories	Computed T-test Value	Df	P-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Content	2.85	38	0.007	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Organization	6.1	38	0.0001	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Format	5.28	38	0.0001	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Grammar	3.08	38	0.0038	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant
Overall Writing	27.34	38	0.0001	Reject Ho	Statistically Significant

The results yield in table 6 were gathered after different approaches in teaching writing to enhance critical thinking skills were implemented in control and experimental groups. The traditional approach and peer editing strategy were utilized respectively.

As seen in table 6, the computed t-value of both groups differ from each other in every category. The computed t-value (content) is 2.85 with a corresponding p-value of 0.0070. For the organization category, the computed t-value is 6.1 while the format category is 5.28 in which both of the categories have a corresponding p-value of 0.0001. The computed t-value of grammar category is 3.08 with a corresponding p-value of 0.0038. The p-value of all the writing categories is lesser than 0.05 level of significance, hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. This asserts that the posttest performances between the control and experimental group displayed a *significant difference*. Additionally, based on the data presented, the experimental group which utilizes the peer editing strategy obtained a higher result than the control group. On the other hand, the control group which utilizes the traditional approach has increased its performance but still does not yield a great impact in enhancing subjects' critical thinking skills in writing.

The findings of the study conform that peer editing strategy is an effective strategy in engaging students in the classroom. Furthermore, the findings conform to Rosnida et al. (2011) who asserted that peer editing strategy aims at engaging

students in their learning, with a focus on thinking about the answers prior to discussing them with their peers, is an active teaching-learning strategy.

They also conform to Galvis (2010) who affirmed that using peer editing strategy when asking questions during a lecture is a great way to get students actively engaged in thinking about their learning, to check for understanding, and to get students to apply new knowledge.

5. CONCLUSION

Peer editing in the writing classroom helps strengthen students' confidence and ability to write. Constructive criticisms from peers contribute to the students' metacognitive feed-backing skills in improving the basic aspects of academic writing.

REFERENCES

Books

- [1] Hafernik, J. J. (2010). *The how and why of peer editing in the ESL writing class*. Springfield, USA: Burn Press.
- [2] Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. et al. (2013). *Learning to cooperate, cooperating to learn*. NY: Springer Science & Business Media.
- [3] Kagan, S. (1986). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente: Resources for Teachers.
- [4] Maybin, J., Mercer, N. & Stierer, B. (2008). *Scaffolding learning in the classroom: The work of the national oracy project*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [5] Pasand, G., Parastou, T. & Abdorreza, A. (2017). *Peer scaffolding in an EFL writing classroom: An investigation of writing accuracy and scaffolding behaviors*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [6] Stoddard, B. & MacArthur, C. A. (2008). *A peer editor strategy: Guiding learning-disabled students in response and revision*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Journals/Periodicals

- [7] Aldana, A. (2005). The process of writing a text by using cooperative learning. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 21(6), 47-58.
- [8] Amores, M. J. (2012). A new perspective on peer-editing. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(4), 513-522.
- [9] Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Hurley, M. M. & Wilkinson, B. (2004). The effects of school-based writing-to-learn interventions on academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(1), 29-58.
- [10] Boldrini, E. & Cattaneo, A. (2014). Scaffolding collaborative reflective writing in a VET curriculum. *Vocations and Learning*, 7(2), 145-165.
- [11] Fajri, H. M., Inderawati, R. & Mirizon, S. (2015). The implementation of peer editing to improve students writing. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, 2(2), 48-57.
- [12] Fathman, A. K. & Kessler, C. (2004). Cooperative language learning in school contexts. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 127-140.
- [13] Galvis, N. M. (2010). Peer editing: a strategic source in EFL students' writing process. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 12(1), 85-97.
- [14] Ge, X. & Land, S. M. (2003). Scaffolding students' problem-solving processes in an ill-structured task using question prompts and peer interactions. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 51(1), 21-38.
- [15] Karegianes, M. J., Pascarella, E. T. & Pflaum, S. W. (2014). The effects of peer editing on the writing proficiency of low-achieving tenth grade students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 73(4), 203-207.
- [16] Larkin, S. (2009). Socially mediated metacognition and learning to write. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 4(3), 149-159.

- [17] Mackiewicz, J. & Thompson, I. (2014). Instruction, cognitive scaffolding, and motivational scaffolding in writing center tutoring. *Composition Studies*, 42(1), 100-107.
- [18] Mahmoud, A. (2005). Informal pedagogical grammar. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 34(4), 283-91.
- [19] Mynlieff, M., Manogaran, A. L., Maurice, M. & Eddinger, T. J. (2014). Writing assignments with a metacognitive component enhance learning in a large Introductory Biology Course. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 13(2), 311-321.
- [20] Nückles, M., Hübner, S. & Renkl, A. (2009). Enhancing self-regulated learning by writing learning protocols. *Learning and Instruction*, 19(3), 259-271.
- [21] Papeontiou-louca, E. (2003). The concept and instruction of metacognition. *Teacher Development*, 7(1), 9-30.
- [22] Pratt, S. (2003). Cooperative learning strategies. *The Science Teacher*, 70(4), 25.
- [23] Raphael, T., Englert, C. & Kirschner, B. (2005). Students' metacognitive knowledge about writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 23(4), 343-379.
- [24] Rosnida, M. D., Deni, A. & Zainor, I. Z. (2011). Peer-editing practice in the writing classroom: *Benefits and Drawbacks*. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 2(1), 92-1
- [25] Sanders, D. & Welk, D. S. (2005). Strategies to scaffold student learning: Applying Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. *Nurse Educator*, 30(5), 203-207.
- [26] Schilderman, H. (2012). Quantitative method. *The Wiley-Blackwell companion to practical theology*, 123-132.
- [27] Slavin, R. E. (2012). Cooperative learning and achievement: Theory and research. *Handbook of Psychology*, 7(3), 85-89.
- [28] Slavin, R. E., Stevens, R. J. & Madden, N. A. (2006). Accommodating student diversity in reading and writing instruction: A cooperative learning approach. *Remedial and Special Education*, 9(1), 60-66.
- [29] Stevens, R. J. (2003). Student team reading and writing: A cooperative learning approach to middle school literacy instruction. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(2), 137-160.
- [30] Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153-173.
- [31] Thompson, I. (2009). Scaffolding in the writing center: A microanalysis of an experienced tutor's verbal and nonverbal tutoring strategies. *Written Communication*, 26(4), 417-453.
- [32] Veerappan, V. A., Suan, W. H. & Sulaiman, T. (2011). The effect of scaffolding technique in journal writing among the second language learners. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 2(4), 202-205.
- [33] Weaver, C. (2010). Scaffolding grammar instruction for writers and writing. *In Beyond the Grammar Wars* 5(1), 195-215.
- [34] Yarrow, F. & Topping, K. J. (2001). Collaborative writing: The effects of metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 7(2), 261-282.

Internet Sources

- [35] National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2016). *Writing skill and its' importance*. Retrieved November 18, 2019 from <http://www.wstrs.org/stable>.
- [36] Schwieter, J. W. (2010). Developing second language writing through scaffolding in the ZPD: A magazine project for an authentic audience. *Oxford University Press*, p.6. Retrieved December 10, 2019 from <http://www.oxfordpress.com>.