

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' REVIEWS OF EXPOSITORY TEXT A Study at English Department of UNP

by Yati Aisya Rani

Submission date: 09-Nov-2019 09:13PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1210340359

File name: artikel.docx (1.23M)

Word count: 5013

Character count: 27420

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' REVIEWS OF EXPOSITORY TEXT

A Study at English Department of UNP

Yati Aisyah Rani

15

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang,
yati_aisyah27@fbs.unp.ac.id

Dinovia Fannil Kher

15

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang,
menik.rezineddin@gmail.com

Abstract

This article describes the result of analysis of expository text reviews made by English Department students at Universitas Negeri Padang. The review quality was seen from the applications of review components. This article is aimed at analyzing how far English Department students used the components in their reviews of expository text. The research design was descriptive by using reviewing task as the instrument. The population of the research was the third-year students at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang who had passed the Extensive Reading and Academic Writing subjects. The sample consisted of 18 students. They were asked to review an expository text with the topic of parents' efforts to prevent their children from becoming smokers. From the result of analysis, it was found that three components were successfully applied by the students in their reviews which were the identification of premise and supporting points, the writing mechanics, and the organization. Meanwhile, other three components; the application of analysis, the critical evaluation, and the review format, were not properly applied in the reviews made by the students.

Keywords: Review, Expository Texts, English Department Students

Abstrak

Artikel ini mengkaji hasil analisis dari review teks eksposisi yang ditulis oleh mahasiswa bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Padang. Kualitas review yang dihasilkan oleh mahasiswa dilihat dari pengaplikasian komponen review didalamnya. Oleh karena itu, artikel ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis sejauh mana masing-masing komponen review ditemukan

dalam review teks eksposisi yang ditulis mahasiswa bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Padang. Jenis penelitian yang digunakan pada artikel ini adalah penelitian deskriptif dengan menggunakan *reviewing task* sebagai instrumennya. Populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah mahasiswa tahun ketiga Jurusan Bahasa Inggris UNP yang sudah selesai mengambil mata kuliah *Extensive Reading* dan *Academic Writing*. Sampel penelitian terdiri dari 18 orang mahasiswa yang dipilih dengan menggunakan teknik *random sampling*. Para mahasiswa tersebut diminta untuk me-review sebuah teks eksposisi dengan topik yang berkaitan dengan usaha orang tua untuk mencegah anak mereka merokok. Dari hasil analisis review mahasiswa, ditemukan bahwa tiga komponen review terkandung didalamnya yaitu identifikasi ide utama dan pendukung dalam teks, mekanika penulisan review, dan penyusunan ide dalam review. Sementara itu, tiga komponen review lain yaitu komponen analisis, evaluasi kritis, dan format review belum tergambar dengan baik. Disarankan kepada para dosen untuk memasukkan komponen review kedalam pengajaran dan menyediakan latihan yang bisa merangsang kemampuan mereview mahasiswa.

Kata Kunci: Review, Teks Eksposisi, Mahasiswa Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris

Introduction

The accessibility of information sources nowadays contributes a lot to university students' learning. Sources in forms of oral and written such as e-book, e-journal, and articles can be accessed in the internet so that finding and obtaining information is not really a problem for the students anymore. In academic settings, both oral and written materials are used to support and to add information and explanation given by the lecturers in the classroom. The students have to do more to deepen their understandings about their field of study. Reading, as one language skill that has to be mastered by the students, plays more in processing the

information gotten from the written materials.

In academic reading, students are not only asked to make sense out of the text and try to understand the information, ideas, and opinions within the text. In fact, they are required to activate their critical thinking toward their reading materials. Alyousef (2005) explains that students have to be actively involved in processes to obtain the textual information from the text. Furthermore, Deal and Rareshide (2013) state students interact with the written language within the text to construct and reflect on meaning while evaluating and questioning in relation to contextual information. From both explanations above, it can be seen that in reading,

17
students have to be able to elicit conclusion about the meaning of text and relate it to their own needs. They are not only absorbing what they read but evaluating and questioning the material from their own point of view. They have to activate their critical thinking while reading the material. They have to pay attention to the importance and the usefulness of the information that they get from the texts to their studies.

The best way for students to connect their critical thinking and academic reading is reviewing. Boschan (2008) explains that reviews engage students' thinking by critiquing the text's contribution to knowledge in their own disciplines. Students may be able to analyze texts so that they can select which one is useful for their studies. By reviewing, the students are able to decide the material that they need most in their studies. She also says that reviewing helps the students in gaining more understandings about their lessons. Reviews include the processes of summarizing and evaluating which display the students' knowledge of the topic discussed in the material they read.

Reviews are also important for the improvement of the students themselves. According to Greenaway (2013), reviews activate students' reflection, communication, learning, and

development since they are able to engage and develop a wide range of learning by connecting the world of thinking. He adds that reflection means that students are able to access their intuitive and tacit knowledge in their reviews. Furthermore, he explains that communication indicates that reviews provide students with the opportunity to comment another's ideas and interpretations. Meanwhile, what he means by learning and development is that reviews enable students to enrich their ideas and apply the ideas in their own learning processes.

There are some components that have to be noted in reviews. Cook (2010) proposes six components of reviews. These components were used in this research in order to determine the quality of the students' reviews. The first is the identification of premise and supporting point. He says that good reviews include accurate identification of the text premise and significant points in support of the premise. The second is the application of analysis which includes several analyses that relate the text to real-life situations. The third is the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points. It means that good reviews include critical thinking that clearly states the students' informed and substantiated opinion, thorough

evaluation of the text's premise and supporting points.

The fourth component of reviews proposed by Cook (2010) is the format of reviews. He explains that the format should be documented accurately and consistently. First, the title of the review is not the same as the title of the text but may include the text's title. Second, the introduction paragraph clearly and accurately presents full bibliographical information about the text such as its title and dates. One or more general statements have to be stated to give a quick indication of the text's contents and the reviewer's reaction to it. Third, the number of body paragraphs varies according to the extent of what the reviewer has to say. He states in general, there will be at least one paragraph of summary and at least one paragraph of evaluation. Moreover, in the summary, all the significant points of the text such as the purpose of the text have to be included. The critical evaluation discusses both positive and negative features as appropriate and is supported with evidence from the text. Last, the conclusion paragraph gives an overall evaluation as the conclusion of what the reviewer has said so far. In addition, he mentions that it includes a recommendation about the type of reader likely to enjoy or benefit from the text.

The fifth component of reviews, according to Cook (2010), is the writing mechanics. He says that good reviews consist of the clear and concise writing with excellent sentence structure and grammar as well as the correct use of punctuations and no spelling errors. Finally, the last is the organization of the reviews. He states the organization of the title of the review, the introduction paragraph, the body paragraphs, and the conclusion paragraph result in clarity and presents logically arranged points of the reviews.

Reviews are not new topics for university students. They are supposedly already familiar with reviews because reviews are put into the syllabus. Taylor (2010) states reviews have an essential part in scholarship so that professors ask students to do reviews in class. Almost all academic journals contain reviews. In fact, reviews are found at lists of faculty publications. At English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang, reviews are included as minor skill of Reading and Writing. In both classes, the students learn and discuss about the theory of review. They are also given review exercises in which they can practice and apply the theory they learned in order to be able to make good reviews. The kind of text that is mostly used in Reading and Writing classes is expository text. According to

Starfield (2011), an expository text is a text written in order to inform the readers about a topic. It gives reasons for a point of view and convinces others of it. Livingston (2004) from Brigham Young University states that in writing expository text, an author researches the topic to obtain information. She states the information is later organized in a logical and interesting manner by using various expository text structures. In short, expository text is a text written with a purpose of informing its readers by giving a clear, concise, and organized writing.

Furthermore, Livingston (2004) explains that there are six expository text structures. They are description, listing, sequence, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and problem and solution. In description, authors include his or her main ideas and details into the text while in listing, he or she notes down connected information, a series of steps, or a hierarchy of ideas. On the other hand, sequence includes a series of events which lead up to a conclusion. Meanwhile, in comparison and contrast, authors describe the similarities or differences of two or more events. The cause and effect text structure explains several reasons why an event occurred and effects from the event itself. Finally, in problem and solution, authors identify problems and

provide possible solutions for the problems being discussed. It can be seen that each expository text structure demands a discussion on a topic based on its own point of view.

The expository text is considered appropriate to university students' academic level. The fact that the structure of the text is more complex, of course, encouraged the students to activate their critical thinking and academic reading so that they could produce good reviews.

Since the students of English Department are already familiar with review and have learned about it in both Reading and Writing classes, it is assumed that they are already capable of doing review. They are assumed to know what to include in their reviews so that their reviews are later considered as good reviews. Unfortunately, from an interview, there were complaints coming from both lecturers and students at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang related to review. The lecturers of Writing subjects said that the scores of the students in reviewing exercises were still low. Meanwhile, the students themselves claimed that they still found it difficult to do reviewing. They were confused of what they should be doing when they were asked to review a text. Those complaints indicated that despite the fact that

review was taught to English Department students, there were some problems that influenced the quality of the students' reviews.

This article analyzes how far English Department students used the components of reviews. Each component was analyzed carefully in order to find out the quality of their reviews of expository text.

The design of this research is descriptive research. Gay et al (2006) explain that descriptive research is done by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting some comprehensive data in order to get insights or understandings of a topic.

This research was conducted at Universitas Negeri Padang. The population was the third year English Department students. Those students were chosen as the population because they had passed the Extensive Reading and Academic Writing subjects that required them to read and to think critically. 18 of them were taken as the sample of this research. The sampling technique used was random sampling.

The main instrument used to collect data in this research was a reviewing task. The 18 students were asked to review an expository text. The title of the text was "How Parents can Protect Their Kids from Becoming Addicted Smoker". This text was

chosen because its topic was really familiar to the students. In addition, it was not really long so that it was considered to be appropriate for the students to review since they were only given time for about 90 minutes.

The students' reviews collected were analyzed by using a review scoring rubric designed by Cook (2010). Each component was scored in order to gain information on how it was used by the students in their reviews. The scores were interpreted into categories from highly competent, competent, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. The categories were used to indicate the number of students who successfully made good review.

Finding and Discussion

The data of this research consist of descriptive data. The data gathered sought to reveal the use of review components by English Department students of Universitas Negeri Padang. The use of the components indicated the quality of the students' reviews. The data were arranged based on six research questions in this research. They were the identification of premise and supporting point, the application of analysis, the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points, the review format, the writing mechanics, and the review organization.

1. The identification of premise and supporting points of the students' reviews

The first research question concerned with the analysis of the identification of premise and supporting

points of the students' reviews. Students' accuracy in identifying the text's premise and its significant supporting points was measured. The data were described as follow:

Table 1. Students' Scores on the Identification of Premise and Supporting points

Student	Scores (0-20)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
		22		9		9
1	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
2	9	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory
3	5	Satisfactory	13	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory
4	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
5	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
6	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
7	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
8	10	Competent	9	Competent	9.5	Competent
9	8	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
10	9	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory	8.5	Satisfactory
11	10	Competent	12	Competent	11	Competent
12	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
13	7	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory
14	5	Satisfactory	6	Satisfactory	5.5	Satisfactory
15	8	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory	8.5	Satisfactory
16	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
17	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
18	10	Competent	12	Competent	11	Competent

Table 1 shows that the number of students who were in the satisfactory category was significant. 15 out of 18 students were in this category. It means that most of the students' reviews missed to include one point whether it was the accurate identification of text premise or significant points in support of the premise in their reviews.

From the analysis, it was found that the point missed by the 15 students

was the inclusion of significant points that support the text's premise in the reviews. They did not focus their reviews on the points made by the author of the text which support the ways that can be done by parents in order to protect their kids from becoming addicted smokers. In fact, they put some unnecessary information.

2. The application of analysis of the students' reviews

The second research question concerned with the analysis of the application of analysis of the students'

reviews. The score was given to the analyses made by the students in which they relate the text to the real-life situations. The data were described as follow:

Table 2. Students' Scores on the Application of Analysis

Student	Scores (0-20)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
2	4	Unsatisfactory	4	Unsatisfactory	4	Unsatisfactory
3	12	Competent	10	Competent	11	Competent
4	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
5	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
6	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
7	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
8	10	Competent	10	Competent	10	Competent
9	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
10	7	Unsatisfactory	8	Satisfactory	7.5	Satisfactory
11	3	Unsatisfactory	4	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
12	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
13	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
14	4	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory
15	9	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory	8.5	Satisfactory
16	3	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	4	Unsatisfactory
17	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory
18	4	Unsatisfactory	3	Unsatisfactory	3.5	Unsatisfactory

Table 2 shows that among 18 students, 13 of them were in the category of unsatisfactory for the application of analysis. It means that the statements included in the students' reviews were not directly related to their real-life situations. In other words, most students did not try to correlate between the author's ideas in the text and the situations or conditions that they found in their daily life so that they could provide substantiated analysis in their

reviews. What they included in the reviews were only the author's statements.

3. The critical evaluation of premise and supporting points of the students' reviews

The third research question concerned with the analysis of the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points of the students' reviews. It included the students' critical

thinking and thorough evaluations of the text's premise and supporting points. How students included their

opinion toward the text's premise was also analyzed. The data were described as follow:

Table 3. Students' Scores on the Critical Evaluation of Premise and Supporting Points

Student	Scores (0-30)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	5	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5.5	Unsatisfactory
2	5	Unsatisfactory	4	Unsatisfactory	4.5	Unsatisfactory
3	13	Competent	17	Competent	15	Competent
4	4	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5	Unsatisfactory
5	5	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5.5	Unsatisfactory
6	4	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5	Unsatisfactory
7	4	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5	Unsatisfactory
8	18	Competent	21	Competent	19.5	Competent
9	14	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory	11.5	Satisfactory
10	7	Satisfactory	10	Satisfactory	8.5	Satisfactory
11	12	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory	10	Satisfactory
12	5	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5.5	Unsatisfactory
13	6	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory
14	5	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5.5	Unsatisfactory
15	14	Satisfactory	12	Satisfactory	13	Satisfactory
16	5	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5.5	Unsatisfactory
17	4	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5	Unsatisfactory
18	4	Unsatisfactory	6	Unsatisfactory	5	Unsatisfactory

Table 3 shows that among 18 students, 12 students were included in the unsatisfactory category for the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points. It means that the students' critical thinking is not evident in their reviews. They failed to present a careful and insightful thinking toward the author's ideas in the original text given to them, such as the message that the text conveyed, how the author

conveyed the message, how the author provided evidences of the ways that parents can do to protect their children from becoming addicted smokers in the text, whether the parental efforts provided by the author complete, whether the parental efforts provided by the author convincing, and how the text broaden his or her understanding of kids and smoking. Those kinds of information should have been included

in the reviews in order to make clear of the students' points of view. However, these students simply accepted the ideas of the author relating to the harm of smoking and how parents should protect their kids from becoming addicted smokers. They did not provide any further consideration and their personal thoughts toward the ideas provided by the author in the original text.

The absence of the application of analysis (component 2) and the critical evaluation (component 3) might be because the students were not critical. It was in accordance with the explanation given by Taylor (2010) that someone needs to become a careful and insightful reader in order to review an article effectively. In fact, the students had lack of knowledge on how to analyze, interpret, and evaluate the larger meaning of a text. Thus, they could not relate the text to the real-life situations. They focused their attention only on looking at the main ideas and supporting points of the text. They did

not consider other things related to the issue or the topic discussed in the expository text because they thought that main ideas were the only points that mattered.

Furthermore, since they were not critical in reviewing the text, it was no wonder that they did not include any critical evaluation in their reviews. They could not provide their own judgment of the author's ideas in the text. They were not critical enough to argue those ideas and stated their own informed and substantiated opinion.

4. The review format of the students' reviews

The fourth research question concerned with the analysis of the review format of the students' reviews. The accurate form of the students' reviews which included the title, the introductory, the body, and the conclusion paragraphs was taken into account. The data were described as follow:

Table 4. Students' Scores on the Review Format

Student	Scores (0-10)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
2	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
3	5	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
4	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
5	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
6	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory

7	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
8	7	8	6	Competent	6.5	Competent
9	5	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
10	5	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
11	5	5	3	5	4	5
12	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
13	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
14	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
15	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
16	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
17	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
18	2	Unsatisfactory	1	Unsatisfactory	1.5	Unsatisfactory

Table 4 reveals that 12 out of 18 students were in the category of unsatisfactory for the application of review format. The correct format of review consisted of four parts including the title of the review, the introductory paragraph, the body paragraphs, and the conclusion paragraph. Each part of the review format should be written accurately and consistently in order to produce a good review. However, those 12 students did not include those parts into their reviews. It can be said that their reviews used no correct review formatting.

Students' failure to present the standard review formatting might be because they did not understand about reviewing itself. Saydam²¹ (2004) clearly mentions that reviewing means thinking carefully and taking into consideration both the strengths and weaknesses in the material. It expresses the readers' point of view in the light of what they already know on the subject and what is

acquired from related texts. In fact, the students were confused about what they were asked to do and what they were doing. They were asked to review the expository text. However, what they did was just summarizing the main ideas in it. The fact that they already learned and discussed about reviewing in their reading and writing classes did not help them a lot when they were asked to review the expository text. It seemed like they did not fully understand about what the lecturers presented to them and they were too shy to ask questions about it too. This, of course, led to students' incapability in reviewing. They did not know what to do in reviewing a text and what to be found when they wanted to review it.

5. The writing mechanics of the students' reviews

The fifth research question concerned with the analysis of the writing mechanics of the students'

reviews. The sub-indicators that were scored in this component were the clarity of the students' writing, the proper use of grammar, the correct use

of punctuation, and the correct use of spelling. The data were described as follow:

Table 5. Students' Scores on the Writing Mechanics

Student	Scores (0-10)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	6	Competent	7	Competent	6.5	Competent
2	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
3	7	Competent	8	Competent	7.5	Competent
4	4	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	4.5	Satisfactory
5	6	Competent	7	Competent	6.5	Competent
6	4	Competent	7	Competent	7.5	Competent
7	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
8	8	Competent	4	Competent	7	Competent
9	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
10	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
11	4	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	4.5	Satisfactory
12	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
13	8	Competent	7	Competent	7.5	Competent
14	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
15	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
16	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
17	6	Competent	7	Competent	6.5	Competent
18	7	Competent	7	Competent	7	Competent

Table 5 shows that among 18 students, only 3 students (student 12, 14, and 16) were in the unsatisfactory category while 7 students (student 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 15) were included in the satisfactory category. Other 8 students (student 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 17, and 18) were in the competent category.

Although most students were included in the satisfactory category, three of them still had problems of this component. From their reviews, it could be seen that their masteries of grammar,

punctuation, and spelling were still low. Mayer (2009) says that when students have lack skills in areas such as grammar, sentence structure, spelling, etc, their writing may be unsatisfactory in multiple ways. As a result, the sentences were a bit difficult to understand.

Furthermore, the sentences they made in their reviews were influenced by their native language, Bahasa Indonesia. Maryanti (2014) explains that in writing reviews, students mostly

thought words in Bahasa Indonesia first then translated them into English later on. The interference of the first language, of course, caused problems in the students' reviews.

The sixth research question concerned with the analysis of the organization of the students' reviews. The logical presentation of ideas in the review was taken into account. The data were described as follow:

6. The organization of the students' reviews

Table 6. Students' Scores on the Organization

Student	Scores (0-10)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	6	4 <i>Competent</i>	7	4 <i>Competent</i>	6.5	4 <i>Competent</i>
2	7	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>
3	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>
4	7	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>
5	6	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
6	6	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
7	6	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
8	8	<i>Competent</i>	8	<i>Competent</i>	8	<i>Competent</i>
9	7	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
10	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>
11	7	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
12	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>
13	7	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
14	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>
15	7	<i>Competent</i>	8	<i>Competent</i>	7.5	<i>Competent</i>
16	7	<i>Competent</i>	6	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
17	6	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>
18	6	<i>Competent</i>	7	<i>Competent</i>	6.5	<i>Competent</i>

Table 6 reveals that all 18 students were in the competent category for the organization of ideas included in the reviews. Overall, the arrangement of ideas made by the students in the review was logical. Unfortunately, the logical ideas organization that the students

made was identical to the organization of ideas made by the author in the original text version. It might happen because the students simply matched the content of the text and its title. After getting the information which matched to the title, they rewrote them directly.

They might have lack of background knowledge and experiences so it was difficult for them to organize their thoughts into the reviews.

Conclusions

Based on the findings above there are six things that can be concluded. First, most students were in the satisfactory category for the identification of premise and supporting points in their reviews because they missed to include one point whether it was the accurate identification of text premise or significant points in support of the premise in their reviews. Second, most students were included in the unsatisfactory category for the application of analysis in their reviews. The statements included in the students' reviews were not directly related to their real-life situations.

Third, most students were not able to present the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points in their reviews since their critical thinking is not evident in their reviews. Next, most students were in the unsatisfactory category for the review format because their reviews used no correct review formatting.

Fifth, most students were included in the satisfactory category for the application of writing mechanics component in their reviews. Last, all

students were in the competent category for the organization of ideas in their reviews.

References

- Alyousef, Heslam Suleiman. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners*. The Reading Matrix. Vol. 5, No.2, 2005, pp. 34-42.
- Boschan, Maria. "Article Review or Critique". (www.ufv.ca/writing_centre), retrieved on September 15, 2014)
- Cook, Robert. *Reviewing Papers*. (Alabama: Columbia Southern University Press, 2010)
- Deal, Amanda and Melissa Raeshide. *Critical Reading Manual*. (Winston-Salem University Press, 2013)
- Gay, L.R., Geoffrey E.Mills, and Peter Airasian. *Educational Research*. (Ohio: Pearson, 2006)
- Greenaway, Roger. "How Active Reviewing and Reflection Support Learning and Change". (<http://reviewing.co.uk/review.htm#benefits>), retrieved on May 22, 2014)
- Livingston, Nancy. "Expository Text Structures". *The Internet TESL Journal* (<http://iteslj.org/Articles/Livingston>)



- [-TextStructures.html](#), retrieved on January 26, 2014)
- Maryanti, Ana. *Students' Ability and Problems in Writing Review Text at Grade XII SMAN 4 Kerinci*. Padang: Pasca Sarjana UNP. 2014. (Unpublished Thesis)
- Mayer, Philip. *Guidelines for Writing a Review Article*. (Zurich: Zurich-Basel Plant Service Center, 2009)
- Saydam, Deniz. *Writing a Critical Review*. (Ankara: METU Academic Writing Center, 2004)
- Starfield, Sue. *Writing a Critical Review*. (Sidney: the UNSW Press, 2011)
- Taylor, Karen. *Writing Academic Reviews*. (Peterborough: The Trent University Academic Skills Centre, 2010)

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' REVIEWS OF EXPOSITORY TEXT A Study at English Department of UNP

ORIGINALITY REPORT

18%

SIMILARITY INDEX

6%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

15%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to University of Central Florida Student Paper	2%
2	Submitted to Glasgow Caledonian University Student Paper	2%
3	Submitted to UCSI University Student Paper	2%
4	www.cal.org Internet Source	1%
5	Submitted to University of Sydney Student Paper	1%
6	Submitted to Grand Canyon University Student Paper	1%
7	Submitted to University of Mary Hardin-Baylor Student Paper	1%
8	agservices.tamu.edu Internet Source	1%
9	N.F. Matsatsinis, M. Doumpou, C. Zopounidis.	

"Knowledge acquisition and representation for expert systems in the field of financial analysis",
Expert Systems with Applications, 1997

Publication

1%

10

Submitted to University of Huddersfield

Student Paper

1%

11

ricahasanudin.blogspot.com

Internet Source

<1%

12

www.ukessays.com

Internet Source

<1%

13

www.usablebuildings.co.uk

Internet Source

<1%

14

Submitted to Hartpury College

Student Paper

<1%

15

Submitted to Mount Kenya University

Student Paper

<1%

16

www.readingrockets.org

Internet Source

<1%

17

eprints.uny.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

18

www.scribd.com

Internet Source

<1%

19

repository.unp.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

20	Submitted to Western Governors University Student Paper	<1%
21	Submitted to University of Wolverhampton Student Paper	<1%
22	A. B. Christie, A. A. B. Mitchell, R. S. Walker. "Quinacillin", Scottish Medical Journal, 2016 Publication	<1%
23	Submitted to iGroup Student Paper	<1%
24	Submitted to Roehampton University Student Paper	<1%
25	journal.uncp.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
26	Submitted to Queensland Academy for Creative Industries Student Paper	<1%
27	Submitted to University of Newcastle Student Paper	<1%
28	repository.uinjkt.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
29	digilib.unila.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
30	Submitted to University of Wales, Lampeter Student Paper	<1%

31

digilib.uinsby.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

32

id.123dok.com

Internet Source

<1%

33

Adeline M. Deladisma, Marc Cohen, Amy Stevens, Peggy Wagner et al. "Do medical students respond empathetically to a virtual patient?", *The American Journal of Surgery*, 2007

Publication

<1%

34

ejournal.unp.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

35

Submitted to University of Liverpool

Student Paper

<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off