A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN SELF-EDITING - PEER REVIEW AND PEER REVIEW - SELF-EDITING IN DIFFERENT GROUPS OF PROFICIENCY TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' WRITING IMPROVEMENT

Neni Iryani, Patuaan Raja, Mahpul
University of Lampung, iryanineni@gmail.com

Abstract

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk meneliti: 1) adakah perbedaan yang signifikan atas peningkatan kemampuan menulis mahasiswa yang diajar dengan strategi self-editing – peer review (Kelas A) dan strategi peer review - self-editing (Kelas B); 2) adakah perbedaan yang signifikan atas peningkatan kemampuan menulis mahasiswa berdasarkan grup proficiency yang berbeda di kedua kelas , dan 3) aspek menulis yang meningkat secara signifikan di kedua kelas. Subjek penelitian ini dalah mahasiswa IBI Darmajaya, Lampung, dengan melibatkan dua kelas eksperimental: Kelas A dan B. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif. Instrumen penelitian adalah tes menulis dan Nelson English Language Proficiency Test (NELT). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa 1) ada perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik dalam kemampuan menulis mahasiswa yang diajar dengan strategi self-editing – peer review (Kelas A) dan strategi peer review - self-editing (Kelas B); 2) ada perbedaan yang sigifikan secara statistik dalam peningkatan kemampuan menulis mahasiswa di grup heterogen di kedua kelas; 3) tata bahasa adalah aspek menulis yang palingsignifikan peningkatannya setelah menggunakan teknik self-editing dan peer review. Self-editing dan peer review dapat membantu mahasiswa dalam meningkatkan kemampuan menulis, dan cocok untuk diterapkan di kelas besar. Selain itu, terbukti bahwa dengan membalik urutan penereapan kedua teknik mengedit tersebut dapat mempengaruhi peningkatan kemajuan menulis mahasiswa secara berbeda.

The aims of this research were to investigate: (1) if there was a statistically significant difference of students' writing improvement between the students treated with self-editing - peer review (Class A) and those thaught with peer review - self-editing techniques (Class B); (2) if there was a statistically significant difference of students' writing improvement in different groups of proficiency of both classes; and (3) the aspect of writing significantly improved in both classes. The subject of this research was the students of IBI Darmajaya, Lampung, involving two experimental classes: Class A and B. This research used quantitative approach. The instruments were writing test and Nelson English Language Proficiency Test (NELT). The result shows that 1) there was a significant difference of students' writing improvement between Class A and Class B; 2) there is a statistically significant difference of students' writing improvement in heterogeneous groups in both classes. In addition, 3) it was language use, a writing aspect mostly improved after incorporating self-editing and peer review. Self-editing and peer review techniques can help students to improve their writing and are suitable to cope with big classes. In addition, it is inferred that reversing the order of applying both techniques does affect students' writing improvement differently.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of four basic language skills which is important to acquire. According to Alwasilah (2003), "in academic circle, writing is an absolute necessity." However, writing may be the most difficult skill to master compared to the other three skills (listening, reading, speaking); since writing is a complex activity. It requires patience and a lot of work involving pre-writing, drafting, editing, revising and then publishing (Harmer, 2004; Jenks, 2003 as cited in Tsai, 2012). In addition, the process of writing may be not linear but rather recursive (Harmer, 2004).

Alwasilah (2003) states that "writing is the most exalting language skill, yet it has been the most neglected one" or less practiced in our education. Practice of writing is actually done in the class, but it does not contribute to the build-up of writing skills significantly. Besides, it is also taught unprofessionally. Based on his study on weaknesses of college writing, he finds out that there are four major weaknesses that are: students get no feedback from instructors, students are taught more theory than practice; students do not realize the importance of writing; and instructors are not competent in teaching writing (Alwasilah, 2003).

These issues of college writing become more complex when it refers to EFL/ L2 students. Students who belong to EFL/ L2 classes "faced with social and cognitive challenges related to second language acquisition" (Toofan, 2014). Therefore, writing teachers/ instructors especially in those classes should consider not only strategic but also language skill development when working with students.

There are many strategies or techniques explored and put on practices to assist the students, especially L2 learners, to be able to produce better writing. Monitoring strategy has become popular strategy nowadays to help the students to improve their writing, especially in terms of getting good feedback. Monitoring strategy includes self-editing and/or peer review. The ability in making correction for our own errors in speaking or writing is called self-editing (Scovel, 1998). Meanwhile, peer review is "collaborative learning in which students asses one another's work and provide each other with feedback", (Pearce, et.al, 2009).

Alwasilah (2003) assumes that peer review is the most practical solution for coping with big classes. Through peer review, which involves collaborative work, "students learn from one another when working together. Besides, through peer review, students read, correct, and suggest one another." This is in line with Austria (2017), saying that peer review could be an effective technique "of managing big writing classes, capitalizing on the editing skill of students." This is in line with Pearce (2009) stating that peer review is "particularly beneficial in large classes where it may be difficult for the lecturer/tutor to provide detailed and timely feedback to all students."

In addition, this technique allows shifting a teacher-centered classroom into a student-centered classroom. Austria confirms that in traditional classs, it is a great job for teacher to check all students' writing. Therefore, students should improve their capability in editing their own work so the work of editing is not only the teacher's job. As Ferris (1995) says that since

teachers/lectures cannot always be there to help the students, it is important for them to learn to edit their own work successfully. Furthermore, self-editing and peer review encourage students to be involved in social interaction and lead them to become autonomous learners and sharpen their critical thinking (Kuyyogsuy, 2019; Khaki, 2016; Al-Sawalha: 2016; Lee, 1997 as cited in Abadikhah, 2014; Tsai, 2012; Pearce, 2009).

Many researchers and educators have recommended the combination of both self-editing and peer review. Tsai (2012) argues that "more and more educators use monitoring strategy (self-editing and peer review) as writing techniques in their EFL writing classes to help learners overcome their writing difficulties." He finds out that by applying both techniques, EFL learners: 1). become more aware of aspects of writing (such as, focus, content, organization, etc); 2). can improve their writing proficiency; and 3).can develop their abilities in correcting, giving feedback, critical thinking, and problem solving (Tsai, 2012).

In the process of applying the two techniques, some researchers encourage the participants/ students to practice self-editing first and then followed by peer-review in the process of writing. However, they are Oshima and Hogue (2007) who provide reversed order in polishing the writing draft: peer review first and then followed by self-editing. Oshima and Hogue (2007) do not mention the reason of why they suggest peer review first and then followed by self-editing as above stated. They just provide the steps of writing.

After reading their book, the researcher is eager to find out if there would be

any difference if the process of editing (self-editing–peer review) is reversed into peer review–self-editing as proposed by Oshima and Hogue (2007). Moreover, Tsai (2012) confirms that "applying peer-editing helped them recognize the weaknesses in peers' essays and indirectly reminded themselves to avoid making the same mistakes." In other word, by checking their peers' drafts firstly, they learn how to be more critical in checking their own drafts. In addition, by doing peer-review first, the students might have new (and hopefully better) perspective/ knowledge about the content of their own writing (and other macro issues) and the grammatical errors/mechanics they have made benefited from peers' feedback. This statement is in line with Hu (2005) who assumes that peer review contributes to learner autonomy "by inducing learning behaviors conducive to the development of self-regulation." To sum up, peer-editing help the students learn and develop self-editing techniques (Tsai, 2012; Lundstrom and Baker, 2009 as cited in Abadikhah, 2014). Taking this into consideration, the researcher think that this research is needed to be done to gain better prove.

Furthermore, in L2 writing context, students "may be at differing stages of L2 development and thus have differing abilities to provide accurate, invormative, and useful feedback" (Wang, 2015). This different level of proficiency may be a challenge in doing peer review, especially when we talk about low-proficient students. Tsai (2012) finds out that one of major obstacles which lead to ineffective result in improving writing ability is low achieving writers. Tsai (2012) points out that "low-achieving writers usually cannot correct composition

skillfully or leniently." This happens because they are not sure or may have no any idea if the draft is correct or not or may think that the drafts are acceptable. Thus, they cannot give appropriate suggestions since they do not know how to make major changes.

Watanabe (2008) says that "collaborative learning involving learners at different proficiency levels is commonly observed in a L2 classroom." However, although many studies have been carried out on the implementation of self-editing and peer review in L2 writing class, very few of them involved grouping technique based on students' level of proficiency. Moreover, it is revealed by Wang (2015) that "different ways of forming students into pairs according to their proficiency levels would result in the variation of peer feedback effects on their draft revisions." Wang (2015) finds out that homogeneous groups of students with similar proficiency levels (H-H and L-L) had mostly positive perceptions of the peer feedback. Meanwhile, in hetergeneous groups of intermediate and low proficiency levels, the intermediate "held mostly negative perceptions of the feedback from his low-proficiency partner." Wang suggests the further research to do a peer grouping (comprises three or four students) rather than pair grouping based on students' level of proficiency to mitigate the negative effects above-mentioned.

By considering this issue, in the present research, the researcher will manage a proficiency level-based grouping comprising three students in one group. It is expected that this kind of grouping will provide better view on how different level of proficiency of students affects their writing.

In regard to the background of the study, the problems of the research are formulated as follow:
1. Is there a statistically significant difference of students' writing improvement between the students treated with self-editing - peer review techniques (Class A) and those taught with peer review-self-editing technique (Class B)?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference of students' writing improvement between different groups of proficiency level of Class A and Class B?
3. Which aspect of writing significantly improved in both classes?

METHOD

This research used quantitative approach. The quantitative data were obtained from the writing drafts from the students.

The design was presented as follows:
$$G1_{(H-H)}$$
$$_{(H-L)}$$
$$_{(L-L)} = T1 \ X1 \ T2$$

$$G2_{(H-H)}$$
$$_{(H-L)}$$
$$_{(L-L)} = T1 \ X2 \ T2$$

Notes:
G1 : experimental Class A
G2 : experimental Class B
T1 : pre test
T2 : post test
X1 : treatment 1 (self-editing followed by peer review)
X2 : treatment 2 (peer review followed by self-editing)
The population of this research was the sophomore students of IBI Darmajaya.

In doing this research, there were some procedures applied in order to get the data, as follows:

1. A General English Proficiency Test Nelson was firstly given to the students in order to determine their proficiency level.

2. Pre-Test

In this phase, the participants wrote a short descriptive paragraph of about minimum 150 words in 90 minutes. There were given prompt to help the participants exploring their ideas.

3. Treatment

The treatment in this research adapted writing (and editing) steps proposed by Oshima and Hogue (2007). The treatment for the both classes was actually the same. The difference was only about the order of the two techniques employed. Class A employed self-editing first and then followed by peer review technique. Meanwhile, the other class (Class B) did peer review followed by self-editing. The students used Self-Editing and Peer Review Worksheet provided by Oshima and Hogue (2007) while checking their and their peers' drafts.

In checking their own draft, they monitored themselves by using blue/black pen to check/ edit their own drafts and red pen in checking their peers' drafts. This way, the researcher and rater were able to differentiate which of which technique being used in one's draft (adapted from Toofan, 2014).

Furthermore, in peer review activity, the students were divided into group of three and not random as suggested by Oshima and Hogue (2007). The division of group was based on their proficiency; means that there were groups consists of

all high-achieving students, high- and low-achieving students, low- and low-achieving students. They exchanged their draft to their peers. Each draft should be checked by minimum 2 other peers belong to the group while using Peer-Editing Worksheet as guidance.

4. Posttest

The posttest was also lasted within 90 minutes and had the same instruction as pretest.

The students' scores were analyzed by using SPSS. The gained data were analyzed by independent group t-test and One Way ANOVA.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The Difference of Students' Wrting Improvement of Class A and B

Independent group t-test was used to analyze the difference in students' writing ability between the students treated with self-editing - peer review techniques (Class A) and those taught with peer review-self-editing technique (Class B).

Table 1.
Independent T-Test of Students' Writing Improvement of Class A and B

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	.160	.691	-5.045	51	.000	-10.058	1.994	-14.061	-6.056
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.022	47.454	.000	-10.058	2.003	-14.086	-6.030

From the table, we can see that Sig. (2-tailed)= 0.000, while t table = -5.045

(p<0.05). It indicates that there is significant difference of students' writing improvement between Class A and Class B.

The result of the research shows that there is significant difference of students' writing improvement in both classes after employing the monitoring strategies self-editing—peer review and peer review—self-editing. During the process of editing, the students in both classes A and B tried to check their own and their peers' draft in allocated time. By doing this, the students' centered classes were built; thus, this was not only teacher's task to check the draft, but the whole students were involved actively. In addition, by applying these techniques, the students activated their knowledge of English and the writing so they could perform the editing task. More importantly, self-editing and peer review encourage students to be involved in social interaction and lead them to become autonomous learners and sharpen their critical thinking (Kuyyogsuy, 2019; Khaki, 2016; Al-Sawalha: 2016; Lee, 1997 as cited in Abadikhah, 2014; Tsai, 2012, Pearce, 2009).

Abadikhah (2014) proves that when students get many different ideas from peers, they "sharpen their thinking abilities, as well as share their experiences and knowledge with each other. Consequently, critical thinking skills enhanced their competence to assess their tasks and become more critical revisers..." On the other hand, Tsai (2012) argues that self-editing and peer review allow students "to activate their linguistic competence in correcting both peers' and their own errors." More importantly, as Pearce (2009) states that peer review encourages students to manage their own learning actively.

Therefore, this is evident that those techniques can help students in both Class A and B to make a significant difference in their writing improvement.

2. The Difference of Students' Writing Improvement in Different Groups of Proficiency between Class A and B

To answer this second research question, one way anova was used. There were three types of groups (H-H, H-L, L-L) labelled consecutively as 1, 2, 3. The following is the table of result of Class A:

Table 2.
The One Way Anova of Students' Writing Improvement in Class A

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	272.667	2	136.333	4.679	.001
Within Groups	699.333	24	29.139		
Total	972.000	26			

From the result of the statistical measurement above, it is evident that f = 4.679 with p= 0.001 (p < 0.005). It means that there is significant difference of students' writing improvement due to proficiency level-based grouping in heterogeneous groups H-L.

Afterwards, the following is the result of Class B, as follows:

Table 3. The One Way Anova of Students' Writing Improvement in Class B

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	746.296	2	373.148	10.801	.000
Within Groups	829.111	24	34.546		
Total	1575.407	26			

From the result of the statistical measurement of Class B, f = 10.801 with p = 0.000 (p < 0.005). It means that there is also significant difference of students' writing improvement due to proficiency level-based grouping in Class B, in heterogeneous groups H-L.

From the above data, it can be concluded that the pattern of grouping (H-H, H-L, L-L) can significantly affect students' writing improvement. And it is heterogeneous groups (H-L) having the significant result. This result is valid in both Class A and Class B.

It seems that heterogeneous groups had more dynamic interaction and recalled more ideas compared to the homogeneous groups. The high-achieving students could give valuable inputs and assistances to their low-achieving peers in order to revise their writing better. And the low-achieving students seemed open for comments and suggestions from their peers. On the other hand, the high-achieving students get certain input from their interaction with less proficient peers. A deeper and more detailed explanation on this issue about how less-proficient peers can help their high-proficient peers is stated by Wang (2013) saying that "when the high ability student explained questions from the low ability student, his or her understanding about the knowledge was deeper than before." Thus, the input was

not only in form of constructive comments and suggestions which might not be able to be given by low-proficient students, but also in terms of indirect benefit the high-proficient students could get during the process of peer review.

In relation to this, Watanabe (2008) says: "peers can be concurrently experts and novices, which means they can provide assistance to each other in order to achieve a higher level of performance." It means that even from the low-achieving peers, a student may get a valuable input. Watanabe (2008) continues saying: " ... social mediation comes not only from experts such as teachers but also from peers, and even from less proficient peers."

The above statements, however, are in contrast with Insai (2017) saying that different levels of language proficiency between the student editor and the student writer may cause problematic issue when dealing with peer review. Tsai (2012) also confirms that low-proficient students become one of challenges in doing peer review. He brought about a controversy of whether monitoring strategy would be effective or not to improve students' writing remembering that less proficient students may not have a skillful ability in detecting problems or errors.

homogeneous high- and high-achieving students, there is no significant improvement. It may be because they had written better or good draft compared to peers in the other two groups since the first draft. That is why there was no many revision needed to be done. As Wang (2014) confirms that in homogeneous H-H groups, the students reviewed their peer's draft "mainly on global aspects of EFL

writing, which might be due to the fact that there were less easily identifiable "rule-based" problems in the high-proficiency partner's EFL writing." This statement of Wang, however, against what J. Wang et al. (2014, as cited in Insai 2017) noting that "high proficiency students were reported performing better in terms of feedback giving and had a chance to benefit more from peer editing tasks." Some believe that those students who give feedback would benefit more from the editing process compared to those who receive feedback.

Meanwhile, in homogeneous low- and low-achieving students, it validates the statement of Tsai (2012) saying that less proficient students may not have a good ability in detecting problems or errors. They seemed unconfident to give correct comments because they may think that the initial draft has been acceptable. Or they might not even have any idea about what to edit and how. Thus, in these groups, there would no significant improvement in students' writing.

3. Aspects of Writing of Class A and Class B Increased Most

There were five aspects of writing to be considered which are content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanic by using *Silent Way* method. Consecutively, these aspects are symbolized with numbers: content (1), organization (2), vocabulary (3), language use (4) and mechanic (5).

The followings are tables of aspects of writing improved most in Class A:

Table 4.
The One Way Anova of Writing Aspects Increased Most in Class A

ANOVA

Groups	All Aspects	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Homogen H-H	Between Groups	666.800	4	166.700	6.198	0.001
	Within Groups	1075.778	40	26.894		
	Total	1742.578	44			
Heteroge H-L	Between Groups	649.244	4	162.311	6.045	0.001
	Within Groups	1074	40	26.85		
	Total	1723.244	44			
Homogen L-L	Between Groups	1550.667	4	387.667	10.303	0.004
	Within Groups	1505.111	40	37.628		
	Total	3055.778	44			

From those tables above, the result shows that it is the aspect of language use (df= 4) increased most in all three groups of H-H, H-L, L-L in Class A. However, the highest correlation is in heterogeneous groups of H-L, where f= 6.045 and p= 0.001 (p < 0.005). Next, homogeneous H-H having f= 6.198 and p= 0.001 (p < 0.005). Meanwhile, the homogeneous low having the lowest correlation, where f= 10.303 and p= 0.004 (p < 0.005).

The followings are tables of *one way anova* of aspects of writing improved most in Class B:

Table 5.
The One Way Anova of Writing Aspects Increased Most in Class B

ANOVA

All Aspects

Groups		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Homogen H-H	Between Groups	1574.756	4	393.689	6.858	0.001
	Within Groups	2296.222	40	57.406		
	Total	3870.978	44			
Heterogen H-L	Between Groups	1789.244	4.000	447.311	9.490	0.000
	Within Groups	1885.333	40.000	47.133		
	Total	3674.578	44.000			
Homogen L-L	Between Groups	1467.911	4	366.978	7.236	0.003
	Within Groups	2028.667	40	50.717		
	Total	3496.578	44			

As shown in the table above, the result shows that it is also the aspect of language use (df = 4) increased most in all three groups of H-H, H-L, L-L in Class B. The highest correlation is in heterogeneous groups of H-L, where f= 9.490, with p= .000 (p < 0.005). Then it is followed by homogeneous groups H-H where f= 6.858, with p= .001 (p < 0.005). Meanwhile, in homogeneous groups L-L, f= 7.236, with p= .003 (p < 0.005).

The result of the research shows that it is the aspect of language use, which improved significantly in both Class A and Class B. Meanwhile, the highest correlation is in heteregeneous group H-L in Class B (0.000). It can be inferred that most students in both Class A and Class B were focused more on micro issues, especially grammatical error. This is in line with Hanjani (2019), stating that in peer review, there is tendency among participants "to focus more on grammar and mechanics mistakes rather than content and organization problems."

It is also evident that content is the least aspect to be paid attention to. It seems that content is something they were not familiar with or simply not their expertise.

It happened due to the fact that those students had limited knowledge about how to develop good content of writing or even to give comments relating to content developing issues. Therefore, they tended criticizing more on micro issues rather than macro issues. Even more, they might be still confused in recognizing grammatical errors let alone content and organization which indeed need a skillful ability in writing. As Kuyyogsuy (2019) argues that "students still lack the necessary skills and appropriate level of confidence to evaluate or criticize peers' writing [...] and have their own linguistic limitations." This is also in line with findings of Hu (2005), saying that there is "a tendency among L2 students to neglect macro textual issues but focus on surface language concerns in their peer review." Or, when they suggest something related to macro issue, they tended to pose vague comments, such as: "be more specific", etc. They might sense the lack of the content's draft of peers but had no idea about how to improve it better.

This result thus proves what Tsai (2012) had noted that through self-editing and peer review, EFL students can improve their writing ability especially on language style and conventions. Kuyyogsuy (2019) continues saying that "feedback by peers made students learn to improve how to use grammar structure correctly, and to use punctuation and tenses on their tasks

more efficiently; this also assisted them to improve their language use."

CONCLUSIONS

Considering all the data gathered after finishing the research conducted at IBI Darmajaya, the researcher draws conclusions as follows:

Self editing and peer review techniques can help the students to improve their writing and are suitable to cope with big classes. In addition, it is inferred that reversing the order of applying both techniques does affect students' writing improvement differently. Furthermore, there is significant difference of students' writing improvement in different groups of proficiency level in Class A and Class B. The heterogeneous group, however, is more dynamic and recalled more ideas. It seemed that low-proficient students benefited more from the review and feedback from the high proficient students. Meanwhile, the high proficient students can enhance their understanding and knowledge by giving comments to and answer the questions of their low proficient peers. As to the aspect of writing improved most, the result shows that it is the language use (grammar) which is mostly improved after the treatment. The students seem more capable in giving feedback about language use or grammar rather than other four aspects of writing. Some students do give input on other aspects, such as in mechanic and organization, but still grammar is the most reviewed aspect. It of course is related to their capability in writing and their English proficiency. Most of them are able to check micro issues but less able to give input/ comments on content.

Based on the result of the research and the conclusion stated previously, the researcher would like to propose some suggestions. Time constrains become a major limitation of this study. The researcher had done some adaptation to minimize time constraints (for example: using red and blue pens during the revision process). However, since this process of editing involved 2 phases and was a lengthy process, time constrain was still a challenge. The researcher suggests that before the treatments begin; do make sure that the participants know well steps by steps they have to do during the process of revision. This may save time and avoid misunderstanding which will cause wasting time and inefficiency. If necessary, the researcher can give some kind of simulation on the process of self-editing and peer-review before the treatment. In addition, the researcher did not pay attention attentively on the dynamic interaction among the participants. For example on how high-achieving student interact with low-achieving students during peer review stage, what they feel, how they express their opinion, the perception and feelings of the students to the process of peer review and the groupings, the way they pose comments. Thus, the researcher suggests the further research to investigate to those before-mentioned. The comprehensive information on those aspects might give valuable insight or suggestions for better or further research which may contribute greatly to the development of second language learning process.

During the peer-review process, the participants used self-editing and peer-review worksheets provided to help them revising theirs and peer's draft. Some students did not fill in the blanks in the worksheet completely, especially

in peer-review session. Some were not understand the questions and could not give appropriate comments. Some others were in a rush to go to the next step so they didn't have enough time to fill in. Thus, for further research, consider wisely about the use of worksheets, their format, and their point of editing to be checked, their effectiveness for the students. In short, it should be a concern before deciding to use them. For teacher or further researcher, the researcher recommends doing the process of writing and editing in more than one meeting (not only 90 minutes in classroom). Since writing or editing take time. Encourage the participants to do peer review independently (without supervision of teacher or outside classroom session) to get more suggestions and comments from peer. Classroom session can be a room for discussion to follow up any challenges they faced and what participants have done. For example, ask them to write draft 1 in one session of meeting and after that ask them to submit the final draft in the next meeting. The final draft means that the draft had been checked/ reviewed by peers and also by oneself (self-monitoring). So, they have enough time to do the writing and editing processes within a week. Last but not least, this research has three findings, but the researcher realizes that not all the aspect have been classified in detail explanation and discussion. Therefore, the researcher suggests the further research to explore the findings which have not been classified and explored yet.

REFERENCES

[1] Abadikhah, Shirin. (2014). Comparison of the Effects of Peer- versus Self-editing on Linguistic Accuracy of Iranian EFL Students. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies* – Vol 20 (3), pp. 113-124.

[2] Al-Sawalha, Abdullah M. (2016). EFL Jordanian Students' Reaction to Written Comments on Their Written Work: A Case Study. *Arab Worl English Journal (AWEJ)*, Vol. 1, Number 1.

[3] Alwasilah, Chaedar. (2003). *Language, Culture, and Education: A Portratit of Contemporary Indonesia*. Bandung: CV Andira.

[4] Austria, M.A.B. (2017). Peer Response as an Effective Writing Strategy. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 13(2), 95-104.

[5] Ferris, Dana. (1995). Teaching Students to Self-Edit. *TESOL Journal*. Vol. 4, No. 4. Available: http://tesol.aua.am/tj_digital/tj_digit/Vol4_4.pdf#page=18

[6] Hanjani, Alireza Memari. (2019). Collective Peer Scaffolding, Self-Revision, and Writing Progress of Novice EFL Learners. *IJES*, vol. 19(1), pp. 41–57.

[7] Harmer, Jeremy. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. Essex: Longman

[8] Hu, Guangwei. (2005). Using Peer Review with Chinese ESL Student Writers. *Language Teaching Research* 9, 3; pp. 321-342.

[9] Insai, Sakolkarn and Tongtip Poonlarp. (2017). More Heads are better than one: Peer editing in a translation classroom of EFL learners. *PASAA*, Volume 54 July - December.

[10] Kuyyogsuy, Sirikarn. (2019). Promoting peer feedback in developing students' English writing ability in L2 writing class. *International Education Studies*; Vol. 12, No. 9.

[11] Oshima, Alice and Ann Hogue. (2007). Intraduction to academic writing. NY: Longman.

[12] Pearce, J., Mulder, R., and Baik, C. (2009). *Involving students in peer review; Case studies and practical strategies for University teaching*. Centre for the Study of Higher Education; The University of Melbourne.

[13] Scovel, Thomas. (1998). *Psycholinguistics*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.

[14] Toofan, Zohreh Zare. (2014). Individual self-monitoring and peer-monitoring in one classroom in writing activities: Who is at disadvantage?. *IJLLALW*. Volume 5, no. 1, pp. 515--534.

[15] Tsai, Yea-Ru. (2012). Investigating the effects of applying monitoring Strategy in EFL Writing Instruction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science ,* Vol. 3 No. 13; 205

[16] Wang, Weiqiang. (2015). How proficiency-pairing affects students' peer-mediated revisions of EFL Writing: Three case studies. *English Language Teaching*; Vol. 8, No. 5

[17] Wang, Zhongwan. (2013). Effects of heterogeneous and homogeneous grouping on student learning. Master of Arts in the School of Education. University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill.

[18] Watanabe, Yuko. (2008). Peer–Peer interaction between L2 learners of different proficiency levels: Their interactions and reflections. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 64.