

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

Yati Aisya Rani

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Padang,
E-mail : yati_aisya27@fbs.unp.ac.id

Dinovia Fannil Kher

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

Diterima : 07 Mei 2019

Direvisi : 25 November 2019

Diterbitkan : 24 Desember 2019

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. Ridiyanto states that when students read a lot, they will be able to enrich their own knowledge from the reading materials.¹

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 explains that students have to be actively involved in processes to obtain the textual information from the text.² Furthermore, Deal and Rareshide 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.³ From both explanations above, it can be seen that in reading, 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. Kher and Rani also explain that reading helps the students to obtain higher thinking skills.⁴ This is along with both previous explanations about the relation of reading and the way of thinking. Other expert, Kaya, uses different term than those three previous experts. He uses the term “perspective” as the aspect gained by students from reading.⁵

The best way for students to connect their critical thinking and academic reading is reviewing. Boschan explains that reviews engage students' thinking by critiquing the text's contribution to knowledge in their own disciplines.⁶ 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

¹Ridiyanto Ridiyanto, “Teaching Reading By Using Paragraph Shrinking Strategy,” *Journal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies* 3, no. 2 (December 29, 2018): 174, doi:10.30983/educative.v3i2.546.

²Heslam Suleiman Alyousef, ‘Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners’, *The Reading Matrix*, 5.2 (2005), 34–42.

³Amanda Deal and Melissa Rareshide, *Critical Reading Manual* (Winston-Salem University Press, 2013).

⁴Yati Aisya Rani and Dinovia Fannil Kher, ‘Developing An Effective Model In Teaching Reading: What Would Work Best In a Large English Class?’, *Jurnal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies*, 4.1 (2019), 1–14.

⁵Ebru Kaya, “The Role of Reading Skills on Reading Comprehension Ability of Turkish EFL Students,” *Üniversitepark Bülten* 4, no. 1–2 (December 30, 2015): 37–51, doi:10.12973/unibulletin.412.4.

⁶Maria Boschan, ‘Article Review or Critique’, 2014 <www.ufv.ca/writing_centre>.

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, 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.⁷ 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.

Reviews are critical comments and evaluations of a text. There are some experts who give the definitions of review. According to Bell et al., a review is sometimes called as a critique, a critical commentary, a critical appraisal, or a critical analysis.⁸ It is usually carried out as a stand-alone exercise, a part of a research, or a preparation of writing a literature review. Boschan defines a review as a form of writing in which the reviewer engages with a source by reporting its main ideas, claims and the reasoning that supports the ideas and by critiquing its contribution for the reviewer.⁹

⁷Roger Greenaway, 'How Active Reviewing and Reflection Support Learning and Change', 2014.

⁸Virginia Bell, Tom Freckleton, and Hazel O'Hara, *Planning a Critical Review* (Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University Effective Learning Service, 2005).

⁹Boschan.

Meanwhile, Procter mentions that a review describes the analysis, comments, and evaluation of the reviewers toward the text they have read.¹⁰ The reviewers are required to read the text thoroughly in order to be able to evaluate and do reflection on their own understandings of the text. Clearly, from the reviews, it can be seen how well the students read critically. If they can relate their reading and think it over, they can produce their own personal reaction. Then, they can be said as successful reviewers.

Reviews have several functions. Benos et al. state that the function of a *review* is generally to let readers know what the text is about and what its merits are so that readers can decide whether they want to read the text or not.¹¹ Meanwhile, Mayer mentions five functions of a review.¹² First, a review is made to organize the text. Second, it is written to evaluate the text. Third, its function is to synthesize the text. Fourth, a review is important to identify patterns and trends in literature. Finally, it is made to identify gaps and recommend new sources of literature. Shortly, the functions of reviewing are to re-examine the content, the structure, and the language of the text in details in order to confirm the readers about the sense of the author's purpose and to evaluate how well they achieved that purpose.

Reviews help students to develop some important skills. Saydam explains that there are two skills to employ when students are asked to

¹⁰Margaret Procter, 'The Book Review or Critical Critique: General Guidelines', 2011 <www.writing.utoronto.ca>.

¹¹Benos, Dale J., Kevin L. Kirk, and John E. Hall, 'How to Review a Paper', *Advan in Physiol Edu*, 27 (2003), 47–52.

¹²Philip Mayer, *Guidelines for Writing a Review Article* (Zurich: Zurich-Basel Plant Service Center, 2009).

do review.¹³ First is the skill to seek information in which they scan the literature efficiently to become well-informed on the subject. Another is the skill to review effectively. In this case, the students are expected to question the information in the text and present an evaluation or judgment of it. Furthermore, he says that efficient reviewing requires an awareness of the main idea, the purpose and the intended audience of the text. He also says that the text is seen from a variety of perspectives and evaluated in relation to the theories, approaches and frameworks of the expected task. Taylor adds one other important skill that can be developed from reviews.¹⁴ It is the interpretive skill. She explains that students are able to break apart the text to see how its parts create a whole and convey a particular vision of that whole and of its parts by doing review. In brief, reviews require the students to have skills so they are able to analyze the content and concepts of the text, separating them into their main components, and then understanding how these interrelate, connect and influence each other.

Many experts propose the steps of reviewing a text. According to Galvan, there are five steps of reviewing.¹⁵ The first is to identify the text that will be reviewed. A reviewer has to make himself or herself familiar with the text. The second is to analyze the text. In doing so, taking an overview of the text and taking notes of important points found in the text are important. After analyzing the text, the next is to summarize the ideas in the text in a concept

map. He explains that tables can be used to help the reviewer in arranging and organizing the ideas. The fourth is to synthesize the text. This step is done to plan how the review is written later. After that, the last step is writing the review. He says that the reviewer has to pay attention to the ideas of the text and his or her own evaluation. They must be arranged carefully in order to produce a coherent review.

Another expert, Cheng from Queen's University, explains the steps of reviewing even from its initial stage of previewing the text.¹⁶ First, before reading the text, a reviewer has to think of how the title leads him or her about the content of the text. In addition, looking at the sub-headings and skimming the paragraphs also have to be done. After previewing the text, the reviewer starts to read the text carefully. He explains that it is important to take notes about the main ideas, the supporting ideas, the conclusions, and the author of the text, its intended audience, the illustrations, as well as the organization of the text while reading. Next, once the reading step is finished, the reviewer prepares an outline by reading over the previous notes. He mentions that the reviewer has to think of a statement to be the thesis of his or her review. Furthermore, he says that supporting details are made along with the thesis so that the review produced is logical. The fourth step is to write the first draft of the review. Finally, once the draft is finished, it is important for the reviewer to revise it to check on its grammar and punctuation errors, organization, as well as errors in quotations or in references.

Meanwhile, Russell from the University of the Fraser Valley proposes three steps of

¹³Deniz Saydam, *Writing a Critical Review* (Ankara: METU Academic Writing Center, 2004).

¹⁴Karen Taylor, *Writing Academic Reviews* (Peterborough: The Trent University Academic Skills Centre, 2010).

¹⁵Jose L. Galvan, *Writing Literature Review: A Guide for Students of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Glendale: Pycszak Publishing, 2006).

¹⁶Liyong Cheng, *A Guide to Writing Reviews* (Kingston: Queen's University Press, 2009).

reviewing.¹⁷ The first step is to read the text carefully. The reviewer may start this step by previewing the text in order to build contexts found within the text. He explains that the reviewer should do some pauses and think about what the author is trying to do in the text while reading. Furthermore, he says that when the reviewer finds some important or new information, some notes may be taken in the text. The second step of reviewing is to re-read the text in order to determine and note down the arguments that support the main ideas. He mentions that the reviewer has to be able to tell about how the text supports its claims, explains the support it offers, and examines how thorough or effective the support is. Moreover, the reviewer may reflect his or her personal attitudes and beliefs to what is being discussed in the text. Finally, the last step is to take a critical approach to the text being reviewed. He explains that in this step, the reviewer may start to evaluate or to make judgment on the ideas in the text.

From those experts' explanations, it can be concluded that the steps of reviewing mainly consists of the reading step and the writing step. In the reading step, it is important to preview the text, take notes of the text content, summarize the author's ideas, and evaluate them. Meanwhile, in the writing step, it is important to note down the author's main ideas and supporting details as well as the reviewer's evaluation of the text in the review.

There are some components that have to be noted in reviews. Several experts propose the components of good reviews. Bray mentions four components of reviews; summary, personal

reflections, documentation, and presentation.¹⁸ He explains that summary means how main points of the text are summarized accurately and thoroughly, how it contains few sentences pulled verbatim from the text and how the expansion is evident and whether the summary is organized in a logical way. Meanwhile, personal reflections indicate that in the reviews, the reviewer's opinions are stated clearly and his or her responses demonstrate a high degree of reflection. Then, he says that documentation measures the grammar, spelling, or usage errors and the correct use of reference and citation in the review. Last, presentation of the reviews is given in a clear manner and all points of the text are covered in the reviews.

Hage only provides three components of reviews.¹⁹ However, he calls them criteria instead of components. Despite the fact that the terms are different, they actually have similar meanings. The first criterion is that the reviews summarize the context and content of the selected text. He says that good reviews provide a very thorough and clear and concise summary of the text context and content. The second criterion is that the reviews identify and describe the reviewer's personal reaction to the text. In addition, they thoroughly describe the reviewer's personal reaction to the text and include discussion of the relevant issues. The third criterion is about the grammar and mechanics. He explains that the reviews have to consistently contain accurate and proper grammatical conventions, spelling, and punctuation.

¹⁷Anna Russell, 'Article Review/Critique', 2011 <www.ufv.ca>.

¹⁸Mark Bray, *Writing a Critical Review of a Journal Article* (Hong Kong: The UHK Academic Writing Center, 2003).

¹⁹Erik Hage, *Writing Literature Reviews* (Albany: Hudson Whitman Excelsior College Press, 2005).

Cook proposes six components of reviews.²⁰ 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 points. He says that good reviews include accurate identification of the text premise and significant points in support of the premise. Bojovic says that in order to be able to find these two, readers can skim and scan the text carefully.²¹ 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 is the format of reviews.²² 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, is the writing mechanics.²³ 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 states reviews have an essential part in scholarship so that professors ask students to do reviews in class.²⁴ 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

²⁰Robert Cook, *Reviewing Papers* (Alabama: Columbia Southern University Press, 2010).

²¹M Bojovic, 'Reading Skills and Reading Comprehension in English for Specific Purposes', *The International Language Conference on The Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication between Cultures 2010*, September 2010, 2010, 1–5.

²²Cook.

²³Cook.

²⁴Taylor.

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.

Basically, there are two types of texts. They are narrative text and expository text. Narrative texts tell a story in order to reach the goal of reading for entertainment. On the other hand, expository texts are written in order to inform the readers about a topic. According to Starfield, an expository text is a text written in order to inform the readers about a topic.²⁵ It gives reasons for a point of view and convinces others of it. Livingston from Brigham Young University states that in writing an expository text, an author researches the topic to obtain information.²⁶ 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 explains that there are six expository text structures. They are description, listing, sequence, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and problem and solution.²⁷ 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.

Expository text has some general characteristics. According to Lynch and Mariconda, the first characteristic of expository texts is that it states its narrow main idea.²⁸ Second, support ideas are presented by using quotes, statistics, examples, and facts. Third, the information in the text is logically organized. However, they explain that the organization of the information may depend on the type of expository. The information could be organized chronologically, from least important to most important or from most important to least. Fourth, the text is made committed to the topic. Last, conclusion is made to restate the topic and main supporting ideas. In short, the author's main ideas on the topic are the most important feature in the expository text. The information given by the author is backed up with things like examples or statistics in order to clarify the fact itself.

An expository text improves university students' skills because of some reasons. First, according to Arkhondi et al., expository texts can be challenging to students because they are structured to facilitate their study process.²⁹ The structures of expository texts guide the students to get through their reading. In addition, Huson mentions that the expository text's complexity

²⁵Sue Starfield, *Writing a Critical Review* (Sidney: The UNSW Press, 2011).

²⁶Nancy Livingston, 'Expository Text Structures', *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2014.

²⁷Livingston.

²⁸Judy Lynch and Barbara Mariconda, *Step-by-Step Strategies for Teaching Expository Writing* (Washington: Scholastic Inc., 2001).

²⁹Moasumeh Arkhondi, Aziz Malayeri, and Arshad Abd Samad, 'How to Teach Expository Text Structure to Facilitate Reading Comprehension', 2012 <<http://www.readingrockets.org>>.

and the higher level vocabulary used in the text can measure the readiness of the university students.³⁰ The better they can handle the complex text, the better they can be. However, Iwai explains that it might be more difficult for students to understand expository texts.³¹ Some of them may be struggling readers while other may be skillful readers. In order to be skillful readers, then they have to activate their background knowledge, make inferences, and possess rich experiences. Those were the reasons of using the expository text in this research.

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.

³⁰Julie Alice Huson, 'The Importance of Reading Expository Text', 2014 <<http://everydaylife.globalpost.com>>.

³¹Yuko Iwai, 'Developing ESL/EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension of Expository Text', *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2007.

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. explain that descriptive research is done by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting some comprehensive data in order to get insights or understandings of a topic.³²

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

³²L.R. Gay, Geoffrey E. Mills, and Peter Airasian, *Educational Research* (Ohio: Pearson, 2006).

designed by Cook.³³ 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 points, the application of analysis, the critical evaluation of premise and supporting points, the review format, the writing mechanics, and the review organization.

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		
1	9	Satisfactory	7	Satisfactory	8	Satisfactory
2	9	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory	9	Satisfactory
3	5	Satisfactory	9	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.

The application of analysis of the students' reviews

³³Cook.

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	Satisfactory	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.

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 that someone needs to become a careful and insightful reader in order to review an article effectively.³⁴ 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.

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 (0-30)				Final Scores	Category
	Rater 1	Category	Rater 2	Category		
1	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
2	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory	2	Unsatisfactory
3	3	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	Competent	6	Competent	6.5	Competent
9	3	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
10	3	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
11	3	Satisfactory	3	Satisfactory	4	Satisfactory
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. Saydam clearly mentions that reviewing means thinking carefully and taking into consideration both the strengths and weaknesses in the material.³⁵ 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

³⁴Taylor.

³⁵Saydam.

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.

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	8	Competent	7	Competent	7.5	Competent
7	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory	5	Satisfactory
8	8	Competent	6	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 explains that in writing reviews, students mostly thought words in Bahasa Indonesia first then translated them into English later on.³⁶ The interference of the first language, of course, caused problems in the students' reviews.

The organization of 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:

³⁶Ana Maryanti, 'Students' Ability and Problems in Writing Review Text at Grade XII SMAN 4 Kerinci' (Universitas Negeri Padang, 2014).

Table 6. Students’ Scores on the Organization

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

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*, 5.2 (2005), 34–42

Arkhondi, Moasumeh, Aziz Malayeri, and Arshad Abd Samad, ‘How to Teach Expository Text Structure to Facilitate Reading Comprehension’, 2012 <<http://www.readingrockets.org>>

Bell, Virginia, Tom Freckleton, and Hazel O’Hara, *Planning a Critical Review* (Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University Effective Learning Service, 2005)

Benos, Dale J., Kevin L. Kirk, and John E. Hall, ‘How to Review a Paper’, *Advan in Physiol*

- Edu*, 27 (2003), 47–52
- Bojovic, M, 'Reading Skills and Reading Comprehension in English for Specific Purposes', *The International Language Conference on The Importance of Learning Professional Foreign Languages for Communication between Cultures 2010*, September 2010, 2010, 1–5
- Boschan, Maria, 'Article Review or Critique', 2014 <www.ufv.ca/writing_centre>
- Bray, Mark, *Writing a Critical Review of a Journal Article* (Hong Kong: The UHK Academic Writing Center, 2003)
- Cheng, Liying, *A Guide to Writing Reviews* (Kingston: Queen's University Press, 2009)
- Cook, Robert, *Reviewing Papers* (Alabama: Columbia Southern University Press, 2010)
- Deal, Amanda, and Melissa Rareshide, *Critical Reading Manual* (Winston-Salem University Press, 2013)
- Galvan, Jose L., *Writing Literature Review: A Guide for Students of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Glendale: Pycszak Publishing, 2006)
- 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', 2014
- Hage, Erik, *Writing Literature Reviews* (Albany: Hudson Whitman Excelsior College Press, 2005)
- Huson, Julie Alice, 'The Importance of Reading Expository Text', 2014 <<http://everydaylife.globalpost.com>>
- Iwai, Yuko, 'Developing ESL/EFL Learners' Reading Comprehension of Expository Text', *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2007
- Kaya, Ebru, 'The Role of Reading Skills on Reading Comprehension Ability of Turkish EFL Students', *ÜNİVERSİTEPARK Bülten*, 4.1–2 (2015), 37–51 <<https://doi.org/10.12973/unibulletin.412.4>>
- Livingston, Nancy, 'Expository Text Structures', *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2014
- Lynch, Judy, and Barbara Mariconda, *Step-by-Step Strategies for Teaching Expository Writing* (Washington: Scholastic Inc., 2001)
- Maryanti, Ana, 'Students' Ability and Problems in Writing Review Text at Grade XII SMAN 4 Kerinci' (Universitas Negeri Padang, 2014)
- Mayer, Philip, *Guidelines for Writing a Review Article* (Zurich: Zurich-Basel Plant Service Center, 2009)
- Procter, Margaret, 'The Book Review or Critical Critique: General Guidelines', 2011 <www.writing.utoronto.ca>
- Rani, Yati Aisya, and Dinovia Fannil Kher, 'Developing An Effective Model In Teaching Reading: What Would Work Best In a Large English Class?', *JURNAL EDUCATIVE: Journal of Educational Studies*, 4.1 (2019), 1–14
- Ridianto, Ridianto, 'TEACHING READING BY USING PARAGRAPH SHRINKING STRATEGY', *Journal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies*, 3.2 (2018), 174 <<https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v3i2.546>>
- Russell, Anna, 'Article Review/Critique', 2011 <www.ufv.ca>
- 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)