RESEARCH ARTICLE

Analysis of Peer Revisions of an EFL Argumentative Essay

TANS FELIKS[*1], GOMER LIUFETO[2], HILDA M. NALLEY[3]

[1,2,3]Graduate English Department, Nusa Cendana University

[*]felikstansnara@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This descriptive study is about how poor and good student writers revise their friends' English as a foreign language (EFL) argumentative writing in an Indonesian university context. Its aims are to find out: 1) elements of EFL writing which are revised by the students' in revising their friends' writing; and, 2) how peer revisers revise their friends' EFL writing. This study was done in March, 2017. Its reserach subjects were two masters students of a graduate English department who revised their friend's EFL argumentative essay. The instrument used was an original EFL argumentative essay by a student writer and two essays as the results of revising the original essay: one was by a poor student writer and the other by a good student writer. The original text and its revised versions were individually done in an hour long classroom sit-in writing. The data were analysed descriptively focusing on: essay content/thesis development; word choice, sentence structure and paragraph structure; organization; and, mechanics. It was found that both revisers revise the text with different focuses and results. The poor student writer focuses on two components, that is: 1) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; and, 2) mechanics. The good student writer, however, focuses more comprehensively on: 1) content (thesis statement); 2) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; 3) organization; and, 4) mechanics. The results of their revisions are also different. The poor student writer results in a worse text, whereas the good student writer produces a better one. Despite such a better result, it is also found that a good student writer is not always free from mistakes/errors in constructing EFL writing components as such. It is, therefore, suggested that student writers rely on more good student writer revisers to better their EFL writing.

Keywords: analysis, peer revisions, EFL, and argumentative essay.

Introduction

A piece of writing, by mature or non-mature writers in their mother tongue (L-1) or foreign and/or second language (L-2), is an individual process, that is, it is writers' total responsibility to make sure that their writing is perfect through such activities as prewriting, writing, rewriting, and postwriting/publishing (Graves, 1975/1983/1986; Zamel, 1982/1983; Calkins, 1994; Houston, 2004; Spandel, 2008; Puengpipattrakul, 2014; Tans, 2014; Abaz & Aziz, 2016). Along the process, writers in general, student writers in particular, rely on

others like their peers or friends or teachers or editors to revise/edit their writings to make them better (Kobayashi, 1992; Houston, 2004; and, Strong, 2006).

It is acknowledged that when it is revised/edited by a profesional editor/revisor/proofreader, a piece of writing can, in general, be better. Yet peer revisions by student writers do not always end up in a better piece of a revised piece of writing; it could also result in a worse piece of writing compared to its original one (Scarcella, 1984; Wallace & Hayes, 1991; Caulk, 1994). The question then is how peer revisions are carried out that they do not always make a piece of writing better.

This research has been designed to answer the question focussing on peer revisions of an EFL argumentative essay in an Indonesian university context. It is believed that answering the question is crucial for several reasons. First, learning a foreign language like EFL is always challenging (Smoke, 1987; Tans, 2017) including EFL writing (De Jesus, 2017; Tans, 1999). It is, therefore, understandable that students, among other things, rely on their peers to help them solve their EFL learning problems in general, in EFL writing in particular, despite the fact that peer revisions may not always end up in a better piece of writing as stated above.

In this sense, knowing how peer revisions work or fail to work could help students improve their mastery of EFL in general, EFL writing in particular. Improving EFL skills could, in turn, help them improve not only their language skills in their mother tongue or any other language(s) they are learning/acquiring because of what Cummins (1991) calls linguisitic interdependence but also their masteary of any subjects/courses they are learning since language is a means of learning/interacting. When it is used effectively, learning could succeed or vise versa (Genesee, 1987; Yule, 1990). In other words, this research is important in terms of helping to make teaching and learning in general, the teaching and learning of EFL writing in particular, be more successful. That is by using a means of learning more effectively, aims of teaching and learning can be more effectively achieved.

Second, for EFL teachers, answering the question is very important because it will help them be more effective in using what is called peer tutoring in EFL writing. That is, by understanding how peer tutoring works or does not work in EFL writing, the teachers can then rely on "smart" students to help other students improve their EFL writing, that is, its content, organization, word choice and structure as well as writing mechanics (Dunbar et al., 1991; Blanchard & Root, 2004; Tans, 2017).

Third, in relation to the reasons stated above, a success in EFL writing will, in turn, help a lot in succcessfully developing and/or creating a far better society since it is basically based upon a good education of its people. In other words, this research is important to create a well-developed society based on good level of education and/or wiriting skill in L-1 or L-2 or both. This is particularly crucial in relation to argumentative writing since it is a kind of writing mostly used at higher level of education. Hence those who are good at argumentative writing must be relatively easier to do their university education assignments which are generally argumentative.

Finally, peer-revision is also a good example of how a social networking system works. That is, by learning from students' ways of helping each other through revising or editing their friends' writing in which they cooperate to create a better piece of writing, people from multicultural backgrounds can then create a more peaceful society based on a good networking system in which competence, inhteraction, harmony and tolerance as well as honesty works for a better world. For Indonesia as a multicultural country, where this study has been carried out, this kind of networking is utlimately important. It can learn for best practices of EFL writing peer revisions how a multilingual society works to build up its great competence, harmonious interactions/relations, tolerance, courage, and honesty as these are some of the characters possessed by editors in making a piece of writing better.

Theoretical Framework

Since this research is related to revision of a piece of argumentative essay, it is important that the nature of argumentaive essay be described. Argumentative essays, Fauziati et al. (2011) argue, can be categorised into two major categories, namely, analytical exposition essays and hortatory ones. In analytical exposition, its writers are experts in their fields; the words they use are, therefore, academic words which describe an issue right to the point, that is, they do not use connotative words; they use denotative words. Its generic structure consists of a thesis statement followed by some arguments. Those arguments are then

reiterated in the conclusion of a text. Along the generic structure, the words used are, in general, modals, action and thinking verbs, adjectives, technical words, general and abstract nouns, and connectors.

In hortatory text, writers present themselves as "common people" who simply express their personal arguments/ideas that their readers may listen to and/or follow. In other words, hortatory text writers express their ideas logically, that is, their use certain reasons to lead their readers to something.   To do so, facts, research results and theories are included in their reasoning. The generic structure of an hortatory text is as follows: thesis statement followed by arguments and recommendations.   Along the process of buliding a text, writers use such words as abstract nouns, actions verbs and thinking verbs, adverbial modals like *certainly* and *surely*, connectors showing time order such as *first* and *second*; words used to evaluate things/people like *crucially improtant* and *credible*; passive voice; and, simple present tense (pp. 44-45/261-262).

Essays which are worth publishing in general, argumentative pieces of essays in particular, are products of a series of revisions. In other words, revision is a necessary part of writing for publication. It is also a part of writing an assignment in schools and/or writing for any important events. In this context, Dunbar et al. (1991: 41) define revising a piece of writing as aprocess "reseeing through fresh eyes – reseeing your work as a whole and reseeing the parts and how they contribute to the whole." The parts that need to be revised in order to make sure that they form the whole piece of writing nicely and logically, they add, are paragraphs (i.e. effective topic sentence and supporting sentences) including the use of transitions and any words needed to have good sentences, paragraphs, and, finally, a comprehensive discourse (pp. 41-50). This is supported by Cox and Giddens (1991: 50) who say that revising a piece of writing may "prompt a thorough reworking of an existing draft or a total replacement of the earlier draft. It can help the writer find a thesis that is more complex, sophisticated, interesting or subtle than her original one."

It is, therefore, important in revising a piece of writing that writers, according to Cox and Giddens, looks first at global aspects of their writing before looking at local concerns. In revising globally, they make "all the decisions and changes that are necessary on a large scale" whose aim is "to get the thrust of your essay right," clear purpose, relevant information, and good order. In local revision, they add, a writer's focus is on the paragraphs and sentences used. Its aim is to "clarify, polish, and refine the smaller elements" of a writer's drafts" (1991: 50).   Along the revision process, writers should also edit and proofread their writing to improve its quality. In editing/proofreading, writers' focus is on "particular words and sentence constructions as well as to the process of cleaning up errors in spelling, punctuation, and usage" (Strong, 2016: 117). In this context, Smoke (1987: 20) says, "When editing your writing, look for surface mistakes, the kinds of mistakes that a writer makes in the first draft." By doing this, one's writing can then be free of mechanical mistakes like spelling and punctuation errors (Houston, 2004: 16).

Such kind of revision can, of course, be done by the writers themselves and/or by their friends when asked to do so by the writers. Hence the term *peer revision* appears. Although it may not always improve one's writing (see, for example, Wallace & Hayes, 1991) because EFL students themselves do have problems in writing, particularly in producing cohesive, coherent and grammatically correct argumentative essays (De Jesus, 2017: 24), peer revision or "peer response," as Strong (2016: 117) calls it, is a common practice in school writing.

As a common phenomenon in writing in schools, *peer revision* is closely related to the teaching and learning of writing, in both L-1 and L-2 contexts. It is worth reminding here that the teaching and learning of writing is basically conducted in three major approaches (paradigms), that is, process approaches (Graves, 1975/1983/1986), genre apporaches (Martin, 1985/1992), and a mixture of both genre and process approaches, i.e., a contextual approach (Tans, 1999; Tans & Semiun, 2015). In such contexts, peer revision is, of course, applicable.

In peer revision, student writers revise/edit their friends' writing in order to make it better and/or free from errors/mistakes in terms of four major components of a peice of (EFL) writing, that is, its content (thesis development), word choice and sentence/paragraph structure, organization of writing, and its mechanics, that is, its spelling, punctuations and other technical matters of writing like how to write italic forms and references (see, for example, Dunbar et al., 1991: 6). In revising/editing a piece of writing, it is important for any editors/revisors to know the nature of a text they are revising, that is, revising a narration,

---

for example, is different from revising/editing a piece of argumentative essay. The first is mainly based on chronological order, the latter on reasoning (i.e. important ideas first) in order to find a "common ground" (Cox & Giddens, 1991: 336).

In practice, however, peer revision as such does not always result in a better piece of writing. This happens, Wallace and Hayes (1991: 54-55) argue, because of three major reasons. First, the students who revise their friends' writing have no "essential revision skills" (p. 54). This is supported by Hayes et al. (1987) who find that students often fail to find out the problems their friends have in their writing that they revise.

Second, the students may find the mistakes/errors in their friends' writing, yet they are not able to correct them. This is supported by Scardamalia and Bereiter (1983) and Bartlett (1981) who find that their research subjects know the problems of their friends in their writing but they cannot "fix" them.

Third, the students who are asked to revise or edit their friends' writing do not understand their task. In other words, their problem in revising their friends' writing is the result of the fact that they do not really understand what their task is or what they have to do in revising/editing their friends' writing. In some cases, they may understand the task, yet they do not have sufficient competence to do it. When it is related to argumentative writing, for example, MaCann (1989: 62) finds that "young students have a great difficulty writing argumentative discourse."

Despite such a failure, however, peer revision is a common practice in the teaching and learning of both L-1 and L-2 writings. It is, therefore, interesting to know how peer revision is practiced in an EFL class writing which is the focus of this study.

Research Objectives

There are two major aims of this research, namely, to find out: 1) elements of EFL writing which are revised by the students' in revising their friends' writing; and, 2) how such writing elements are revised by student writers in their porcesses of revising their friend's argumentative essay.

Method

This is a descriptive study aiming at describing a phenomenon as it happens in its real/natural condition (Borg & Gall, 1989; Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Latief, 2011). The phenomenon to be described in this research is peer revision in EFL argumentative piece of writing. Its research subjects were two second semester students doing their masters studies at the Graduate English Education Program of a sate university in Indonesia, that is, Nusa Cendana University – their masters study is supposed to finish in two years, namely, Sopa and Aria, nikcnames. They were purposively chosen, that is, Aria as the best and Sopa the poorest student writers in their class of 14 students.

To get the data, 14 students were asked on 14 March, 2017, to revise the following argumentative writing in terms of its content, word choice/sentence structure/paragraph structure, organization, and mechanics:

Text 1: Why I want to Study at Nusa Cendana University
By Bilo

The purpose to study at Nusa Cendana University Kupang is to develop knowledge and increase my capability in order to fulfill the needs in my country. Undana gives me the knowledge, skills, confidence and experience, to help me make my world better. Whether I am school leaver or a mature student, university opens up an opportunity and lets me takes control of my future.   And have a university qualification will make me more attractive in the future   and increases my earning potential. It shows that I have the ability and self-motivation to learn at a higher level, and I will be dedication to see my course through to the end if I know what I want to do after graduating.

Educational degree can significantly improve my job prospects at the same time as giving me professional skills and knowledge relevant to my future career. An increasing number of graduate jobs do not specify a particular subject area. Employers often look for the skills that I develop throughout my degree, such as educational science teaching skills,

teamwork and problem solving. University will be let me develop as an individual. It gives me the time and opportunity to develop new interests, learn new skills and meet new people. Especially if it's my first time away from home, I'll become more independent and self-reliant. I'll have space to form an idea of the path; I want to take after graduation and opportunity to broaden my horizons by meeting new people from different place of the country, I will be facing new challenges and making use of the huge range of new activities, and societies on offer. I may even be able to take part of my course in West Timor and learn English language, another new language, its Bahasa Malayu NTT and culture. It doesn't necessarily involve several years of full-time study at Undana. Flexible study options make me choose how and when I learn.

It was a piece of in-class argumentative writing by Bilo, a nickname of a graduate student of the same department. His essay consists of two paragraphs, 15 sentences, that is five in P.1 and 10 in P.2, 322 words, 21 lines.

The students were asked to revise the essay in class for an hour using their laptop. It turned out that each of student produced his/her revised version of Bilo's essay. In revising the essay, however, the students did not open up any dictionary and did not discuss it with their friends/lecturer despite the fact that they were encouraged to do so when necessary.

 After revising the essay, Text 1, above, the researchers copied the essays into their laptops for analysis purposes. Yet, what was chosen for this research was just two pieces of essays, that is, one by Sopa and another one by Aria, for the reason stated above.

The data were analysed descriptively based on the content (thesis development), word choice/sentence structure/paragraph structure, writing organization, and mechanics of the essays (Blanchard and Root, 1990; Dunbar et al., 1991; Fauziati et al., 2011).

Findings and Discussion

Based on its objectives, these research results are divided into several parts, that is, elements of EFL writing that the research subjects revised and the ways both students revised the elements (quality of revision). These are described below.

1. **Revised Elements of EFL Writing**

 It is found out that both student writers, Sopa and Aria, did revise the essay, Text 1, by Bilo, yet they had different focuses in revising it. Sopa revised its word choice, sentence structure, and mechanics. Her revision of Text 1 is the following Text 2.

Text 2: Why I Want to Study at Nusa Cendana University

I entered Nusa Cendana University for one purpose, which is to develop my knowledge and to increase my capability in mastering English in order to fulfill my country's necessity. Undana contributes knowledge, skills, confidence, provides a good experience to me in order to make my life becomes better and opens up an opportunity to take control of my future. By having a university qualification, it will make me becomes more attractive and also it will help me to get a better income in the future. Moreover, i will be dedicated enough in confronting the real life after I graduated.

Educational degree can help me in improving my skill to become more professional because it is known that enterprises always concern on people's skill by their degree. So university lets me to be more developed individually and independently, gives me the opportunity to meet new people out there and facing the new challenges and the opportunity to join many new activities that offered by the society. I might be able to take part of my course and I can learn English, I also can learn Kupang Malay language and learn their culture.

Text 2 consists of seven sentences, 191 words, and 14 lines compared to 10 sentences and 322 words of its orginal version.

Aria, however, revised the essay more comprehensively; her revision focussed on four elements of the essay, namely: 1) its content (thesis development); 2) word choice, sentence structure, paragraph structure; 3) organization; and, 4) mechanics as seen in Text 3 below.

Text 3: Why I Want to Sutdy at Nusa Cendana University

At its most basic level, education is important for everyone since it gives people the base line skill to survive in the world. It is essential for nearly for every type of job or career, and in many cases education makes the difference between being able to perform a job safely and accurately and being unable to perform a job at all. Eleanor Roosevelt famously said that education is essential to good citizenship and that education is important to life as it enables people to contribute to their country. Others believe that education is important because it helps to answer life's big questions, including question of how to live, work, and love.

For the shake of the above fact mentioned, I finally choose to continue my education degree to a higher level, i.e, master program at Nusa Cendana University. There are some reasons of why continuing my study at Nusa Cendana University, especially on English eEducation Department; First, by looking at the importance of mastering English as the lingua franca today, I feel obliged to follow further education to a higher level. Being able to speak English allows us to communicate effectively in numerous countries, and this opens up lots of possibilities for you in terms of the countries you could choose to seek work in one day. Even in countries where English is not an official language, it is often used as a lingua franca. For that shake, I am sure that taking the master's program in English helps me in improving my skills, knowledge, and insight in English studies in general, especially in my area of specialization, such as linguistics, literary, cultural studies, or education for me. This master program will develop a critical and independent attitude of mine, as a student through theoretical and methodological teaching, as well as further developing my written and oral skills in the English language.

Second, I want to develop my knowledge and increase my capability especially in English education. Having a higher degree of education can significantly improve my job prospects at the same time as giving me professional skills and knowledge relevant to my future career. Employers often look for the skills that I develop throughout my degree, such as educational science teaching skills, team work and problem solving.

Third, coming to the University, to a higher level offers me time and opportunity todevelop new interests, learn new skills and meet new people. I will become more independent. I will also be facing new challenges and learn many new cultures which will be gotten from my new collegas.

The third points mentioned above are my reasons of why continuing study at Nusa Cendana University. For me, to reach our dream and plans and being successful depends on ourselves. By having strong motivation and better determination I am positive that we will reach what we have planned. Shortly, I would like to say keep on being enthusiasm and don't stop achieving our dream.
Thank you

TANS FELIKS et al.,

Text 3 is much longer than Text 1, its original version; it consists of six paragraphs – including P.6 that just consists of one sentence, that is, *Thank you* – 20 sentences, and 494 words. How Sopa and Aria revised those components is described below.

2.   Student Writers' Ways of Revising an Argumentative Essay

2.1 Revision of Content/Thesis Development

Revision on this component of writing should focus on what an essay is all about. It is, therefore, based on the nature of the task, which is reasoning in the context of this research, students are supposed to give some reasons why they want to study at a particular university. In this sense, revising the content of an essay means proposing some reasons which are relevant to its topic. That is, a revisor of this text should include some reasons that are not found in the original text to make the reasons richer and more logical. Hence, the irrelevant reasons found in the original text be dropped out. In other words, since this essay is categorised as an hortatory text, the content should have its thesis statement, arguments, and recommendation.

In that line of thought, the content of Bilo's writing is, to a certain extent, relevant to the topic of his essay, that is, he gave his reasons why he wanted to study at the University of Nusa Cendana (UNC) to do his masters degree. He mentioned his reasons for his studying at UNC, namely:

1.   He wants to to improve his knowledge and capability needed to develop his country (P.1, S.1, Ls.1-2) and his personality/individuality (P.2, S.4, L.5);
2.   UNC is capable to give him "the knowledge, skills, confidence and experience, to help" him in such a way that his future can be better (P.1, S.2, Ls.2-3) or UNC "opens up an opportunity and lets me takes control of my future" (P.1, S.3, Ls.4);
3.   He wants to be "more more attractive in the future" by increasing his income potential (P.1, S.4, L.5).
4.   He wants to show that he has "the ability and self-motivation to learn at a higher level" of education (P.1, S.5, L.6);
5.   He wants to have a university degree that can improve his "job prospect" (P.2, S.1, L.1); and,
6.   He wants to "broaden his horizon" (P.2, S.7, L.8) as UNC gives him "the time and opportunity to develop new interests, learn new skills and meet new people" (P.2, S.5, Ls.5-6).

It is interesting to see Sopa and Aria revised Bilo's original text in totally different ways. Sopa did not make any changes to the content (thesis development) of Bilo's writing. In other words, its content/thesis development is kept without any changes by Sopa (see Text 1 and Text 2). This is not proper as Text 1 needs a lot of revision of its content as it is not yet perfect. Aria, however, revises the content of Bilo's writing, that is, its thesis development is reformulated. She proposes three reasons why she wants to study at the university; those reasons are found from paragraph one to paragraph three. These are the ideas she has proposed to answer the question why she wants to study at the university. In doing that, Aria keeps just a few words and sentences originally found in Bilo's writing (see Text 1 and Text 3).

Despite Aria's revison of the content of Bilo's essay, however, it is found that the original essay has not been comprehensively revised; there have been some reasons that have not been mentioned like the ideas related to, for example, his home town and its distance to his university, culture/habits, cost, and transportation. Text 1 also shows that the ideas are not relatively complete, that is, there are some reasons that Bilo fails to include in his essay. Although it is understandable as it was a sit-in classroom essay and in such a limitted period of time, it is always common not to have a very comprehensive piece of essay, it is found that both revisors fail to relatively complete the content of the essay (Text 1).

In addition, Bilo includes some ideas which are redundant in such terms as "professional skills and knowledge relevant to my future career" (P.2, S.1, L.2) which is more or less the same as the ideas he proposes

in P.1, S.1, Ls. 1-2, that is, "The purpose to study at Nusa Cendana University Kupang is to develop knowledge and increase my capability in order to fulfill the needs in my country."

Besides those redundancies, some of Bilo's ideas were unclear or irrelevant in several cases. The first is this: "An increasing number of graduate jobs do not specify a particular subject area" (P.2, S.2, Ls. 2-3). This is not clear because it is not related to his topic. The second irrelevant/unclear one can be seen in, "Employers often look for the skills that I develop throughout my degree, such as educational science teaching skills, teamwork and problem solving (P.2, S.3, Ls.3-5)." This is not clear because the writer fails to be explicit in that context. So, he can make himself clearer by, for example, modifying the sentence as, "Employers often look for the skills that I develop throughout my degree, such as educational science teaching skills, teamwork and problem solving. As these are what I learn/study at UNC, I, therefore decide to study at UNC."   In addition, the following ideas are irrelevant to his essay topic which is supposed to be reasons why he wants to study at UNC for his masters degree:

1. Especially if it's my first time away from home, I'll become more independent and self-reliant (P.2, S.6, Ls.6-7).
2. I'll have space to form an idea of the path; I want to take after graduation and opportunity to broaden my horizons by meeting new people from different place of the country, I will be facing new challenges and making use of the huge range of new activities, and societies on offer (P.2, S.7, Ls.7-10).
3. I may even be able to take part of my course in West Timor and learn English language, another new language, its Bahasa Malayu NTT and culture (P.2, S.8, Ls.10-12).
4. It doesn't necessarily involve several years of full-time study at Undana (P.2, S.9, L.12).
5. Flexible study options make me choose how and when I learn (P.2, S.10, L.13).

As these ideas are not found in both the revised versions of Text 1 by both Sopa and Aria, it is fair to say here that they might have seen these ideas as redundant too.

All in all, however, the content of Bilo's essay has not been comprehensively revised by both student writers; those revisions by Aria are insufficient to have a more convincing argumentative piece of writing as such. However, it is acknowledged that Aria's revision of the content of Bilo's essay is better than that of Sopa.

2.2 Revision of Word Choices/Phrases, Sentence and Paragraph Sturctures

2.2.1 Word Choices/Phrases

Revision of word choice is related to the use of parts of speech like nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs used in correct forms and meanings. In that sense, Bilo's word choice for his essay is generally good, although it is not that rich since he has failed to suport his reasons with some convincing facts, examples, and details. In some cases, he also fails to use the words effectively. There are some cases, for example, in which his word choice is pretty poor as in the following cases. His use of the phrase "The purpose ..." (P.1, L.1, S.1) is not natural as article *the* is usually used to refer to a noun that has been mentioned in a sentence. In this context, it is, therefore, better to use, for example, such phrases/wprds as "My purpose ..." which is more natural. The use of *the* in "... the knowledge..." (P.1, Ls.2-3, S.2) is not approriate in that context and, therefore, be changed by such words as *some* or *a lot of knowledge.* This is also the case for such phrase as *the huge range of* (P.2 , L.10, S.7) which is not natural and, therefore, be replaced by *a huge range of.*

In "... school leaver ..." (P.1, L.4, S.3), there should be an article *a* before the phrase. So, it would be "a school leaver."   In "And have a ..." (P.1, L.5, S.4), the use of the word *and* is not appropriate and it should be without *and*. In, "... to take part of my course .." (P.2, L.11, S.8), the word *of* should be replaced by *in* to make it more logical. In *Bahasa Melayu NTT* (P.2, L.12, S.9), Bilo uses a wrong name, it should be *Kupang Malay in NTT* (East Nusa Tenggara Province). In "... to develop knowledge ... (P.1, S.1, L.1), the phrase is not natural and, therefore, should be changed into "... to develop my knowldge...;" and, "... if ..." (P.1, S.5, L.7) should be replaced by *when/because.* The use of *and opportunity* (P.2, L.8, S.7) is incorrect and it should be *an opportunity*. The use of the phrase *different place* (P.2, L.9, S.7) is not correct and should be replaced by *different places.*

Those are things that both Sopa and Aria should revise. They did so, yet in revising the words/phrases, they had one major difference, that is, Sopa maintained most of the words used by Bila as shown in Table 1 below. Aria, however, mostly used not only her own words but also used them in more virous ways that made her writing relatively much longer than its original text. This difference is reflected in Sopa'sText 2, which is shorter than Text1 and Aria's Text 3 which is much longer than Text 1. Aria's first paragraph (Text 3), for example, consists of totally new words, that is, words which are not found in Sopa's original text (Text 1).

Table 1: Revision of Word Choices/Phrases by Sopa

No.	Bilo's Original Versions	Revision by Sopa
1.	The purpose (P.1, L.1, S.1)	One purpose (P.1, L.1, S.1)
2.	the needs in my *gives* country (P.1, L.2. S. 1)	my country's necessity (P.1, Ls.2-3, S.1)
3.	gives ... (P.1, L.2, S.2)	contributes ... to me.. (P.1, Ls. 3-4, S.2)
4.	... to help me make my world better (P.1, L. 3, S.2)	... in order to make my life becomes better ... (P.1, L.4, S. 2)
5.	may (P2, L.10, S.8)	might (P.2, L.5, S.3)
6.	Bahasa Melayu NTT (P.2, L.11, S.8)	Kupang Malay language (P.2, L.6, S.3)

2.2.2 Sentence Structure

Sentence structure is related to such language aspects as tenses and patterns of simple, complex and compound sentences. In that sense, revising a sentence structure means making a sentence better or more natural in its contenxt. In other words, if, for example, a writer wrote, "He go to New York every day," it should be changed into, for example, "He goes to New York every day," or "They go to New York every day," that is, the subject and adverb of place or time are changed to ensure that the sentence is logical.

In line of such thought, Bilo's sentences structures are, in general, great. Yet, there are some cases in which he should have made some changes like "... takes ..." (P.1, L.4, S.3) should be "take;" gerundial form " ... have..." (P.1, L.5, S.4) should be *having; "...* increases ..." (P.1, L.6, S.4)" should be "increase*;* and, *"* ... I will be dedication ..." (P.1, L.7, S.5) should be *I will dedicate* (*my whole time*?) *... .* In "... increases my earning potential ..." (P.1, L.6, S.4), the correct form of the verb is *increase* since it has the auxiliary verb *will* before it. In addition, the use of *will be let* in "University will be let me develop as an individual" (P.2, L.5, S.4) is not correct. It should be *University will let me develop as an individual.* These are supposed to be revised by both Sopa and Aria.

As a matter of fact, both Sopa and Aria change some sentence structures used by Bilo. The changes, however, do not always end up in creating better sentence structures or more natural ones as shown in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Revision of Sentence Structures by Sopa

No.	Bilo's Original Versions	Revision by Sopa
1.	The purpose to study at Nusa Cendana University Kupang is to develop knowledge and increase my capability in order to fulfill the needs in my country (P.1, Ls.1-2, S.1)	I entered Nusa Cendana University for one purpose, which is to develop my knowledge and to increase my capability in mastering English in order to fulfill my country's necessity (P.1, Ls.1-3, S.1)
2.	I may even be able to take part of my course in West Timor and learn English language, another new language, its Bahasa Malayu NTT and culture (P.2, Ls.10-12, S.8).	I might be able to take part of my course and I can learn English, I also can learn Kupang Malay language and learn their culture (P.2, Ls.5-7, S. 3)

In example No.1, Bilo uses a simple sentence in present tense, yet Sopa changes it into a complex sentence, that is, an independent clause in past tense combined with an independent clause in simple present tense. A more natural sentence would be, "My purpose to study at Nusa Cendana University Kupang is to develop my knowledge and to increase my capability in order to fulfill the needs of my country" or "I have entered Nusa

Cendana University for one purpose, that is, to develop my knowledge and to increase my capability in using English so that I can fulfill my country's necessity."

Aria also changes certain sentence structures as in, "Having a higher degree of education can significantly improve my job prospects at the same time as giving me professional skills and knowledge relevant to my future career" (P.2, L.3-4, S.2, Text 3). This seems to have been changing from this sentence, "And have a university qualification will make me more attractive in the future and increases my earning potential" (P.1, Ls.4-6, S.4). In this sense, a gerundial form has been correctly changed by Aria, yet the sentence can be made more natural by changing it into, "Having a higher degree of education can significantly improve my job prospects because of my professional skills and knowledge relevant to my future career."

All in all, Aria has changed the sentence structures in better ways than Sopa has. As the first is more creative her own sentence structures compared to the latter who prefers to maintain the original form of the txt by Bala.

2.2.3 Paragraph Structures

Paragraph structure is divided into three categories, that is, introductory paragraphs, content-related paragraphs (thesis development), and concluding paragraphs. Each category is, of course, unique. An introductory paragraph should have background information on the topic being discussed. Its main aim is to attract readers' attention in such a way that they want to read the whole story. It has, therefore, one or combination of the following techniques, that is, using funny stories, quoting other's ideas, asking questions, and presenting facts and statistics leading to a thesis statement, that is, what the essay is about (its topic/subject) and its focus. Content-related paragraphs are also called thesis development. Each content paragraph is a development of a thesis statement. In that sense each paragraph has one major idea stated in one major sentence. The major idea is supported by some supporting sentences in which some facts, examples, and details are found. The concluding paragraph as a final comment covers such techniques as restating major ideas, asking some questions, proposing a solution, recommending something, and predicting (Blanchard and Root, 2004: 61).

Bilo's essay, however, fails to cover those categorial paragraphs as it simply consists of two paragraphs. It has no introductory and concluding paragraphs. It seems that both paragraphs of Text 1 are the thesis development/content of the essay, yet their structures are poor as there are more that one main idea in a paragraph and there are no well-established supporting ideas. In paragraph one, for example, Bilo has five sentences and each of them covers one main idea making the paragraph have five main ideas. In other words, in P.1, Bilo has five main ideas in five major sentences which, of course, are not good since a good paragraph should have just one main idea expressed in a main sentence and it is supposed to be supported by some supporting ideas in some supporting sentences.

This is also the case for P.2. It consists of 10 major sentences, each of which has its own major idea. Thus, P.2 is without a single major sentence that has one major idea. As a result, it has no supporting sentences that have supporting ideas. This is not a good sign for a good paragraph as a pargraph should have just one main idea and it is supposed to be supported by one or more supporting ideas in one or more supporting sentences.

To make Bilo's essay better, it is, therefore, important that he should make some modifications by, for example, making it into one paragraph, deleting some ideas which are irrelevant and/or redundant (for example, P.1, S.5; P.2, Ss.1-4 and Ss.6-10). Such modification can also be done by using one main idea in a main sentence and supporting it by using some supporting ideas logically connected by some connectives. This is to make his ideas more logical and his writing simpler as in the following revised version of Bilo's essay by the researchers:

<div align="center">

Why I want to Study at Nusa Cendana University

By Bilo

</div>

There are some purposes of my studying at Nusa Cendana University (Undana), Kupang. First is to develop knowledge and increase my capability in order to fulfill the needs in my country. Second, Undana gives me knowledge, skills, confidence and experience, to help me

make my world better. Third, whether I am school leaver or a mature student, university opens up an opportunity and lets me take control of my future. Fourth, having a university qualification will make me more attractive in the future and increase my earning potential. Fourth, it gives me the time and opportunity to develop new interests, learn new skills and meet new people.

Revising a paragraph structure, therefore, should be done as suggested above. The data shows, however, that Sopa fails to revise the original text in that categorial condition as she does not have introductory and concluding paragraphs in her revision (see Text 2). She simply rewrites the original text into another text without its introduction and conclusion. In other words, like the original text (Text 1), Text 2 by Sopa is withouth introductory paragraph and concluding paragraph. Her thesis development structure (content) is, therefore, poorly constructed; it has no major idea and no supporting ideas since there has been more than one idea in her paragraph and the supporitng ideas are not also well-developed.

On the other hand, Aria made some comprehensive changes; her Text 3 has an introductory paragraph, content development, and a concluding paragraph. However, their structures seem to be pretty poor. Her introductory paragraph, P.1, for example, is not comprehensive as it has no introductory techniques leading to a thesis statement. This is also the case for P.2 which is supposed to be the first paragraph of her theisis development. Its major idea and supporting ideas are not well established; so are P.3 and P.4 as well as P.5 (its concluding paragraph).

In addition, P.6 that simply consists of a sentence, that is, "Thank you" without even a punctuation (exclamatory remark, *!* , or full stop, . ,) is irrelevant. The sentence as such is usually used in an oral language; it is not suitable for an academic piece of writing.

2.3   Writing Organization

A complete discourse like a piece of argumentative essay should have a well-established organization: its introduction, thesis development, and conclusion. That is why changing a piece of writing means changing its organizational aspects in order to make them more relevant. In other words, if a piece of writing is without an introduction, revisors should include one; if it is without a conlcusion, they should create one.

Bilo's essay is without a good organization as it has no introduction, no thesis statement, no thesis development, and no conclusion. In terms of its organization, therefore, Bilo's writing is poor. So, in order to make its organization good, the essay has to have: 1) an introduction that uses such techniques as stated above leading to a thesis statement; 2) an explicit thesis development; and, 3) a conclusion using such tecniques as stated above.

It is found that Sopa fails to revise Text 1 in that line of thought because she simply rewrites the original text in its original form, that is, without introduction and conclusion. It has its "thesis development," yet it is not well-established as it fails to use the criteria needed to develop a thesis statement.

Aria's revision, however, is comprehennsive in terms of its organization: it has introduction, thesis developemnt, and conclusion. Yet, i is not well-established. That is, such an organizational change is not always convincing for the following reasons: 1) its introduction techniques are poor; 2) its thesis debelopment is not explicit; 3) its thesis development lacks main ideas or main ideas are crowded in one single paragraph; 4) its conclusions are not that good as they lack such techniques as restating major points, predicting, recommending, and predicting; and, 5) the influence of an oral language style is pretty strong as in P.6, "Thank you."

2.4   Writing Mechanics

Mechanics of writing are punctuations, spelling, and many more technical things related to writing like italic forms, underlining, and how to write references. In general, Bilo's writing mechanics (for example, spellings and punctuations) are good. However, there some cases in which his use of those mechanics is incorrect as in, "... *Nusa Cendana University Kupang* ..." (P.1, L.1, S.1) that should be *Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, ...* that is, a comma before and after the word *Kupang.* In "... experience, ... (P.1, L.3, S.2), there should be no comma after the word experience. It is also the case for "... my degree, ..." (P.2, L.4, S.3), there should be no comma after the phrase *my degree*.   In other cases, Bilo uses some short forms which are not

allowed in a piece of acdemic writing as *it's* (P.2, L.6, S.6), *I'll* (twice, P.2, L.7, Ss. 6-7), and *doesn't* (P.2, L.12, S.9). They should be *it is, I will,* and *does not* respectively.

It is, therefore, understandable that both Sopa and Aria revise those mechanical problems as they are no longer found in their revised version. Yet, the data show that in some cases both revisers create their own mechanical problems. Sopa, for example, wrote, "... in order to make my life becomes better ..." (P.1, L.4, S.2) in which the use of *becomes* is false; it should be *become* or the word may not be used at all. She also wrote "i" instead of "I" (P.1, L.6, S.3). This also the case for Aria. She also makes some mechanical errors like the word "eEducation" (P.2, L.4, S.2), capital "F" in "First" after a semi-collon (P.2, L.4, S.2), "don't" (P.5, L.5, S.6), and the last sentence without any punctuation, that is, an "!" or "." (P.6, L.1, S.1).

Conclusions

To conclude it is important to state here that both revisors revise the given text, yet in revising it they have different focusses and results. Sopa focusses on: 1) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; and, 2) mechanics. Aria, however, focusses her revisions on four major elements of a piece of writing, that is: 1) content (thesis statement); 2) word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure; 3) orgnization; and, 4) mechanics.

The results of such revisions are different. Compared to the original Text 1, Text 2 by Sopa is worse than Text 1 in such aspects as content (thesis statement), word choice, sentence structure, and paragraph structure, orgnization, and mechanics. This confirms the theory that peer revision may not always result in a better piece of writing. Yet Text 3 revised by Aria results in a text which is far better than Text 1 in those aspects. This finding, therefore, contradicts the theory that peer revision could worsen the quality of an original text as peer revision in this case improves a student's writing. To achieve this, however, the student writer who does the peer revision should be one whose writing competence is better than the one whose writing he/she is to revise. In other words, this research has found that relatively good student writers revise better than thoses who are not. This is why it is important that student writers be more active to consult their writing with good student writers to improve the quality of their writing.

However, it is also important to state here that both good revisors and poor ones do have some problems in correctly constructing such aspects of a piece of writing as content, word choice, sentence/paragraph structure, organization, and mechanics. That is why it is always necessary for student writers, poor or good ones, to keep improving their competences in constructing those components of writing in any language in general, in EFL argumentative writing in particular. This is also crucial along their way to becoming great writers. It is logical as no one can be a good writer if his/her understanding of what is written is poor, his/her word choice/sententce/paragraph structure weak, organization illogical, and mechanics incorrect.

References

Abas, I. H. & Aziz, N. H. A. 2016. "Indonesian EFL Students' Perspective on Writing Process: A Pilot Study." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies,* Vol. 7(3), June, pp. 1-7.

Bartlett, E. J. 1981. *Learning to Write: Some Cognitive and Linguistic Components.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Blanchard, K & Root, Ch. 2004. *Ready to Write More.* New York: Pearson Education.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. 2007. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods.* New York: Pearson.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. 1989. *Educational Research: An Introduction.* New York: Longman.

Calkins, L. Mc. 1994. *The Art of Teaching Writing.* Toronto: Irwin Publishing.

Caulk, N. 1994. "Comparing Teacher and Student Responses to Written Work." *TESOL Quarterly,* 28(1), Spring, pp. 181-188.

Cox, D. R. & Giddens, E. 1991. *Crafting Prose.* Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

De Jesus, E. D. S. 2017. "An Analysis of Argumentative Writing of the Fifth Semester Students of English Study Program of Universidade Dili in Academic Year 2017." *International Journal of Advanced Research (IJAR).* http://www.journalijar.com. 5(9), pp. 24-33. Downloaded on 16 February, 2018.

Dunbar, G., Dunbar, C., & Rorabacher, L. E. 1991. *Assignments in Exposition.* New York: HarperCollins.

Fauzia, E., Ariatmi, S.Z., Laila, M., Srijono, Dj., Fatmawati, R., Prasetyarini, A., Hidayat, 2011. *English Language Teaching and Learning. Theory And Practice.* English Module. PDF. Adobe Reader, pp. 1-297.

Genesee, F. *Learning Through Two Languages: Studies in Immersion and Bilingual Education.* Cambridge: Newbury House.

Graves, D. 1975. "An Examination of the Writing Processes of Seven Year Old Children." *Research in the Teaching of English,* 9(3), pp. 227-241.

Graves, D. 1983. *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Graves, D. 1986. "Writing Process Has growing Pains." In RD Walshe (Ed.), *Children Writing.* Melbourne: The Dominion Press, pp. 17-23.

Hayes, J. R., Flower, L.S., Schriver, K.A., Stratman, J. & Carey, L. 1987. "Cognitive Prcesses in Revision." In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in Psycholinguistics, Volume II: Reading, Writing, and Language Processing.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Houston, G. 2004. *How Writing Works: Imposing Organizational Structure within the Writing Process.* New York: Pearson.

Kobayashi, T. 1992. "Native and Nonnative Reactions to ESL Compositions." *TESOL Quarterly,* 26(1), Spring, pp. 81-112.

Latief, M. A. 2011. *Research Methods on Language Learning: An Introduction. Malang: UM Press.*

MaCann, T. M. 1989. "Student Argumentative writing Knowledge and Ability at Three Grade Levels". *Research in the Teaching of English,* Vol. 3, No. 1, February, pp. 62-76.

Martin, J. R. 1985. *Factual Writing: Exploring and Challenging Social Reality*. Gelong: Deakin University Press.

Martin, J. R. 1992. *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Puengpipattrakul, W. 2014. "A Process Approach to Writing to Develop Thai Students' Socio-Cognitive Skills." *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching,* Vol. 11(2), pp. 270-284. Downloaded on March 12, 2017.

Scarcella, RC. 1984. "How Writers Orient their Readers in Expository Essays: A Comparative Study of Native and Nonnative English Writers." *TESOL Quarterly,* 18(4), December, pp. 671-688.

Scardamalia, M. and Bereiter, C. 1983. "The Development of Evaluative, Diagnostic and Remedial Capabilities in Children's Composing." In M. Martlew (Ed.), *The Psychology of Written Language: Developmental and Educational Perspectives.* New York: Wiley, pp. 67-95.

Smoke, T. 1987. *A Writer's Workbook: An Interactive Writing Text for ESL Students.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Spandel, V. 2008. *Creating Young Writers: Using the Six Traits to Enrich Writing Process in Primary Classrooms.* New York: Pearson.

Strong, W. 2006. *Write for Insight: Empowering Content Area Learning, Grades 6-12.* New York: Pearson.

Tans, F. amd Semiun, A. 2015. Teaching the Writing of English as Foreign Language: An Indonesian Context. *Intenational Journal of Higher Education and Research (IJHER),* Vol. 11(1), pp-182-202

Tans, F. 1999. *EFL Writing of Indonesian Grade 11 Students: An Inquiry into Becoming a Writer.* Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, School of Education, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.

Tans, F. 2014. *Writing: An Introduction.* Kupang: Lima Bintang.

Tans, F. 2017. " Coherence and Cohesion in an EFL Essay of a Graduate Student." *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translational Studies* (IJELR), Vol. 4 (1), Jan-March, pp. 281-292.

Wallace, D. L & Hayes, J. R. 1991. "Redifining Revision for Freshmen." *Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 25(1), February, pp. 54-66.*

Yule, G. *The Study of Language.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Zamel, V. 1982. "Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning." *TESOL Quarterly,* 16(2), June, pp. 195-209.

Zamel, V. 1983. "The Composing Proceses of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies." *TESOL Quarterly,* 17(2), June, pp. 165-183.