

PEER EVALUATION TO TEACH SEMANTICS

Wuri Syaputri

English Department, STKIP Muhammadiyah Pringsewu

Email: wurisyaputri@gmail.com

Abstract

This study begins from the problem of student's confidence to express their knowledge in order to support their understanding the references in learning semantics. The objective of this study knows the significance of achievement process in Semantics class. The technique of this study is using peer evaluation to conduct semantics class. Method of the study is using classroom action research with questionnaire, test and documentation during the semester. The result showed the raising reaction of the students' confidence in expressing their knowledge. It was proven by the gain of the students score in cycle 1 and 2.

Keywords: *Semantics, Peer Evaluation, Achievement.*

1. INTRODUCTION

This research focus on how the students learn the process than getting them to master the process. Learning the terminology, being competent in statistical computations, understanding how to analyze research and other basic components of educational research are essential knowledge for the student. Evaluation is a crucial part of the learning process was the statement came from Barrett (1986). Then, feedback and evaluation on a student's progress are important to the student. Students need information on their progress to make improvements in their work. Through this way, the students can get the best goal in effective learning activity.

Through observing traditional lecture methods, it has noted that student understanding and the existence of a great deal of passive knowledge across all ages and grades, including colleges and universities as Gardner (2011) stated. It could be assumed that students achievement goal depend on how the learning process in the classroom. Students can follow the classroom activity as well as they can. Then, according to Canavan (2003) it was continued that several strategies have been devised to counteract the irrelevance created by over compartmentalization of knowledge and to build a triangulation between teaching, learning, and reality. To make an effective learning activity, peer evaluation is chosen and has a

hypothesis that this strategy as the best way in teaching. In this occasion, it practiced in Semantic classroom. The instructional strategies and techniques that are adopted by a teacher bespeak his attitudes about himself, his students, and their respective roles in the teaching learning process.

Based on interview done by the researcher, it got the statement that most of the students lack of confident when they elaborate their knowledge in linguistics class especially semantics. In accordance with the students, they need more discussion to gain more knowledge and get the best expectation in learning process to get A as their final score. Then, it supported by the students result from test result was various score of each student. The average score was 51.20 from 30 students. It can be seen that their semantics score is not good enough. Then, to face this fact, the students need a technique to give more chance in exploring and discussing their mind. Peer evaluation technique was chosen.

The previous research to support this research was from Reese-Durham (2005). It was stated that the students' researcher agreed that the feedback in peer evaluation was helpful, constructive,

clear and understandable. It assumed that peer evaluation could be an alternative way in learning process. Further, results indicated that the student researchers realized that they need to include more substantial information in the review of the literature section and that the activity was helpful in the final paper revision process. It could be conclude that, peer evaluation is effective to teach a class that need more analysis and theory understanding in classroom such semantics class.

Then according to Lu, Warren, Jermaine, Chaudhuri, & Rixner (2015) was supported that peer evaluation could give more motivation in the classroom. It was because of the student did better job when grading their peers assignment. The researcher found a term named by "grading the graders". The students had responsibility to give the best performance in explaining the topic in discussion session. Then, they should capable to give the score for the other students. So, the students' motivation to learn harder was strong.

Semantics

According to Kreidler (1998) semantics is an attempt to explicate the knowledge of any speaker of a language which allows that speaker to communicate facts, feelings, intentions and products of the imagination to other speakers and to understand what they communicate to him or her. It assumed, as students begin by discovering the value of the subject and then move through all key topics in the field. In semantics, pass a process called by analysis. When the speaker speak something (written or spoken), the listener could catch the meaning of the speaker's intend. The processes of catching is passing the process of listening then analyze the speaker's words.

Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation or assessment refers to the many ways in which students can share their creative work with peers for constructive feedback, and then use this feedback to revise and improve their work (n.d.). This definition implies learning and teaching are activities of the teacher and the learner. The students may have "heart and mind" of their teacher.

As well, it is to prove the ongoing process of improvement and enrichment of the "heart and mind" of the teacher relative to the teacher's professional responsibility for the knowledge development. It means that, to teach is to learn. Such is the nature of the "calling" of teaching.

Best practice literature suggests that this effort will require "(1) building a foundation in the classroom that supports collaborative evaluation, (2) creating effective evaluation tools by articulating specific criteria and ensuring honest student participation, (3) implementing formative feedback during the collaborative experience, (4) formulating summative feedback at the conclusion of the experience, and (5) assessing the collaborative evaluation process" these were proposed by Gueldenzoph & May (2002). To find out the result, the researcher reduced steps in practicing Peer Evaluation in the classroom. They were five requirements then adopted to be four steps only, they were (1) Making group discussion and give the topics for every meeting, (2) giving the instruction to the students how to conduct peer evaluation in classroom, (3) implementing the feedback during the

collaborative experience, (4) assessing the collaborative evaluation process. Anecdotal evidence suggests there is frustration with implementing and using peer feedback to effectively change behavior (improve individual performance) and evaluate individual contributions to team performance was proposed by Topping (1998). Thus, to achieve what Gueldenzoph & May (2002) suggest, an instrument that can be easily and effectively implemented by the major is needed.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher used an action research. This action research consisted of two cycles. The series of cycling activities are planning, action, observing, and reflecting. In collecting the data, the researcher used three research instruments, namely observation, test, and documentation. Observation was done to watch the process of students achievement using *Peer Evaluation*. During the observation the researcher also used field notes, observation checklist for students' activity. By making use of observation, the researcher expected that the use of *Peer Evaluation* to improve students' achievement could be figured out. Focus of the observation

are: the achievement process of Semantics class during group work. Next, in documentation, the researcher used a video camera. The video taping took place at any kind of activities during the teaching learning process. It made easier for the researcher to replay and examine the detail of capture.

In analyzing the data, the writer adapted steps of analysing Action Research data which is proposed by Burns (2010). In the this research the researcher analyzed the improvement of students' achievement by identifying appropriate data analysis and data interpreting technique.

Firstly, the researcher collected the data by using observation, test, and documentation. Secondly, the data that had been collected was analyzed and synthesized both qualitatively and quantitatively. The result of observation and documentation were analyzed qualitatively by categorising and inductive coding. Inductive coding means that we look at the data from the perspectives of people closely involved in the research context and analyze their opinions and views exactly as we find them. Thirdly, the researcher built meaning and interpretation. Fourthly, having interpreted the result of collecting data, the writer employed WH- Question

to know clearly the educational process which was occurred during the research. The last, the researcher reported the outcomes.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Sum up of the improvement of students' achievement from pre-observation to cycle 2

Pre- Observation	Cycle 1	Cycle 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students were embarrassed to express their opinion or idea • Students lacked vocabulary . • It was difficult for students to utter the correct sentences. • Students' average score 51.20. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students tried to express their opinion . • Grammatical Error and inappropriate pronunciation still dominated students' speaking • Some students had adequate vocabularies but others still lacked vocabulary • Some students interact with other members in simple way • Students' average score got 62,40 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few students still made grammatical error and inappropriate pronunciation in their utterance but it did not obscure the meaning • Most of the students spoke fluently • Most of the students used wide of vocabularies in speaking • A few students spoke with much pausing and hesitation • Students average score got 72,90

For both cycle, students prepare their best performance as presenters in order to give clear information to their friends. At

that occasion, the other students as the participant can ask freely to the presenter about their curiosity in learning semantics. But, some students still confuse how to participate in the classroom. Most of them get the difficulties on their vocabulary mastery. In the other hand, the presenters (peers) keep their friends attention and try to give interesting topic on the discussion. Sometimes they give some joke while the presentation session. After having the discussion session, the presenters give the time for the lecturer to explain and give the decision for best explanation. It means that the lecturer evaluate the students accuracy of material discussion. Then, the presenters give the evaluation for all the presenters in the test form. The test already discussed with the lecturer before. The test contains five questions and should answer in students' worksheet for each student (individual). After finish the class, the presenters submit the participant worksheet and asses the result to give score for each students. at the last stage, the presenters give the worksheet to the lecturer and validate the assessment and scoring.

The result in table 1 show that from the first cycle to the second cycle, peer evaluation has a chance to be good way improve the process of students achievement. In the first cycle, students worked in group, and present it to the participant. In this cycle only 60 % students were active in group interaction. It could be seen during the activity. Some students in the groups were not active while some other students enjoyed learning in group. Active students interacted with their friends happily, they tried to express opinion to discuss the topics. When they found difficulty, they did not give up. They spoke without considering the structure. Moreover some students did not enjoy learning in group, they were not enthusiastic to interact with their friends. All of the students took a solicit turn but their interaction was still limited. They asked and answered questions in his turn but they could not maintain the discussion. Since their interaction was not good enough, they could not develop their speaking. They took much pausing and hesitation in interaction. When they were required to speak, they took much time to think or grope the words. It was because their lack of vocabulary and they still

made grammatical error and used inappropriate pronunciation. The average students score from 30 students got 62,40.

Therefore, the lecturer and students peers had motivated them to be active. In the second cycle, the students were required to do peer evaluation again. Since in the first cycle, some students did not maintain the interaction, the researcher decided to prepare the lesson. In the cycle 2, their process achievement was better than the first cycle. The students average score got 72,90. They were more active to be involved in students process achievements by taking the turns properly. Most of the students maintained their interaction. Since their interaction was great, it influenced their speaking skill. Their speaking was also better than the previous cycle. They also spoke with appropriate pronunciation and grammatically. They could elaborate their speaking.

4. CONCLUSION

The research findings lead the researcher to conclude that this study was successfully done. During the group activity over five sessions, learners were observed by the researcher. Peer

Evaluation was employed effectively in students' learning. The observation compared two cycles, and worksheet test showed that students' achievement improve. It could be seen from the development of students' interaction and achievement from the first cycle to the second. Students took the turns properly. When they got the solicit turn, they could take it well.

They could ask and answer the question. Then, they not only could initiate the interaction but also maintain the interaction well. Students are curious to do interaction in Peer Evaluation technique where they can do mobile discussion; speak responsively, giving opinion, and discuss the topics. There is improvement of Students' achievement using Peer Evaluation. Peer Evaluation facilitates students to give more chance make and interaction, it enhances them to be involved in learner-learner interaction. Due to the fact that their interaction is great, it influences their speaking skill then their achievement in Semantics.

5. REFERENCES

- Barrett, J. (1986). The Evaluation of Teachers. ERIC Digest 12. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED278657>
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. Routledge. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=s3SMAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Burns,+A.+\(2010\).+Doing+action+research+in+English+language+teaching:+A+guide+for+practitioners.+&ots=9kAlTRzGT9&sig=9EuXXzVAISHEYOQgN3ruLYJKyWg](https://www.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=s3SMAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Burns,+A.+(2010).+Doing+action+research+in+English+language+teaching:+A+guide+for+practitioners.+&ots=9kAlTRzGT9&sig=9EuXXzVAISHEYOQgN3ruLYJKyWg)
- Canavan, D. (2003). A mind of one's own: Seeing the suchness of things. *Unpublished Manuscript*.
- Gardner, H. (2011). *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Think and How Schools Should Teach*. Basic Books.
- Gueldenzoph, L. E., & May, G. L. (2002). Collaborative peer evaluation: Best practices for group member assessments. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 65(1), 9–20.
- Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing english semantics*. Psychology Press. Retrieved from [https://www.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=QFiv5tDnI_sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=to+Kreidler+\(1998\)&ots=7hllQV494n&sig=gTB8muVAaijNSTccHqIa3NV9bTM](https://www.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=QFiv5tDnI_sC&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=to+Kreidler+(1998)&ots=7hllQV494n&sig=gTB8muVAaijNSTccHqIa3NV9bTM)

Lu, Y., Warren, J., Jermaine, C., Chaudhuri, S., & Rixner, S. (2015). Grading the Graders: Motivating Peer Graders in a MOOC. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 680–690). International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2741649>

Reese-Durham, N. (2005). Peer evaluation as an active learning technique. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 32(4), 338.

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(3), 249–276. (n.d.). Retrieved April 22, 2016, from <http://www.westlothian.gov.uk/media/2685/PeerEvaluation/pdf/peerevaluation.pdf>