

Peer and Collaborative Review: Its Effect on the 2nd grading Performance of selected Grade 10 students of Sta. Catalina National High School

Phoebe Nicole A. Paran, L.P.T and Aileen M. Daran, Ed.D.

phoebenicoleparancute@gmail.com, aileenm.daran@gmail.com
Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz 4009 Laguna, Philippines

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to determine if the statuses of collaborative and peer review of respondents' have an effect with their performance in 2nd grading period. Specifically it sought to answer the following questions: (1) What is the mean level of engaging in group studying/collaborative learning in terms of frequency; (2) What is the mean level of the students' performance in English during the 2nd grading period?; (3) Is there a significant effect engaging in peer and collaborative review to the performance of the students during 2nd grading period?

The statistical treatments that were used in this study were: Mean- in getting the average grade of the respondents and the level of the performance, frequency percentage or relative frequency in terms of length of hours engaging in peer and collaborative review.

Based on the gathered data, the findings of this study were the following:

The status of the respondents engaging in group studying/collaborative learning got an overall average mean of 2.48. It reveals that the respondents are "moderately engaged" in group studying/collaborative learning. The level of the respondents' performance on their 2nd grading period got an overall average mean of 88.43 marked as "very satisfactory." It reveals that the level of respondents' performance on their 2nd grading has a remark of very satisfactory. It fully shows that the peer and collaborative review has a significant effect on the students 2nd grading period.

Keywords: Peer Review; Collaborative Learning; Performance

1. Main text

Introduction

According to Lai (2011) collaborative is broadly defined as "a situation in which two or more people learn or attempt to learn something together," and more specifically as joint problem solving (Dillenbourg, 1999, p. 1). Roschelle and Teasley define collaboration learning more specifically as "mutual engagement of participants in a coordinated effort to solve a problem and give help to achieve a particular work together."

As such, Dillenbourg (2001) also explained that collaborative review takes many forms such that students studying course materials together for a test; joint problem solving in which learning is assumed to occur as a by-product of interactions; leaning as a "biological and/or cultural process" that takes place over several years; and learning from collaborative working, which refers to the lifelong acquisition of expertise

within a professional community”. Dillenbourg notes that noting is inherently instructive about working with more than one person on a task; rather, interaction triggers learning process. Collaborative review situations require instructions, a physical setting, and other kinds of performance that involves the input of more than one individual to share ideas, feedbacks, and opinions about a subject. Often collaborative reviews, different people are included for their different areas of expertise. Everyone must be mindful of how their feedback can impact other peers.

In addition, according to Lai (2011) research in this suggests that collaborative classroom structures can have powerful effects on student learning and performance. For example, seventh-grade students working in groups of 3–4 on computational math problems earned significantly higher scores working in groups than equivalent-ability students working individually (Webb, 1993).

However, several questions are still being raised with regards to the effectiveness of peer and collaborative method of studying especially in terms of assessing how well the students perform.

Having this knowledge in hand, this study will take a closer look on peer and collaborative review of Grade 10 students as well as its effects on their performance in the 2nd Grading Period.

Theoretical Framework

According to Roschelle (2001) frames collaboration as an exercise in convergence or construction of shared meanings and notes that research on conversational analysis has identified features of interactions that enable participants to reach convergence through the construction monitoring, and repairing of shared knowledge. Convergence occurs gradually, but tends to include four elements: a) construction of an abstract understanding the problem’s deep structure; b) the interplay of metaphors; c) an interactive cycle of displaying, confirming, and repairing conceptions; and d) application of progressively higher standards of evidence for convergence. Similarly, Teasley (1995) define collaboration as “coordinated, synchronous activity that is the result of a continued attempt to construct and maintain a shared conception of a problem”.

In addition, they can define the joint problem space as the shared knowledge structure that structure that supports problem solving by integrating goals, descriptions of the current problem state, and awareness of potential strategies.

Statement of the Problem

The researcher will aim to determine and further explore the peer and collaborative learning of Grade 10 students as well as its effects on their performance in the 2nd Grading Period.

It sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the mean level of engaging in group studying/collaborative learning in terms of frequency?
2. What is the mean level of the students’ performance in English during the 2nd grading period?
3. Is there a significant effect of engaging in peer and collaborative review to the performance of the students during 2nd grading period?

Research Methodology

The researcher used the descriptive design and administered a questionnaire as the main instrument in gathering all the pertinent information to come up with significant answers for this study.

Descriptive research is concerned with the descriptive of data and characteristics about a population. The methods involved range from the survey which describes the status quo, the correlation study which investigates the relationship between variables, to developmental studies which seek to determine changes over time (Key, 2007).

Descriptive research design is used for some definite purpose. It is focused on explanation of characteristics of a certain group like the hours allotted in doing the peer and collaborative review. The technique that was used under descriptive research design was the survey method which is commonly used to explore opinions according to respondents that can represent a whole population.

In terms of approach, the study employed the quantitative approach which is focused on obtaining numerical findings used with the survey method.

Results and Discussion

1. Level of Engaging in Group Studying/Collaborative Learning

Table 1 displays the respondents' level of engaging in group studying/collaborative learning. The statistical treatments used are frequency, percentage or relative frequency, and mean.

Out of forty respondents, none of them engaged in group studying for more than two hours (2 hours). Only two (2) or five percent (5%) of the respondents engaged in group studying for 2 hours, with interpretation as **“Moderately Engaged.”**

Table 1. Level of Engaging in Group Studying/Collaborative Learning

Duration	Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)	Interpretation
More than 2 hours	0	0	Highly Engaged
2 hours	2	5	Engaged
1 hour	18	45	Moderately Engaged
30 minutes	17	43	Less Engaged
20 minutes	3	7	Not Engaged
Total	40	100	
Mean: 2.48 – Moderately Engaged			

Legend:

Scale	Range	Interpretation
5	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Engaged
4	3.40 – 4.19	Engaged
3	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Engaged
2	1.80 – 2.59	Less Engaged
1	1.00 – 1.79	Not Engaged

2. Students' performance in English during the 2nd grading period

Table 2. Level of Performance in English in terms of Grades in 2nd Grading

The table below presents the level of performance in English in terms of grades in 2nd grading with respective interpretation of Outstanding, Very satisfactory, satisfactory, fair and needs improvement. This table was used to understand the level of respondents' performance in English in terms of their Grades in 2nd

grading as they used the process of peer and collaborative review.

Piaget suggested that the “social transmission” of knowledge, which takes place when children interact with each other and test their ideas against those of their peers, is one of the most powerful forces in expanding students thinking abilities (Ginsberg and Oper, 1969) Higgins, Hartley, and skelton (2002) noted that is meaningful, of high quality, and timely helps students become cognitively engaged in the content under study, as well as in the learning environment in which they are studying.

The computed grade 93.51-100 have used 1 hour of engaging in peer and collaborative review. Their grades is interpreted as **“Outstanding.”** The next grade 87.51-93.50 is interpreted as **“Very Satisfactory.”** The other 81.51-87.59 is interpreted as **“Satisfactory.”** 75.01-81.50 is interpreted as **“Fair.”** And the remaining 75 below is interpreted as interpreted as **“Needs improvement.”**

Grades	Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
93.51 – 100	1	2
87.51 – 93.50	24	60
81.51 – 87.50	9	23
75.01 – 81.50	6	15
75 below	0	0
Total	40	100
Mean: 88.43 – Very Satisfactory		

With a mean of 88.43, the researcher found out that the level of Performance in English in terms of Grades in 2nd Grading is **“Very Satisfactory.”**

Legend:

Range	Interpretation
93.51 – 100	Outstanding
87.51 – 93.50	Very Satisfactory
81.51 – 87.50	Satisfactory
75.01 – 81.50	Fair
75 – Below	Needs Improvement

3. Significant effect of engaging in peer and collaborative review to the performance of the students during 2nd grading period.

Table 3. Test on the Effect of Engaging in Peer and Collaborative Review on the Performance in English

This table is used to know the effects of peer and collaborative review on the performance in English. This table was used to analyze and clearly understand if the process of peer and collaborative review has a significant effect to the respondents’ performance in English.

Variables	Mean	df	Computed t-value	Critical t-value	Interpretation
Frequency	2.48	41	123.462	2.020	Significant

Grades	88.43				
--------	-------	--	--	--	--

Table 3 was used to understand the effect of peer and collaborative review to the performance of 2nd grading period of the respondents. The frequency got the mean score **2.48** which means that the students got very satisfactory effect on their performance after they undergone the process of peer and collaborative review. This process got critical t-value of 2.020 which means that the process of peer and collaborative review has a significant effect to the performance of the selected grade 10 students of Sta.Catalina National High School.

In determining the effect of engaging in peer and collaborative review on the performance in English, the data showed in table 3 were computed electronically using Microsoft Excel 2016 and statistically treated using t-test: two-sample assuming unequal variances.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were made:

There is a sufficient evidence to prove that there is a significant effect of peer and collaborative review on the students' performance in 2nd grading period.

Recommendations

Based on the conclusions drawn from the study, the following were recommended:

1. Teacher should continue of use
2. It is also recommended for the students to continue aim for the best that will lead to their success. They may strive hard in their studies and make their parent proud of them. They may not only rely on the things that their parent can give to them. What important is their inner drive that push them to study hard and excel in their academic performance in the educational institution.
3. This study will be relevant for future researchers to further elaborate different factors of parental involvement that can contribute to the academic performance and achievements of their child. They could also integrate diverse tactics in the attainment of the relevant information from their respondents.

References

- Amante, Kevin A. (2014). *"Peer and collaborative review effects in final examination"* Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.
- Ambrocio, Mhar Kenneth (2015). *"Factors Affecting the Writing Proficiency of Selected Grade 8 students of Linga National High School"* Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.
- Dela Cruz Hannah, et. Al. (2014). *"Peer evaluation impact to grade 9 students of LNHS"* Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.
- Fernandez, Ma. Glennalyn G. (2015). *"Comparative Study on English Written Communication Skills of Grade Six Pupils Between Selected Private and Public Schools"* Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.
- Idang, Mark Anthony P. (2013). *"Development and Validation of Work- Text for Campus*

Journalists and Paper Advisers” Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.

Janolino, Glessa Rose A. (2015). “Indicators of Organizational Performance of the Campus Publications of LSPU System” Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.

Macabato, RizzaArceta (2009). “Factors affecting the Handwriting of twenty selected first year High School Studetns at Unson National High School CabanbananPagsanjan, Laguna, School Year 2009-2010) Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.

Magbuhos Jr., Felipe R. (2015). “Determinants of Composition Writing Proficiency in English Among High School Student- Journalists” Unpublished Master’s Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.

Palconan, Sheryll G. (2006). “The Four Macro Skills Performance of the Selected Student in San Roque National High School Victoria, Laguna” Unpublished Thesis, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Santa Cruz Campus.