

# THE IMPLEMENTATION OF *PEER EDITING* TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT

**Hanafziah Miftahul Fajri**

hmfajri@gmail.com

**Rita Inderawati**

ritarudisaid@yahoo.com

**Soni Mirizon**

smirizon@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** This study aimed to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in recount writing achievement of the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 3 Prabumulih between those who were taught through Peer editing Technique and those who were not and to find out whether or not there was a significant difference in recount writing achievement after the students were taught through Peer editing Technique. The sample was 58 students which were taken by using purposive sampling method. A quasi-experimental study was used. The calculation was done by using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Science) version 21. The result of paired sample t-test in experimental group showed the t-obtained was higher than the critical value of t-table ( $9.087 > 2.041$ ). It could be stated that there was a significant difference in the recount writing achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group. In addition, the independent sample t-test showed the t-obtained was also higher than t-table after students' mean score was calculated ( $8.474 > 2.003$ ). It can be concluded that there was a significant difference in recount writing achievement between the students who were taught through Peer editing Technique (experimental group) and those who were not (control group). In brief, Peer editing Technique was effective in improving students' recount writing achievement.

**Key words:** *Peer editing Technique, Recount Writing Achievement, tenth graders*

One of the English skills that take an important role in people's life is writing. Many students are not able to write well because writing skill is the most difficult skills to be learned. Woods (2005) identifies writing as one of language skill that is difficult

for learners. Learners should pay much attention on it. In line with that, the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (2003, p. 10) explains, "Writing enriches the nation's political life as well. ... Fields like engineering

emphasize the written materials, such as proposals and interim and final report that are essential by-products of technical work.” However, the commission also explains that writing is not something that can be underestimated, but writing is something that essential in many aspects. In other word, writing is also important to push people’s career forward. Patel and Jain (2008, p.125) state that writing is essential features of learning a language because it provides a very good means of foxing the vocabulary, spelling, and sentence patterns. According to 2006 curriculum, there are four types of writing in English subject for the tenth graders: narrative, recount, procedure, news item (National Department of Education, 2006). In line with that, New South Wales (NSW) Department of Education and Communities (2011) explains, there are seven types of text in writing English: factual description, factual recount, information report, procedure, procedural recount, and explanation. However, this study will focus on recount text only. Based on Curriculum 2006, recount text retells events for the purpose of informing or entertaining. Events are usually arranged in a temporal sequence. Therefore, recount text is related to student’s real life, because recount text consists of every activities that has been done.

Peer editing comes out as one way to improve student’s ability through reading and giving comments on their friend’s writing task. The students will be more interested in their writing because they will try another way in learning it. Oshima & Hogue (1999) state, “Peer editing is an interactive process of reading and commenting on classmate’s writing.”

Furthermore, Oshima and Hogue (1999, p. x) state,

Interactive Peer Editing Checklist appears with each writing assignment. One method of using these lists is to ask pairs of students to exchange books as well as first draft of compositions. Each student in a pair edits the other student’s work and writes comments and suggestions about the other’s composition in that student’s book.

In line with that, Hyland (2003, p. 202) writes that peer-editing helps the students and makes the students aware of their reader when they write and make revision. In addition, peer-editing also helps the students become more sensitive to problems in their writing and more confident in correcting them.

Peer editing also frames a self-awareness in student’s writing. According to Burhan (2014), “Language awareness is needed as to facilitate the gap between L1 acquisition and L2 learning.” Furthermore he says, “L1 is not only acquired but also learned, and L2 is not only learned but also acquired.” Consequently, peer editing brings positive thing for students, in case they will be aware to their friends writing assignment although they will just criticize it and students will try their best to revise their own works to avoid “constructive criticism” from their peer.

Related to the previous study conducted by Nahdi (2011) entitled “Improving Students’ Writing Ability by Using Peer Editing Technique.”The researcher found that there was an improvement in student’s writing achievement. By using T-test for non-independent between pre-test and posttest, the result comes out. The score of pre-test and posttest was very

differ significantly, pre-test score was  $t_0$  (15.696) and posttest score was  $t_t$  (2.04). The second study was conducted by Asih (2014) entitled "Teaching Descriptive Paragraph Writing by Using Peer Editing to the Eight Grade Students of SMP Swa Dharma in Academic Year 2013/2014". The researcher claimed that there was an improvement on her students' writing descriptive paragraph. She found that peer editing technique was effective to help student's writing assessment. In this study, the researcher will try to adopt the peer-editing technique to improve recount text achievement for students. Then the researcher will use different population and sample.

In the relation to the background of the study, this study aimed to answer the following question: (1) Is there any significant difference in recount writing achievement of the tenth graders of SMAN 3 Prabumulih between before and after they are taught by using peer-editing technique? ; (2) Is there any significant difference in recount writing achievement of the tenth graders of SMAN 3 Prabumulih between they who are taught through peer editing technique and those that of who are not?.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study used a quasi-experimental study: pretest and posttest control group design was used. The students were divided into two groups: experimental and control group. The experimental group was given treatment through Peer editing Technique within 16 meetings, including 2 meetings for pretest and posttest.

The population of this study was the tenth graders of SMA Negeri 3

Prabumulih. The sample was 58 students of SMA Negeri 3 Prabumulih which were taken by using purposive sampling method from 137 total of population. The purposive sampling was used by considering researcher's criteria where those two classes had the same English teacher and the same average of their English score. There were 31 students in experimental group and also 27 students in control group, so the total number of the students was 58 students.

The data were collected by means of writing test given in pretest and posttest. After being collected, the data were analyzed by using SPSS 21 application for Windows. The statistical analysis of the paired samples T-test was implemented to find out whether there was a significant difference between the scores of pretest to posttest for both experimental and control groups. The average score between the two groups were compared and analyzed to figure out whether or not there was significant difference between both of the scores. The independent sample T-test was implemented to analyze the average score between experimental and control group.

## **FINDINGS**

In this part, the results of pretest and posttest in experimental group were analyzed. Before describing the result of pretest and posttest of the students, the test was analyzed by using normality test through SPSS 21 Version for windows. Normality test was used to determine whether the data were normally distributed or not. If the data were not normally distributed then paired sample t-test could not be done.

**Table 1**  
**The Results of Normality Test**

Group	Pretest			Posttest		
	M	Sig.	Kol Mogo rov-Smir nov Z	M	Sig.	Kol Mogo rov-Smir nov Z
Exp	46.4	.481	.840	61.0	.362	.923
Control	34.1	.157	1.127	39.0	.961	.505

The significance (2-tailed) of pretest and posttest of the experimental group were .362 and .481, while the significance (2-tailed) of pretest and posttest of control group were .157 and .961. Since all the value (.362, .481, .157, and .961) were higher than 0.05, it was suggested that the data were considerably normal. So, the results of pretest and posttest of experimental and control group could be analyzed by using t-test.

In order to answer research question number one, the paired sample t-test was used. This test was used to find out whether or not there was significant difference on recount writing achievement gained by the experimental group in the pretest with the mean score gained in the posttest. The result of this test was also used to see the difference between experimental and control group pretest and posttest score in their recount writing achievement.

**Table 2**  
**Result Paired Sample t-test (Exp Group)**

Group	Test	Mean	Mean Diff	Sig.(2-tailed)
Exp	Pretest	46.45	14.54	.000
	Posttest	61.00		

**Table 3**  
**Paired Sample t-test (Control Group)**

Group	Test	Mean	Mean Diff	Sig.(2-tailed)
Exp	Pre	34.18	4.85	.078
	Post	39.03		

Based on the results of paired sample t-test in the experimental group, the mean score of the posttest (61.000) was higher than the mean score of pretest (46.4516) with the mean difference was 14.54839. T-obtained was higher than t-table (9.087 > 2.041), it could be said that there was a significant difference in the writing achievement before and after the treatment in the experimental group. The significant value / p value (sig. (2-tailed)) for the experimental group was 0.00. Since the value was less than 0.05, it could be stated that there was significant difference between the pretest and posttest. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) was rejected and the research hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was accepted.

Meanwhile, the results of paired sample t-test in the control group showed that the mean score of the posttest (39.0370) was higher than the mean score of the pretest (34.1852) with the mean difference was 4.85185. The t-obtained both pretest and posttest of control group was 1.837. It showed that the critical value of t-table was higher than t-obtained 2.056 > 1.837. Since the value of t-obtained 1.837 was lower than the critical value of t-table 2.056, it could be stated that there was no significant difference in the writing achievement before and after test in the control group. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) was accepted and the research hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was rejected.

To support the result of paired sample t-test, students' pretest and posttest score in experimental and control group was shown.

**Table 4**  
**Score Distribution (Exp Group)**

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
86-100	Excellent	-	0	-	0

71-85	Good	1	3.2	6	19.3
56-70	Fair	4	12.9	15	48.4
41-55	Poor	14	45.1	9	29.1
0-40	Failed	12	38.7	1	3.2
Total		31	100	31	100

Based on the results obtained in the experimental group, the lowest score in the pretest was 24 and the highest score was 72. From the 31 students, most of the students were in the poor category. There was 1 student in good category, 4 students in fair category, 14 students in poor category and 12 students in failed category. After the students were treated in the 16 meetings, there was an improvement from the students' score. From the explanation above, it could be concluded that the students' post-test result had significantly improved since using Peer editing Technique as treatment in writing recount text.

Meanwhile, based on the results obtained in the control group, the lowest score in the pretest was 20 and the highest score was 59. From the 27 students, most of the students got the failed category. There were only 2 students who were in the fair category, 4 students in the poor category, and 21 students in the failed category. The control group was taught by their English teacher. The mean score of pretest had improved from 34.2 to 39. From the result obtained, the score of the control group students was not improved as well as experimental group.

**Table 5**  
**Score Distribution (Control Group)**

Score Interval	Category	Pretest		Posttest	
		N	%	N	%
86-100	Excellent	-	0	-	0
71-85	Good	-	0	-	0
56-70	Fair	2	7.4	1	3.2
41-55	Poor	4	14.9	9	33.4
0-40	Failed	21	77.8	17	63
Total		27	100	27	100

In order to answer the research question number two, the independent sample t-test was used. The independent sample t-test was used to find out whether or not there was significant difference in recount writing achievement of the students who were taught by using Peer editing Technique (experimental group) and those that who were not (control group). The result showed that the t-obtained was 8.474. The t-obtained was 8.474, the t-table was 2.003, and (df) 56.

**Table 6**  
**Result of Independent t-test**

Group	Mean	N	Std. Dev	Sig.2-tailed
Exp	61.0	31	11.1	.000
Control	39.0	27	8.1	.000

The t-obtained was higher than t-table, so that the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the research hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was confirmed. It can be stated that there was a significant difference in recount writing achievement of the tenth graders of SMA Negeri 3 Prabumulih between those who were taught by using Peer-editing Technique and those who were not. It means that the Peer-editing Technique was effective for the students to improve their recount writing achievement.

## DISCUSSION

There are some points to be discussed based on the findings above. First, the writer obtained the results of the pretest and posttest in the experimental group to find out whether or not there is any significant difference before and after the treatment. The mean score of pretest and posttest of the experimental group had increased after getting the Peer-

editing technique treatment, from 46.5 (pretest) to 61 (posttest). The experimental group was treated 16 times by Peer-editing technique. By doing the treatment the writer found that the experimental group students had an improvement from the first time they had the technique until the last treatment. It can be seen from their score that improved from the pretest to posttest. From the pretest, the students were in low score but for the posttest result their score improved. The improvement itself was significant. In other words, the experimental group performance was better in posttest after they were treated by using Peer-editing technique. Based on the results obtained there was an improvement for both group. There was a significant difference in score of pretest and posttest of recount writing achievement from the experimental and control group. However, the control group had a little improvement on their score from 34.2 (pretest) to 39 (posttest). Thus for the control group, even they had an improvement, their score did not improve as well as experimental group. In other words, the progress of the control group was not as significant as the experimental group.

According to the findings above, it could be assumed that the improvement was caused by the strategy applied. Peer editing technique is an appropriate strategy in improving students' recount writing achievement. It is relevant to the statement of Oshima and Hogue (1999) state that peer-editing is an interactive and interesting process in order to write text. Furthermore, peer-editing is an alternative way to improve student's ability in writing. Basically, the steps of peer-editing

were exchanging the students' writing task, reading their friend's text, and giving a helpful comment on their friend's text. Moreover, peer editing technique had helped the students to enhance their capability in writing. Brown (2000, p. 335) states, "Peer-editing is a true sharing process. Not only you get feedback from your classmates, but also give feedback to them." It is very important to be realized that pair work makes the students be more active in learning process.

Second, during the process of learning, the writer found out some students' difficulties in writing. They did not know exactly how to write in English well. Especially in writing recount text. The students were lack of grammar, vocabulary, and the grammatical pattern/generic structure of the recount text. According to NSW Department of Education and Communities (2011) the grammatical patterns of recount text are begins with a background information (orientation), describes the series of events in time order (sequel of events) and end with personal comment (re orientation). Based on the result of this study, the writer found out that some of the students had problem with the orientation, sequel of events and re orientation part. Based on the posttest result of experimental group, even the students' score were good, their generic structure was still not very good, especially for the sequel of events and re orientation part. Some of the students did not write their personal comment and just ended the text. They also made mistakes in positioning the events. Moreover, the students did not feel confident about their writing result. They were shy to ask about the things that they did not know to the writer. They were not

motivated to do their best in recount writing.

In order to ease the students in writing recount text, the writer helped them by explaining the purpose, the generic structure, and the language feature of recount text before starting the teaching process. The writer also provided the rubric as their task as the guidance to make the students be more focus about what they should do in doing peer editing. The writer divided the students into a pair. By having the pair work, they were more conscious in doing their task. It is relevant to the statement of Brown (2000) that Peer-editing is a true sharing process, students are not only got feedback from their classmates, but they also give feedback to them. In other word, it is a two-way street. The students learn to be a better researcher and a better reader. It is because they wanted to be better than their friend. The role play of the writer as teacher in the class was very important. Indirectly the students were motivated to write well because they did not want to be the worst among others. In each meeting, the students were asked to write a recount text with variance topic, therefore they would be more innovative and creative in enhancing their ideas.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and the discussion above it can be concluded that teaching recount writing through peer-editing was effective. The data showed that the score of the students were significantly improved after the treatment. It can be stated that Peer-editing technique can improve students' recount writing.

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher would like to

offer some suggestions for the English teachers, students, and for further researchers. First, for the English teachers, in teaching recount writing, they have to find out interesting technique or strategy in order to stimulate students' intention in writing subject. To neglect the student's boredom in writing subject, the researcher recommends peer-editing technique as the technique to teach recount writing. The teachers should also prepare some interesting themes in order to develop the students' creativity in writing. Second, for the students, the researcher would like to suggest that the students should do more practice in writing not only in the classroom but also outside. Furthermore, by maximizing their practice in writing, they will also improve their grammar, vocabulary and etc. Third, for the further researchers, the researcher hopes that this study will be a basis for the next studies. The researcher suggest the further researchers to use bigger number of sampling and provide more time allocation in teaching process and also to be more creative in order to stimulate and motivate the students in their English learning process, especially recount writing subject.

## REFERENCES

- Andrzejczak, N., Trainin, G., & Poldberg, M. (2005). From image to text: Using images in the writing process. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 6(12). Retrieved from <http://ijea.asu.edu/v6n12/>.
- Asih, N.W.R. (2014). Teaching descriptive paragraph writing by

- using peer editing to the eighth grade students of SMP SWA DHARMA in academic year 2013/2014. (Undergraduate Thesis, Mahasaraswati Denpasar University, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia). Retrieved from <http://unmas-library.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Thesis-Ni-Wayan-Rahayu-Asih.pdf>
- Attribution-ShareAlike Creative Commons*. (2015). Retrieved January 9th, 2015, from Wikipedia: [http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahasa\\_Inggris](http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bahasa_Inggris).
- Bartels, N. (2013). *English teaching forum: Written peer response in L2 writing*. Retrieved from [http://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource\\_files/03-41-1-k.pdf](http://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/03-41-1-k.pdf)
- Bima, B., Winardi, A., & Nurmalina, S. (2005). *Let's talk/untuk Kelas IX/SMP-MTs*. Bandung: Jawa Barat
- Bram, B. (1995). *Write well: Improving writing skills*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Burhan, A. (2014). *Improving the quality of education to strengthen the global competitiveness: A response to the current curriculum*. Paper presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference 2014, faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16-18, 2014.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. (2006). *Silabus SMA kelas X*. Jakarta, Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://ktsf.files.wordpress.com/2006/11/bahasa-inggris.p>
- Department for Education and Child Development. (2012). *Engaging in and exploring recount writing*. South Australia, Australia. Retrieved from: [file:///C:/Users/LENOVO/Downloads/Recount\\_Writing\\_June\\_2102.pdf](file:///C:/Users/LENOVO/Downloads/Recount_Writing_June_2102.pdf)
- Department of Education and Communities. *Text types: Different types of writing*. (2011). NSW, Australia. Retrieved from: <https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/eppcontent/glossary/app/resource/factsheet/4108.pdf>
- Ellis, E.G., & Esler, A. (2007). *World history*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Book & Press.
- Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Unsri. (2011). *Buku pedoman Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Sriwijaya tahun akademik 2012-2013*. Sumatera Selatan: Inderalaya.
- Grenville, K. (2001). *Writing from start to finish: A six-step guide*.



- Crows Nest, South Australia: Griffin Press.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of english language teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164. Retrieved from [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374307000495](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374307000495)
- Hornby, A. (2005). Oxford advanced learners' dictionary (7th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jain, P.M., & Patel, M.F. (2008). *English language teaching*. Jaipur: Sunrise Publishers & Distributor.
- Lee, D. (2001). Genres, registers, text types, domains, and styles: Clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle. *Language Learning & Technology*, 5(3), 37-72. Retrieved from <http://lt.msu.edu/vol5num3/pdf/lee.pdf>.
- Merriam-Webster dictionaries online. (2015). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/editing>
- Nahdi, M. (2011). *Improving students' writing ability by using peer editing technique: An action research at the third semester students of English study program of STKIP Hamzanwadi Selong in the academic year of 2010/2011*. Retrieved from: [http://digilib.uns.ac.id/pengguna.php?mn=detail&d\\_id=19978](http://digilib.uns.ac.id/pengguna.php?mn=detail&d_id=19978)
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (3rd. ed.). (1999). *Writing academic English*. NY: White Plains.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (3rd ed.). NY: Pearson Education Press.
- Oxford University Press. (2008). *Oxford learner's pocket dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Oxford dictionaries online. (2015). Retrieved from [http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\\_english/reinforcement](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/reinforcement)
- Pardiyono. (2007). *Pasti bisa ! teaching genre based writing*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Rudy, R.I. (2011). *From classroom to peer comment in facebook: Bridging to establish learner's literacy*. Paper presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference of ICT for Language Learning, Florence, Italy. Retrieved from [http://www.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2011/common/download/Paper\\_pdf/IBL41-282-FP-Rudy-ICT4LL2011.pdf](http://www.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2011/common/download/Paper_pdf/IBL41-282-FP-Rudy-ICT4LL2011.pdf)
- Saaraylett. (2012). *iRubric: Recount assessment for year 3/4 rubric*. Retrieved from <http://www.rcampus.com/rubricshowc.cfm?code=R4W486&sp=yes&>
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian pendidikan: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (rev.ed.). Bandung, Indonesia: ALFABETA.
- The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003). *The neglected "R": The need for a writing*

*revolution*. New York, NY: The College Board.

Tsai, Y.R., & Lin, C.F. (2012). Investigating the effects of applying monitoring strategy in EFL writing instruction. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(13), 205-216. Retrieved from <http://www.ibssnet.com>

Tuckman, B.W. (1978). *Conducting educational research*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanich press.

Woods, C. (2005). *Teaching and assessing skill in foreign*

*language*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

#### **About the Authors:**

Hanafziah Miftahul Fajri is the graduate of the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.

Dr. Rita Inderawati, M.Pd and Soni Mirizon, M.A., Ed.D are the lecturers at the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.