

The implementation of Peer-Correction technique to improve students' writing capability of recount texts at the first grade of SMA N 1 Pringsewu

Nur Afifah^{1*}, Bambang Setiyadi², Mahpul³

FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No. 1 Bandarlampung^{1,2,3}

¹Correspondence: afinurafifah4@gmail.com, Telp: +6285669767608

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this research were to find out whether there is any significant improvement on the students' writing achievement of recount texts and to investigate the students' most dominant errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy in terms of grammar. The current study used one group pretest posttest design. The result showed that there was a statistically significant improvement of the students' writing achievement. It can be seen from the result of the Paired-Sample T-Test where the significant value was lower than 0.05 (0.00). Moreover, the frequency of grammar errors indicated that omission was the errors which most frequently produced by the students. It took 45.3% of the total error. In sum, peer-correction technique improve their writing capability of recount texts. Hence, the technique could be implemented in the learning process.

Keywords: *peer-correction, recount text, surface strategy taxonomy, writing capability*

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is one part of language competencies. The competencies divided into two which are organization competence and pragmatic competence. Organization competence is an ability to comprehend and form correct sentences, understand meaning of sentences and pour these sentences into a text (Bachman, 1990 in Cakrawati, 2012). Moreover, Harmer (2004) states about writing which encourages students to focus on accurate language use. It is because students consider the language use when the students engage in their writing process. This activity will provoke language development because the students resolve problems what writing put in the students' minds. Based on the statements, these indicate that mastering writing achievement plays an essential role in learning English.

In the curriculum of SMA (*Kurikulum* 2013), the students are asked to write down some texts in English subject. The texts can be descriptive, narrative, procedure, review, recount even self-introduction and so on. In this case, the researcher elaborated more about writing recount texts. According to Anderson (2003), a recount text is speaking or writing about past events or a piece of text that retells past events, usually in the order which they happened. The aim of the text is to retell the past event or to tell someone's experience in chronological order. However, based on Supatmi (2013), in writing recount text, the students sometimes have the difficulty in terms of grammar and vocabulary especially the tense used in the text. For example, changing V1 (present tense) to V2 (past tense), *go* become *went*, like "I go to Baron beach last month". The sentence is wrong because it should be in the past form like "I went to Baron beach last month". It can be say that the students often forget about the past form of words even they do not know about it.

In addition, Sani (2017) has conducted a preliminary research and the result shows that more than 60% of the regular eighth grade students did not pass the minimum achievement criteria which the teacher expected. From 275 students, there were only 29.1% students who got the score over 75 and 70.9% got the score under 75. It indicates that there are many students who have weaknesses and difficulties in writing recount texts. Furthermore, Fidrayanti (2017) states that Omission error becomes the most frequent errors committed by the students. From 30 students' writing which were analyzed based on surface strategy taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982), it was found that there are 169 errors committed by the subject including 130 (77%) omission errors, 14 (8.28%) misordering errors, 13 (7.7%) misformation errors, and 12 (7.1%) addition errors. Netanel (2017) also stated that two common error in writing recount texts are; the first is omission and the second is misformation. He also found that the most common mistakes of omission were in regular and irregular of past tenses. Regarding to the previous studies, some problems were about the students do not know whether their writing is right or not because they were not instructed to ask their teacher even their friends when they doubt about the writing. It causes them to repeat the same mistakes and cannot gain more self-confidence in writing. These are also happening in the school which has been studied.

To minimize the problem, we can see Muray (1980) who distinguishes three stages in writing: pre-writing, drafting, and revising. Brown (2001) also claimed that writing is a thinking process. Furthermore, he states that writing can be planned and given with an unlimited number of revi-

sions before its release. To have a good writing, it is necessary for English teacher to make writing processes become easier, more interesting and motivating for the students.

Concerning with this case, an English teacher should be able to implement a good technique for teaching the students in order to make them able to write the text in proper. One of the techniques which can be applied in teaching writing is peer-correction technique. This helps the teacher to teach the students how to make a good writing through pair correction.

Regarding to Putri (2013), peer-correction technique makes the students able to learn each other. Then, peer tends to give specific and deep comments on the work. Peer correction technique has also been found to be useful to those who provide critiques, helping students to develop analytical and critical thinking abilities and being a good judge for reviewing their own writing. In addition, Dixon (1986) states that peer-correction is a technique which strongly enables the students to get feedback when the students correct their drafts in pair.

Furthermore, based on Sani (2017), peer-correction technique is adequate technique to help students correct their work when there was something wrong in their writing. This gives the student an opportunity to reflect on their mistakes and make improvements to their writing. In addition, Tanuadji (2017) who implemented the technique stated that all of the participants, however, revealed improvement in their writing skill. These are in line with Ayisah (2013) who said that there is a significant increase of students' ability in writing of recount text after being taught through peer-correction. It can be inferred that if the teacher give a good instruction to the students (implementing the technique), the main problem of the students can be minimized and make their writing better.

Considering the findings of the previous studies, the researcher conducted a research about the implementation of peer-correction technique in improving the students' recount text writing. This research tries to find out the significant improvement of the students' achievement of recount texts and to investigate the students' most dominant errors in terms of grammar in writing recount texts after being taught through peer-correction technique based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy.

II. METHODS

The research used the One Group Pretest and Posttest Design as the research design. This was used to compare the students' mean score of writing recount text in pretest and post-test after the treatment was given. This design is referred to Setiyadi (2018) as follows:

$$G : T1 \times T2$$

Where: G: Group (one class)

T1: Pretest

X: Treatment (the implementation of peer-correction technique)

T2: Posttest

The participants were 33 students in class X Science 4 of SMA N 1 Pringsewu. Furthermore, the instruments of the research were pretest and posttest of writing. Both of the tests can be said equal but different. The tests were conducted out of the treatments. The tests are about asking the students to make recount texts in which the topics were personal experiences (bad and good experiences). It has been done in order to see the significant improvement of the students' recount text writing and the grammatically errors in their posttest. Moreover, the researcher used SPSS Version 20 where the Repeated Measured T-Test was used to know the level of significance of the improvement and to investigate the frequency of error produced by the students. Then, for giving the students' scores of recount text writing, the researcher used the criteria written by Jacob (1981) which there are five aspects to be tested: content, organization, vocabulary, language use or grammar, and mechanics. Additionally, for knowing the total number of errors in grammar of the students, the scoring rubric and the criteria was adapted from Dulay et.al (1982) who stated that Surface Strategy Taxonomy classifies errors into four; omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

After conducting the research, the researcher gathered the result of the tests. To prove that there is a significant improvement, Paired-Sample T-Test was used. Those can be seen in the table below:

Table 1: The differences of the students' mean scores

	Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower				Upper
Posttest-Pretest	23.000	7.018	1.222	20.512	25.488	18.827	32	.000

The current study, which involves 33 students of class X Science 4 of SMA N 1 Pringsewu, provides evidence that the students' mean score is statistically significant different ($0.00 < 0.05$). It shows that the differences are particularly strong. The null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected if the significant level is higher than 0.05. On the other hand, the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is accepted if the significant level is lower than 0.05. The SPSS analysis shows that the comparison of the mean scores has a lower significant value than 0.05. As it is revealed in the Table 7, that the significant level of the scores is 0.00, meaning that there is a significant improvement of the students' writing skill among the pretest and posttest after the implementation of peer-correction technique ($0.00 < 0.05$).

The technique guides the students to be aware of their own mistakes in their work. Therefore, this technique can increase the students' self-confidence so that their work might be better. In

addition, numerous studies have been reported the affective advantages of peer-correction technique when it is properly applied.

The present study is consistent with Arifiana's (2015) and Ayisah's (2012) findings where there is a significant increase of the students' ability in writing particularly in writing recount text. Meanwhile, many studies have confirmed the positive effects of this technique towards the development of EFL even ESL writing and their language learning process.

Moreover, to know the most dominant error in grammar, the frequency and the percentage of error sentences for each type will be explained in the table below:

Table 2: The students' error sentences for each type

Types of error		Frequency	Percentage
Omission		48	45.3%
Addition	Double Marking	10	9.4%
	Simple Addition	18	17.0%
		Total of addition	26.5%
Misformation	Regularization	9	8.5%
	Archie-Form	8	7.5%
	Alternating Form	3	2.8%
		Total of misformation	18.9%
Misordering		10	9.4%
Total error sentences		106	100%

The result of table 2 indicates that there are 106 error sentences in grammar. It reveals that omission is the error which most frequently produced by the students. It takes 45.3% of the total error.

These findings are in accordance with Netanel (2017) who states that two common error in writing recount texts are; the first is omission and the second is misformation. He also found that the most common mistakes of omission were in regular and irregular of past tenses. In addition, Gulō and Rahmawelly's (2018) research result showed the most common error sentences found in the data are related to omission errors.

The current study is also supported by the findings of Wijayanti (2017) which indicates that there are four types of errors occurred in the research. The most error sentence in the students' works was omission. It took 89 of the total number or 47.8 of the total percentage. Besides that, according to Fidrayati (2017), from 30 students' works which were analyzed based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982), it is found that there are 169 errors committed by the subject including 130 (77%) omission errors. This means that omission error becomes the most frequent errors committed by the students. The studies are in accordance with Solikha & Rahmawati (2019) who found that the numbers of errors of omission are 18 errors with the percentage of 41.86% of the total errors in the students recount texts.

According to the findings and the interpretation of this study, the technique made the students' writing capability of recount text increase although there are some grammatical error sentences. This might be caused by the wrong correction of the peers and also their first language interference. The previous statement is in agreement with Jacobs (1989) who stated that one of the drawbacks of the technique is mis-corrections of the students.

Additionally, Richard (1974) in Haryanto (2012) explained that the first language can influence the target languages. The concept of their first language is may be different from the target languages. Take for example in the student work, when the student wanted to write "Saya sangat senang.", they wrote "I very happy." instead of writing "I am very happy". In Bahasa Indonesia even in their traditional languages there is no auxiliary verb like *is*, *am*, and *are*, so, because of their habit of grammatical rules, it influenced the rules in English. In sum, after the technique was applied in the learning process, there is a possibility that errors still occurred in the students writing.

Having considered the explanation above, we can infer that the use of peer-correction technique is suitable to improve students' English writing skill. Moreover, omission is strongly proven as the most dominant error produced by the students in terms of grammar in recount text.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

From this research which has been conducted, it can be concluded that: First, peer-correction technique significantly improves the students' writing capability. This improvement was because of the technique builds the students' awareness of their mistakes after reviewed their friends' drafts. Hence, it increased the students' self-confidence. They also gained their critical thinking skill from being able to read the text of their pair and revise their own works. Second, from the result of data analysis, there were found 160 grammatically error sentences in the students' writing of recount texts. The errors were found in each type of grammar error based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy, such as: first, omission (45.3% of the total error). By seeing the percentages of each error, the most dominant error in terms of grammar which made by the students is omission.

Furthermore, the author found some things that need to be considered. For the further researchers, it is suggested that: First, if we want to use only one class, the sample must be at least 30 students but more is better. Furthermore, if we are going to find out only the students' improvement, it is strongly suggested to choose at least 2 classes. Second, since this study is limited on the significant improvement and the most dominant error in terms of grammar, it will be more interesting to observe error in the different aspects of writing even in all aspects of writing. Additionally, it also can be investigating the factors which influence the students to commit the errors and/or the students' perception toward the technique itself. Third, the findings of this study can be used as the additional reference and comparative studies about peer-correction technique.

Additionally, there are also some suggestions for the English teachers who want to apply the technique: First, the teacher should explain the concept of peer-correction, peer-correction

guidelines and sheets, and the concept of recount text or the other texts clearly enough. If it is possible, the teachers should give the students a chance to ask some questions about their confusion to make sure that there is no misunderstanding anymore. Additionally, after the students correct their pairs' works, the teacher and the students must discuss together about the corrections so that they can avoid the same mistakes as their friends did. Since after the implementation of the technique, the most dominant error in grammar which was produced by X Science 4 of SMA N 1 Pringsewu is omission. In other words, there are still some mistakes in grammar so that the English teacher should more focus on improving the students' grammar specifically the omission and also peer-correction technique should be properly implemented to have a great writing.

Moreover, the students also should learn more about writing recount texts mainly the use of grammar not only from the teacher but also from other resources.

REFERENCES

- Arifiana, Candra. (2015). *Improving Students' Skill in Writing Recount Text by Using Peer Review Technique*. Semarang: Semarang States University
- Ayisah, J.S. (2012). *Increasing Students' Ability of Writing Recount Text through Peer Correction*. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.
- Cakrawati. (2012). *Communicative Carton Movies in Improving Students' Writing Skill at SMPN 1 Arjosari*. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung
- Eriya Sani, Hilda. (2017). *The Influence of Using Peer Review Technique Towards Students' Recount Text Writing Ability At The Second Semester of The Regular Eighth Grade Of MTS Negeri 2 Bandar Lampung in 2016/2017 Academic Year*. Bandar Lampung: Raden Intan State Islamic University.
- Fidrayanti, N.P.T.M.E. (2017). *Grammatical Errors Committed by 8th Grade Students in Writing Recount Texts*. Singaraja: Ganesha Education University
- Gulö, I., & Ramawelly, V. (2018). *An analysis of omission in students' English writings. Teknosastik: Analysis Omission*, 16 (2), Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2v5nYU3>
- Haryanto, R. (2012). *Cohesion in the headlines of the Jakarta Post online issued in november to december, 2010*. Yogyakarta State University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2vM5QPG>
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, Holly, S. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publisher, Inc.
- Jacobs, G. (1989). *Miscorrection in peer feedback in writing class*. *RELC Journal*, 20(1), June 1st., doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F003368828902000105>
- Netanel, Eukharistia. (2017). *An Analysis of Error in Simple Past Tense in Recount Text Written by the Eighth Students of SMP Pangudi Luhur Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta: Santa Dharma University
- Putri, Annisa. (2013). *The Influence of Peer Correction on Students' Descriptive Text Writing at the First Year of SMKN 2 Metro*. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.

- Setiyadi, A. B. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing Pendekatan Kuantitatif Dan Kualitatif Edisi 2*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Solikha, E. N., & Rahmawati, D. (2019). *The analysis of grammatical error in writing recount text using surface strategy taxonomy*. Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/2xj1lw5>
- Supatmi, Dwi. (2013). *Students' Difficulties in Writing Recount Text At The Second Year Of Smp N 2 Kartasura in 2012/2013 Academic Year*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Tanuadji, Fransisca Tuti R. (2017). *Effect of Peer and Pair Feedback on Students' Recount Writing*. Master Scientiae-ISSN. No. 14, March 2017.
- Wijayanti, S. S. (2017). *The analysis of grammatical error in students' recount texts made by the eighth grade students of SMP N 1 Gombong in the academic year of 2016/2017*. Purworejo Muhammadiyah University, Central Java, Indonesia. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/38Dm0YI>