

## Using Peer Editing and Peer Feedback Techniques in Writing to Private University Students

Gaya Tridinanti\*, Rusman Roni, Farnia Sari

Department of English Education, Universitas Tridinanti Palembang

\*Corresponding e-mail: gaya@univ-tridinanti.ac.id

Received: 15 July 2020

Accepted: 26 October 2020

Published: 18 November 2020

**Abstract: Using Peer Editing and Peer Feedback Techniques in Writing to Private University Students.** **Objectives:** this reserach is to find out whether there was any significant difference between the students are taught by using Peer Editing and Peer Feedback Technique. **Methods:** Quasi-Experimental method was used by providing two groups as an experimental group and control group. The total of students from both groups was 100 students. The data were analyzed by paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test. **Findings:** The result of paired sample t-test in experimental and control group showed that value of p-value was .000. At the signicance level  $p > 0.05$  for two tailed test. **Conclusion:** the use of Peer Editing and Peer Feedback technique can improve students' in writing narrative text.

**Keywords:** peer-editing technique, peer feedback technique, writing skill.

**Abstrak: Menggunakan Teknik Peer Editing dan Peer Feedback dalam Menulis untuk Mahasiswa Universitas Swasta.** **Tujuan:** penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara siswa yang diajar dengan menggunakan Peer Editing dan Peer Feedback Technique. **Metode:** Metode eksperimen semu digunakan dengan menyediakan dua kelompok sebagai kelompok eksperimen dan kelompok kontrol. Total siswa dari kedua kelompok adalah 100 siswa. Data dianalisis dengan uji-t berpasangan dan uji-t sampel independen. **Temuan:** Hasil paired sample t-test eksperimental dan kelompok kontrol menunjukkan bahwa nilai P-value adalah .000. Pada tingkat signifikansi  $p > 0,05$  untuk dua tes berekor. **Kesimpulan:** penggunaan teknik Peer Editing dan Peer Feedback dapat meningkatkan kemampuan siswa dalam menulis teks naratif.

**Kata kunci:** teknik peer-editing, teknik feedback dan menulis.

### To cite this article:

Tridinanti, G., Roni, R. & Sari, F. (2020). Using Peer Editing and Peer Feedback Techniques in Writing to Private University Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 10(3), 383-395. doi: 10.23960/jpp.v10.i3.202001.

## ■ INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the curriculum of university-level standards, writing academic must be obtained by learners. Some learners are required to have the knowledge, logical ideas, language competence, and reliable communication capability which learners have the competence of the aspects of languages including ideas, vocabularies, grammar, sentence structures, and cultures. Nik (2010). *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*. 1 (1), 54-59. states that grammar, syntactic structures, vocabulary, rhetorical structure, and idioms are the most significant component are required to form ideas and thoughts in English as a foreign language. Furthermore, generating ideas and organizing ideas using an appropriate diction, sentence and paragraph organization into a readable text are supposed to require for the university students in achieving the good quality of writing (Richards & Renandya, 2005). Eventually, the graduates might be able to write smoothly and effectively in English for academic purposes and real-life situation.

Writing skill provides opportunities for students to express their ideas, messages, and thoughts through letters, words, and sentences in English. Writing seems like something easy, but good writing requires knowledge, logical idea, competent language skill, and reliable communication capability. It involves many aspects of language such as ideas, vocabularies, grammar, cultures, sentence structures, and etc. Writing is not only important but also the most difficult skill that should be developed. Nugraha (2015) states that university students had weak competence in writing

These are factors of the students' barriers in academic writing. Several researchers argued that the problems of that occurred at academic level. First, under-preparedness when in writing activities; the teachers are inadequate exposure

to implement the various strategies and approaches in teaching and learning process. Thus, the students had a lack of exposure to involve writing activities because of less importance of writing skills in our society. They assumed writing as a secondary level after speaking skill. Second, socio-economic issues; social level influences the learners' ability how the economic supports and facilitate their learning process. Third, inadequate reading; writing is not separated from reading activities where there skills are linked and necessary to gain the knowledge of words and construct sentences into good paragraph. Unfortunately, these skill remain ignored and inadequate to implement these skills for academic life. Fourth, lack of motivation; the students had demotivation in learning because of fear. In other words, fear of not achieving goals in the context of competence or efficacy had given the impact on students' motivation (Chokwe, 2013; Fared, et al., 2013; Harmer, 2006).

Oshima and Hogue (1999) stated that writing is a long process for learners of English as a foreign language to improve the genres of writing. Hence, increasing students' writing achievement in writing might require non-stop process for continuing of learning and revisions. In Indonesia, writing skills are difficult for some students because of limited opportunity to practice by considering reading and speaking skills are more priority to acquire for foreign learners.

Regarding these problems, peer editing and peer feedback as considerations to implement for increasing the students' writing. Peer editing have provided the advantages for increasing students' writing, namely; a) stimulating students to have active in evaluating and revising each other writing on their peers, b) creating the cooperative atmosphere in writing activities, advancing independence and responsibility, discovering strengths and weakness in their writing task and reinforcing editing skills, c) minimizing the teachers work for editing the students' work, d) activating

the students and increasing their motivation in the learning and writing process, e) peer editing allows students to function as audience and respond to other students writing as well as enables students to use each other's comment while revising their draft, f) accommodating students to give response for sharing ideas each other to give contribution for producing the good final product, g) encouraging the students to be independence and motivated, h) reducing the errors in writing, i) providing the feedback to revise the learners writing task for each other where this activity could help in stimulating to activate the cognitive process (Patterson, 2003 cited in Arfani & Noor, 2018).

Meanwhile, Peer Feedback technique might have effects for improving students' writing and their motivation. It is proven by Farrah (2012, p. 199), he found that the students could expand their ideas to compose the effective paragraph and their perceptions were better when they had involved in writing activities.

By implementing these techniques, the teacher could assist the students how to explore their writing through sharing ideas between pairs, assessing their works, developing their capacity to give a response in revising the students' mistakes of their work. Hence, this study reported in this paper aimed to investigate the use of Peer Editing and Peer Feedback in writing narrative text to students of private university level. Then it offers a significant difference of writing skill in narrative text between the students of private university level who were taught by peer feedback technique and those who were taught using the peer editing technique. Finally, we address the limitations of our study design for future research.

#### A General Overview of Peer Editing Technique

Peer Editing Technique (PET) is showing the work to another person to increase the writing skill. The students would try to read and give comments from each other to achieve better-

written products. The students might talk together and write comments on a sheet or write directly on their pair's work to assist the students understand their mistakes for revising final-product of writing (Zemack and Rumisek, 2005, p. 21). Furthermore, Galvis (2010) stated that peer editing is a key to the writing process. In other words, students read each other's papers and give the revisions to each other (p.87). Peer Editing Technique (PET) generated students in critical thinking to evaluate and give their opinion to other students' work. Peer Editing Technique (PET) is a technique for giving students the opportunity to increase written skill by seeking throughout the written text and finding some mistakes by giving comments.

Before implementing a peer editing technique, the students are instructed to write a first draft based on the topic chosen. The steps of implementing peer editing technique are: determining the peers depending on the size of class, the member of students could be more than two members for giving the comments to revise their mistakes of their own paper and asking to exchange their writing work, ask them to read the text to find some mistakes, write the editing symbols, give their papers back and consult with the editor for clarification to revise their mistakes. He added that the best companions to revise the pair's work are a note, dictionary, a grammar book. The students might consult with their editors or ask other students in checking the possible way of editing (Tusino, 2013, p. 139 – 140).

Asih (2014) stated that praise, advice, and correction are steps to implement a good peer editing technique. Praise is the priority to consider that is most important thing for revision writing. Second, advise, such as giving more specific ideas or details as a consideration for the students to make writing better. Finally, correction that the students are asked to revise their peer's work in spelling, grammar, mechanics, and punctuation (p.3).

Furthermore, Elizabeth, et al (2005) stated there four steps of Peer Editing Technique (PET) were: (1) the students work in pair and then take turns in giving ideas for the paper for each other, (2) the students do their duty to write their work in writing narrative text, (3) the students exchange work for each other and they will begin to edit their pair work by following rubric writing and make the comments to their partner work and discuss about their works together between the teacher and students and they would submit their works to the teacher for evaluation. Through Peer-Editing Technique (PET), the students learn how to receive the comments and suggestion on their written work from the students and teacher.

Barkley, Cross, and Major (2005) stated that PET might help students how to expand their skills in critization and evaluation when they revise their own writing in identifying good or poor writing features. In line with the peer editing effects, Peer Editing Technique (PET) encourages the students to increase their abilities in critical thinking on the other student's work. By implementing PET, the students are expected to increase their motivation to evaluate and revise their writing tasks to each other.

Galvis (2010, p.91-96) stated that there are some categories for peer editing sessions to build the students relationships during this process as follows:

#### 1. *Scaffolding*

The students establish scaffolding in developing their cognitive because of the interaction social. Peer editing facilitates the students' transition from assisted to independence performance. It could help to build the students more independence.

#### 2. *Empowering the students' collaboration to classmates with a good capability*

The students who were more knowledge than less capable peers shared their knowledge when they corrected each other's written text. It

is to break the gap for the students in doing writing tasks.

#### 3. *Supporting relationships in assisiting each other for empowering collaborative relations*

Interpersonal and intergroup relations are series of relationship which this activitiy consider the possession of knowledge or skill. In other words, the relationships were generated by the relationships and shared among participants.

#### 4. *Contact*

Students could establish contact and transfer knowledge to each other. Additionally, the increased frequency interaction through non verbal communication, body contact, and facial expression will gain knowledge and share experiences with each other.

#### 5. *Thinking when revising*

The students accomodate their cognitive process to transform their ideas, experiences and thoughts into written assignment. Identification errors and revision process would be implemented to ask the students to establish knowledge through analysis, synthesis and interpretation. This process is a part of metacognitive thinking to produce the better writer. This process would produce reciprocal knowledge for the students.

### **1.1. A General overview of peer feedback technique**

Hattie and Timperly (2017) stated that PFT (Peer Feedback Technique) means to decrease the students' gap what they know and what their demands to increase their writing competence. Feedback is a way to give information regarding the writing aspects of their peers' writing performance (p.81). Furthermore, Moore and Teather (2013) describes a feedback process consisting the activities that facilitate the students to comprehend the criteria that will be used for judging the students' writing works and expand their competence to distinguish both current and

desired levels of achievement to discover information about how to close any gap and give them the opportunity to use that information to close the gap (p.197).

Peer Feedback Technique (PFT) is a technique to encourage the students to be critical and analytical to revise students' work to improve their writing skills through feedbacks on their friends' work by giving suggestions and comments. Furthermore, PFT is a personal or group discussion to give remark giving and share idea, and opinion about other students' work to aim a specific purpose. Learners become agents in peer feedback that provide a foundation for students to learn from each other.

Moreover, Nicole and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) consider seven principles for feedback technique practice: (1) helping to account what a good performance (objective, principles, expected standards); (2) a good performance (goal, criteria, expected standards); (2) simplifying the expanding of self-assessment (reflection) in learning; (3) conveying high-quality information to students about their learning; (4) promoting positive motivational beliefs and self-rating; (6) offering opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance; and (7) giving information to students that can be used to help the particular teaching. In addition, peer feedback plays a fundamental role to build scaffolding and decrease any gaps in their learning process. Feedback and critical peer feedback might greatly help students in increasing their writing performance (Bijami & Kashef, 2013). Learners might adapt to evaluate the other' work critically to appear this condition which could stimulate their awareness on how to write successfully and effectively. Some writers agree with that peer feedback can run well when the teachers concerns on the three necessity areas of pre-training students, namely: "*awareness raising* (the principles and objectives of peer response), *productive group interaction*

(collaboration, supportiveness, tact, etiquette), *productive response and revision* (basic procedures, effective commenting, reader-writer dialogue, effective revision)" (Rollinson, 2005; McCoy, 2018). Furthermore, McCoy (2018) states that that the students act as collaborators rather than correctors. The groups are allowed to improve their own feedback to assist the writer make a better second draft. He added the amount of time spent on responding-rewriting depends on the students' competence level, their experiences in writing, the length of the written form, the number of required drafts, and the time of process that provided by teachers. Cosequently, the students could be a professional writer to demonstrate their revisions from colleagues' comments.

#### A General overview of writing

Writing is one of four language major skills in English; it is into written language skill. Writing is expressing feeling or ideas in the written form. According to Astrea (2013), "writing is a way of communicate to deliver information, ideas, feeling to other people and writing requires more planning and organizing" (p.6). Writing is one of the communication skills for people to construct their thinking through written form. In addition, Brown (2007) stated that written product requires think, draft and revision. The students have specialized skills how to elaborate the ideas, organize them smooth, and use discourse markers and rhetorical conventions coherently into a written text, revise text and edit text which is used appropriate with meaning and grammar to produce a good final product (p.335).

Furthermore, Sokolik (2003) defines that writing is a combination of process and product. The process of writing is to gather ideas and use them to produce the final product that is good written work and a way to organize one's thinking accordingly and construct it through a written form that could be readable text in order the readers understand what the conveyed message.

Brown (2004, p. 343) states that writing has several microskills, namely: (a) produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English and produce writing at an efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose, (b) produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns, (c) utilize acceptable grammatical systems patterns and rules, (d) assert a particular meaning in different grammatical forms, (e) use cohesive devices in written discourse, (f) employ the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse, (g) appropriately accomplish the communicative functions of written texts according to form and purpose, (h) convey links and connections between events and communicate relations such as main idea, supporting idea, new information, information given, generalization, and exemplification, (i) distinguish between literal and implied meanings, (j) convey culturally specific references in the context of written text, and (k) develop and use a battery of writing strategies.

#### A general overview of narrative text

A narrative text refers to the sequence of events of a story in written form to entertain the readers. According to Richard and Schmidt (2002), “narrative text is the written or oral account of a real or fictional story” (p. 349). Narrative text is one of the types of writing in telling a story such as fable and legend which are to entertain people. Meyers (2005, p.52) stated that narrative is one of the communicative ways to tell a story or chronologically text. Furthermore, narrative text is a group of a sentence that tells what happens, how the action occurs, and in what order the events happen. Meanwhile, Karolina (2006) said that narrative is a text which contains about story in the genres of fiction, non-fiction, tales, folktales, fables, myths, or epic (p. 26). Moreover, a narrative is a fiction story which contains complication and it is solved that occurred in a resolution. Narrative text has a general structure to build a story chronologically. Furthermore, Roni (2012) defines “narrative text

dealing with the conflict lead to a crisis which in turn to come across a resolution” (p. 96).

A narrative has several aspects (Refnaldi & Havi, 2010), such as of material signs, the meaningful discourse, the interesting story, and social function. The social function of narrative text can be cultural values, a crisis point in the problem of the story, and also the way to behave and solve the problem. Besides, the narrative text is written in past verbs and use vocabularies, such as *once upon time* that use to show the past time. While according to Neo (2005, p. 2) narrative has a structure, a shape or a pattern.

However, Anderson (1997, p. 8) stated that there five steps for constructing a narrative are:

- a) Orientation or exposition: In this step, the narrator will introduce the major characters, possibly some minor characters in the story and also indicate the location or place that used to support the action.
- b) Complication or rising action: the events that some kind of conflict or problematic event occurred or climax action. In this step, the problems will be more complicated.
- c) A sequence of Event (Climax): these were where the narrator told and how the character reacts to the complication.

Meanwhile, the characteristics of narrative text among others: (a) It tells us about a story of event or events, (b) the events had chronological order to express the event of story. However, narratives consist of not only chronologically ordered sentences but also episodes. Each episode in a narrative “implies a reference frame, which is the conceptual space of the states and events described in that episode” (Iranidoust, 1999 cited in Wijaya & Hindarto, 2018, p. 282).

## ■ METHODS

The participants of the native speaker of Indonesian were the fourth and sixth semester of Education Study Program at Tridinanti University

of Palembang. The two groups were involved to support to conduct this research. The sixth, eighth and tenth semester was assigned to be an experimental group which the peer feedback would be used to apply for teaching writing in narrative text, while the second and fourth semester was assigned to be a control group which teaching writing through peer editing. The materials were appropriate with their syllabus where the students had already studied narrative text from the first semester, but their scoring was unsatisfied in achieving the goals. To ensure the validity, the participants were taken 50 students from each group (EG: N = 50; CG: N= 50) with a total of 100 participants. The participants had presented for all sessions are included in the data collection.

The instructors who had applied these techniques were lecturers of Tridinanti University had already experience with more than 10 years in teaching writing of narrative text and practicing these techniques.

The materials given to the students for the experimental group and control group were adapted from Academic Writing Textbook written by Hogue and Ann (2013) and Anderson(1997). The assigned topic for pre-test and post-test five folktales, they were *Malin Kundang*, *Bawang Merah Bawang Putih*, *Lake Toba*, *Tangkuban Perahu*, and *Si Pahit Lidah* . Moreover. The topic taken from the legend and folktales, *Cerita Rakyat*, of Palembang, South Sumaterawould be given for all sessions. These topics were familiar to students for stimulating their prior knowledge to be more active to express their ideas and ease their thinking.

In delivering the materials, the teachers had implemented Peer Editing Technique (PET) for the control group and Peer Feedback Technique (PFT) for the experimental group for eight treatment sessions consisted of 100 minutes treatment sessions. On the first day, the students' was pretested. A week later, the experimental group received the implementation of peer

feedback, while the control group was implemented through peer editing to increase the students' writing skill in narrative text. On the last day, both experimental groups did the post-test that was administered to investigate the effect of each technique.

## ■ RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data generated in this study were analyzed with SPSS. Percent accuracy for the test was entered into the statistical analyses. To answer the research questions, paired samples t-tests and independent test were carried out. Descriptive statistics for both groups are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics for mean test score

Variables	Pre-test		Post-test	
	M	Std. Deviation	M	Std. Deviation
EG	58.64	5.649	66.08	3.096
CG	52.54	5.219	59.46	6.393

The pretest result of experimental group showed that mean score was 58,64 and standard deviation score was 5.649. Meanwhile, the result posttest showed that mean score was 66.08 and standard deviation score was 3.096. The pretest result of control group showed that mean score was 52.54 and standard deviation was 5.219, and the posttest result showed that mean score was 59.46, and standard deviation was 6.393.

However, before analyzing the data, normality of the data and the homogeneity of the variance data would be carried out. The normality testing aimed to determine the data normally distributed. Based on the result of the normality testing by using the Shapiro – Wilk analysis, the data of the experimental group in this research 0.282 (pretest) and 0.740 (post-test), while the control group that 0.219 (pretest) and 0.222 (post-test) were higher than 0.05. All of the group data in this research were normally distributed.

The result of the analysis showed that the two classes were not homogenous or not equal (Test of Between-Subject Effects sig. value 0.05 ). It is obtained that the samples used in this research were not homogeneous. Based on these results, it indicated that the data proven were normal but were not homogeneous.

To answer the problems of this study, Paired sample t-test was administered to measure the improvement of the students' writing skill and independent sample t-test was administered to find out a significant difference of students' writing skill in narrative between implemented peer editing and peer feedback techniques.

The Paired t-test conducted on the pretest and the post test for EG and CG showed that the improvements of the students' writing score were significantly different after implementing the Peer Feedback and the Peer Editing Techniques. Paired samples t-test showed that the mean

accuracy the Experiment group gained from pre-test to post-test was significant,  $p = 0.000$ .

The paired-sample t-test showed that the significance of two-tailed was 0.000 lower than 0.05 for the two-tailed test with a degree of freedom (df) 98.

While output of Control group from pre-test to post-test was significant,  $p = 0.000$ . The paired-sample t-test showed that the significance of two-tailed was 0.000 was lower than 0.05 for the two-tailed test with a degree of freedom (df) 98. It meant there was a difference between the pre-test and the post-test in control group.

The Independent t-test conducted on the post-test showed that the students' writing scores of the EG group was significantly different from that of the CG,  $F = 17.390$ ,  $p = 0.000$ , which indicated the EG was more effective in increasing students' writing skills than CG after the treatment. The results show in table 3.

**Table 2.** Paired-sample t-test

Variables		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. Error mean	$T_{\text{obtain}}$	df	Sig (2-tailed)
Experimental group	Pretest-posttest	7.440	6.878	0.973	7.648	49	0.000
Control group	Pretest-posttest	6.920	3.193	0.452	15.323	49	0.000

**Table 3.** Independent Samples Text

	Leven's Test for quality of Variances		t-test for Equality of means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% confidence interval of the difference	
								Lower	Upper
Hasil menulis nar equal variance assumed	17.390	.000	6.590	98	.000	6.620	1.005	-86.13	4.627
Equal variance not assumed			6.590	70.788	.000	6.620	1.005	-8.623	4.617



To answer our first research problem, the results of this study indicated that peer Editing technique could bring a positive effect on increasing writing skill in a narrative text. The participants in the control group showed significant gains from pre-test and post-test. However, the control group indicated the gains after instructed writing task through peer editing techniques. In brief, the control group treated through Pair Editing Technique (PET) indicated that  $H_{a1}$  was accepted while  $H_{01}$  was rejected.

To answer the second research problem, the Peer Feedback was effective in teaching writing to university students and more helpful in assisting to increase the students' writing narrative text. By implementing PFT, the students could get input their writing in expressing ideas and organizing narrative text from the other students delivered the ideas and knowledge and shared and discussed information related to their writing tasks. In brief, the experimental group treated through Pair Feedback Technique (PET) indicated that  $H_{a2}$  was accepted while  $H_{02}$  was rejected.

The answer of the third research problem, the students' writing scores of the EG group was significantly different from that of the CG. It can be seen that the students treated through PFT and PET were different significant in improving writing in narrative text. In other words, PFT is better than PET in teaching witing narrative text.

Furthermore, the use of Peer Feedback Techniques allows students to understand the entire text. During the reading process, they read the text and connected with the background of their knowledge. This study also showed an increase in reading comprehension. It is concluded that reading comprehension improvement achieved by students. The results indicated Peer Feedback Techniques was more effective than Peer Editing Technique. It is in line with Mathew & Mathew (2018) who found that Peer Feedback Techniques could improve

reading comprehension and give a significant improvement of narrative text. As well, Peer Feedback Techniques build good interactions between students with a peer. When good interactions are built, students will have a good relationship between the students and the lecturer. Thus, their learning activity would be fun and eased them to share information and knowledge. This is supported by Dib (2018). By implementing Peer Feedback Technique in narrative writing, background knowledge development require students' comprehension of the text and the application of schema activation strategy will be effective. Peer Feedback Technique could help the students improve their grammar, spelling, vocabulary and generating ideas. It is proved the results of study conducted by Mashadi (2014). He found that the students were enthusiastic and active to read the peer's work to find some mistakes in terms of format, punctuation and mechanics, content, organization, and grammar and sentence structure. By implementing PFT, the students could reflect their ideas, comments and suggestions to revise peer's draft. Consequently, the students became better after given three cycles which in each cycle had done in three meetings. They could correct the students' mistakes, such as misspelling and wrong sentence construction. Furthermore, the students could arrange the right order of the generic structure of the descriptive texts. The results are also supported by Fatimah & Suharto (2017). They found that most of students became more interesting and felt confident and enthusiastic to involve teaching and learning process because the teacher asked them to write any ideas without hesitation and worried of getting punishment from the teacher. They had been given the chance to revise their works after getting some revisions and suggestions from their peers to produce the better written text.

The Control group also showed an increasing in writing narrative text, while the

Experimental group was more effective to contribute to the students' performance in enhancing their writing narrative text. During the teaching and learning process through peer editing technique, the students writing skill was also They felt more motivated and more autonomy. The classroom atmosphere was more alive when the students' did the revisions of pair. It is inline with Ayuningtyas's study (2014), the results provided the support for an argument that self-editing technique motivated students to become independent and better learning in what they were learning and how they were learning. She added that through peer editing created a better atmosphere during teaching-learning process and more vivid when the students exchanged ideas with pairs. Nurdianingsih (2016) supported these findings. She found that the students got positive behavior that they could be more confident and active in writing an essay after implemented peer editing technique. They also felt more excited to involve writing activities and motivated in composing their essay. According to Galvis (2010), peer editing is a useful strategy to implement cognitive processes, such as reflection, analysis, and reviewing in collaborative classroom which valuable opportunities for students in assessing their writing works.

At the end of the research, experimental students tended to be active due to some phase that was applied in the classroom. The students had good responses and motivation. The students could read the text to find the main idea correctly. Hence, schema activation strategy contributed a positive effect on the students writing narrative text and facilitated them to read the text better.

## ■ CONCLUSION

This research investigated about Peer Editing Technique and Peer Feedback Technique. The results showed that PFT were effective for improving students' writing skills at Tridinanti University of Palembang . Additionally, the

students ability contributed to their achievement in all kinds of writing. Based on the results of the research, it was revealed that there was a significant increase in students ability in writing narrative text. It indicated that Peer Editing Techniques could improve students' ability in writing narrative texts. Peer Feedback Techniques could improve students' ability to write narrative texts. In addition, there were significant differences between students taught using Peer Feedback Techniques and students taught using Peer Editing Techniques.

After conducting the research, there are some suggestions for the lecturers and students. The lecturers of English are suggested to give more attention for the students in the teaching-learning process. It is important for lecturers to provide more practice to students to achieve their learning goals. The lecturers could apply schema Peer Editing Technique and Peer Feedback Technique as alternative ways in teaching writing. Meanwhile, the teachers are expected to be creative to stimulate the students' motivation in order the students more productive in doing the better writing task.

## ■ REFERENCES

- Anderson M 1997 *Text Type in English 2* (Australia: Macmillan).
- Arfani, S. & HM Noor, Idris. (2018). The effectiveness of using peer and self-editing technique to improve students' writing descriptive composition (A study of 3<sup>rd</sup> semester students at Institute of Bina Sarana Informatika – FLA- IBSI) Jakarta Indonesia. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*. 6(1), 32 – 48. Retrieved from <http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Effectiveness-of-Using-Peer-and-Self-Editing-Techniques-to-Improve-Students%E2%80%99-Writing-Descriptive-Composition-A-Study-of-3rd-Semester-Students.pdf>.

- Asih, N. W. R. 2014. *Teaching descriptive paragraph writing by using the peer editing to The eighth-grade students of private junior high school.* (Undergraduate Thesis). University of Mahasaraswati, Denpasar.
- Astrea, E. (2013). *Teaching writing narrative paragraph by using a note-taking technique to the eighth-grade students of state junior high school 33 of Palembang.* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). University of PGRI, Palembang.
- Ayuningtyas, D. (2014). *Using peer editing technique to improve students' writing skill at grade VIII of SMP N 3 Kota Bengkulu* (Published undergraduate thesis). Faculty of Teacher and Training and Education, University of Bengkulu.
- Barkley, C., Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass)
- Bijami, M. & Kashef, S. H. 2013 Peer feedback in learning English writing: Advantages and disadvantages *Journal of Studies in Education.* 3 (4), 91 – 97. Retrieved from [www.macrothink.org/jse](http://www.macrothink.org/jse)
- Brown, H. D 2007 *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to pedagogy (5<sup>th</sup> Ed).* (White Plains, NY: Pearson Education).
- Chokwe, J.M. 2013 Factors impacting academic writing skills of English second language students *Mediterranean Journal of Sciences* 4(14), 377-382. Doi: 10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p377
- Dib, M.N.(2018). *Effect of Peer Versus Self-Editing on Students' Revision of Language Errors in Revised Draft.* 85-95. Retrieved from [www.ScienceDirect.com](http://www.ScienceDirect.com)
- Elizabeth, F., Barkley, K., Patricia C., and Claire, H.M 2005 *Collaborative Learning Technique.* NY: Jossey-Bass
- Fatimah, S. & Suharto, G. (2017). Using peer feedback technique to improve students' writing skills: A quasi – experimental study among secondary students. *Journal of English Language Teaching (JELLT),* 1(2), 40 – 48.
- Fareed, M., Almas Ashraf, & M. Bilal. (2016). ESL learners' writing skills: Problems factors, and suggestions. *Journal of Education and Social Science.* 4(2), 81-92. Doi: 10.20547/jess0421604201
- Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students. *An Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities),* 12(1), 180-210
- Galvis, N. M. D. (2010). Peer editing: A strategic source in EFL students' writing process. *Colombian Applied Linguistic Journal,* 12 (1), 85-98 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.93>
- Harmer, J 2006 *The practice of English language teaching* (England: Pearson Education Limited)
- Harmer, J. 2007 *How to teach English* (England: Pearson Education Limited)
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007) Review of Educational research: The power of feedback. *Sage Journals.* <https://doi.org/10.310/003465430298487>.
- Irandoost, H. (1999). The past perfect: Moving across conceptual spaces. *Cognitive Linguistics,* 10(3), 279-302.
- Karolina, I. (2006). *Teaching narrative text in improving writing to the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Petarukan, Pemalang* (Published Post Graduate Thesis). State University of Semarang.
- Maarof, N., Yamat, H., & Lili, K. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer

- feedback enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Science Journal*, 15 (Innovation and Pedagogy for Life Long Learning), 29-35.
- Mashadi, A. I. (2014). *Improving students' writing abilities through peer feedback technique at class VII D of SMP Negeri 1 Mlati in the academic year of 2012/2013 (Unpublished undergraduate thesis)*. English Education of State University of Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta.
- Mathew, V. & Mathew, H. (2018). Peer evaluation within experiential pedagogy: fairness, objectivity, retaliation safeguarding, constructive feedback, and experiential learning as part of peer assessment. *The International Journal Management Education*. 16(1), 92-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.12.003>
- McCoy, P. (2018, March). *Using Peer Feedback Effectively in EFL Writing Classes*. Paper presented at the first ASEN-ELT of Universiti Putra Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia
- Meyers, A 2005 *Gateways to academic writing: Effective sentences paragraph and essay* (New York: Longman)
- Moore, C. Teather, S. (2013) Engaging students in peer review: Feedback as learning. *Issues in Educational Research Journal*. 23(2), 196-211. Retrieved from <http://iier.org.au/iier23/moore.pdf>
- Neo, E. 2005 *Narrative for 'O' Level*. (Malaysia: Longman)
- Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006) Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Nik, Yah Awg, Hamzah, A., & Rafidee, H. (2010). A comparative study of the factors affecting the writing performance among bachelors students. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*. 1 (1), 54-59.
- Nugraha, A.K.E. 2015, Augustus 26 Mahasiswa Indonesia masih lemah menulis karya ilmiah. *Rakyatku.Com*. Retrieved from <http://rakyatku.com/2015/08/26/edukasi/mahasiswa-indonesia-masih-lemah-menulis-karya-ilmiah.html>.
- Nurdianingsih, F. 2016. Increasing students' writing skill through peer editing technique to the second semester of IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro. *Jurnal Humaniora*. 4(1), 410 – 437
- Oshima, A and Ann H. (1999). *Writing academic English* (3rd ed.). White plains, New York; Addison whisley Longman
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (3rd Ed). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Peterson, S. 2003 *Peer influence on student revision of their narrative writing LI Education studies in language and literature*. Retrieved from <http://ehow.com/about5072s01-advantages-peer-editing-students.html>.
- Refnaldi, Kurnia N., & Havi, A. 2010. *Systematic functional grammar: An Introduction*. Padang: English Language Teaching Study Program State University of Padang
- Richards, J.C. & W.A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., and Schmidt, R. 2002. *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd Ed). Edinburgh: Longman.
- Rollinson, P. 2005. Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59 (1), 23-30.

- Roni, R. 2012. *Materials development: ESP based genre, EFL curriculum*. Palembang: Universitas Sriwijaya.
- Sokolik, M. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. Singapore: Mc Graw Hill. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 14(2), 133-143
- Wijaya, D. & Hidarto, A. (2018). The effects of cognitive grammar-grounded instruction and formal traditional grammar instruction on learning simple past and past perfect. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL*. 15 (4), 915-930. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.2.915>
- Zemach, D., and Rumisek, L. A 2005 *Academic Writing from Paragraph to Essay*. (Oxford: Mc.Milan Publisher Ltd)