

IMPROVING STUDENTS' SKILLS IN WRITING A DESCRIPTIVE PARAGRAPH USING PEER-CORRECTION

Arielia Pachira Humarani¹, Nurhaedah Gailea², Eri Rahmawati³

Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa

e-mail: erielipachira@gmail.com, nurhaedah@untirta.ac.id, eri.rahmawati@untirta.ac.id

Abstract

The research objective was to determine the improvement of students' skills in writing a descriptive paragraph using peer-correction technique on seventh grade students at SMPN 10 Kota Serang. The quantitative research with pre-experimental method was employed in this research, and one-group pretest-posttest design was implemented. The subject of this research was 30 students of VII I class and it was chosen based on the simple random sampling technique. The result of the study shows that the mean posttest score (71.10) exceeded the mean pretest score (52.33). Furthermore, H_a is accepted. This indicates that through receiving treatment, students' writing descriptive text abilities improved. Moreover, the researcher calculated that the score of t obtained $< t$ table ($-119.751 < 2.045$) and the sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05 ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. It can be concluded that the Peer-Correction has an improvement on the writing skills of seventh grade students at SMPN 10 Kota Serang.

Keywords: descriptive text, peer-correction, writing Skills, technique, treatment

Received: 03 March 2023

Revised : 20 May 2023

Accepted: 04 June 2023

Published: 30 June 2023

INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are important skills in life, not only important in education but also important in people's lives. The ability to write is one of the linguistic abilities that students need to develop. This is due to the fact that writing allows learners to communicate the suggestions, viewpoints, perceptions, and emotions. Writing can also be used as a means to develop students' thinking and creativity.

According to Huy (2015:54) that writing is a challenging mastery task that necessitates a person to have understanding, foundational skills, strategies, and the capability to manage several procedures. Use English not just orally but also in writing in order to communicate. Writers develop creativity when they are able to express themselves rather than replicating what has already been written in order to be read and understood. According to Harmer (2004:4) that writing is a method of arranging and enclosing thoughts, as well as refining phrases into a paragraph. Writing also depicts people's feelings, which are unable to be spoken verbally and must instead be expressed in writing.

In addition, according to Dewi (2020:34) that the much more essential benefit of writing for students is the capacity to think effectively. Writing helps students preserve and expand their vocabularies. According to Dolin & Evans (2018) in Dwiyantri (2021:10) that writing undoubtedly must also be assessed in order to determine how well students are writing, which will then be utilized as a benchmark for evaluation on how to help students write better.

The researcher chose SMPN 10 Kota Serang as the place for the research because the researcher used to have teaching practice activities in SMPN 10 Kota Serang and when the researcher did the pre-observation and did an informal interview with the English teacher, the researcher found that the average student at the school were having difficulties in writing activities, especially English texts. Even though it is only a simple English text, students still struggle to begin writing, which is because students do not even know enough about writing, such as what to write, able to successfully compose it, able to confidently

chose words, sentences, and writing styles. The researcher discovers that the learners' writing accomplishments in SMPN 10 Kota Serang remained low. The students were still unsure about how to present their views. They lacked the knowledge and courage to communicate in their own language. They also have other issues, such as poor grammar and a lack of vocabulary.

The descriptive text is used to teach the English content. Learners need understand how to write descriptive texts as part of the English writing curriculum. Anderson & Anderson (2003:26) explained descriptive text describes a significant individual, location, or things. This denotes an individual, place, or collection of things is the focus of a piece of descriptive writing. Additionally, Anderson & Anderson employed descriptive writing to explain the problem by describing its features without jumping to conclusions. Pardiyo (2007:33) stated that descriptive text provides the reader with descriptions of living or non-living things. In other words, the text can determine whether or not an item is still alive. Furthermore, Barbara (2004:142) stated because it influences our feelings and expands our perceptions, description offers a crucial perspective on a subject.

From the statements above, it can be concluded that a description tells about something or someone in particular, causing the reader's view to shift and their knowledge to expand broadly.

Studies about writing skills have been conducted by some researchers, they are Dayanti (2020), Melni (2017), Ayisah (2013). The first study was done by Dayanti (2020), she reported that instructing narrative text work through the use of the peer-correction technique was successful in enhancing the students' narrative text writing abilities. Second research was done by Melni (2017), she stated that learners who were instructed utilizing the PRT (Peer Response Technique) received better scores than those who were instructed applying traditional methods. The third study was done by Ayisah (2013), she reported that throughout receiving peer correction, learners' abilities to write recount texts significantly improved. Related to the nature from study, those will

become inferred which peer correction could significantly enhance learners' abilities to write recount texts.

Related to the problems faced by several previous researchers, the researcher discovered that learners encountered several common issues, particularly with writing when learning English, such as: a lack of knowledge about writing, such as what to write, how to write it, how to choose vocabulary, grammar, writing techniques, and the teacher has not use peer-correction as a media to teach English. The researcher also found there are differences among the previous studies, which are the previous studies conducted quasi experimental study and utilized narrative text. Meanwhile, this study conducted pre experimental study and used descriptive text.

One of the contributing factors is the method used to correct learners' task drafts. Majority English teachers continued to employ conventional methods. Educators independently modify the learners' drafts of their assignment. After employing this method, the students are unaware of their errors and how to fix it. The researcher employed peer correction as a restoration strategy when learning descriptive text that assist the learners to write more effectively.

Liu and Hansen (2005:31) defined peer-correction is the process through which utilization of students as data sources and interconnections towards each other in thus a situation that the students assume obligations or roles that are commonly given on and successfully done by educators or qualified mentors throughout acknowledging or deriding their own manuscripts or proposals throughout the assignment. It indicates that students could interact with one another as peers and remark on one another's performance, which is often done by their instructor.

According to Richards, et.al (2002) that during the writing procedure' peer-correction stage, learners gain criticism on their paper comes from many different learners.. Students usually work in pairs or small groups, reading each other's writings and asking questions, providing feedback, and making ideas.

According to Suryani (2009:26) The term "peer-correction technique" alludes to classroom learning or exercises in which learners engage the products of their classmates and then provide feedback in the shape of corrections while still acting as readers. Writing skills can be enhanced in learners as well as their sensitivity to become critical readers by employing this strategy, this promotes students toward being proficient in acceptable and efficient verbal communication.

The researcher concludes the peer-correction is indeed knowledge that individuals provide regarding the definition given provide orderly to those around to help them improve the performance by correcting or assessing them. Information is provided via a variety of people, including instructors, friends, parents, and others.

The reason why the researcher utilized the peer-correction technique because this technique have not done by the English teachers at the school and the researcher interested to utilized this technique in teaching learning. Various writing skill educators, such as Brookes & Grundy (1998), Leki (2007), and Robinson (1988), advocate the concept of including peer-correction onto a testing phase. During performing peer correction, learners participate in critical thinking activities such reading their peers' writing, discussing the topic, and evaluating expressing personal writing issues. Then keep in mind that the present learning approach encourages more active engagement from students.

In addition, Liu and Hansen (2005:31) stated peer-correction is described as the use of

METHOD

The researcher employed a quantitative study for this experiment. An experimental methodology was used throughout the process by the researcher to conduct the study. The research method that the researcher used was pre-experimental design. Arikunto (2010:123) stated that pre-experimental designs (nondesigns) are frequently seen as fictitious experiments. As a result, it is frequently referred to as a "quasi-experimental" term. It is so named because this form of experiment does not fit the

students or colleagues as references and interrelations for someone else in a really way that the students assume key decisions that are typically taken onto it and attained by educators or qualified instructors in discussing or deriding their own texts or letters throughout the assignment. It suggests that learners might interact with one another as colleagues and offer feedback on the progress of their colleagues, something that is frequently performed through their educator. According to Dolin & Evans in Dwiyanti (2021:10) that peer assessment is the act of commenting on a method, an activity, or a result in the interest of enhancing knowledge.

According to Dewi (2020:35) that peer correction gives students the opportunity to establish ownership of their learning and develop their independence. Students will find themselves more adept at comprehending and improving individual writing deficiencies. This method will aid the student in communicating with others, which could also enhance their writing skills.

Considering how the situation was stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to determine the improvement in students' skills in writing a descriptive paragraph using peer correction technique.

Throughout this study, participants took the SMPN 10 Kota Serang learners in seventh grade students. There are approximately 365 students in the seventh grade. Simple random sampling procedures were utilized to select the sample throughout this study. Hence, the chosen sample was the students of VII I at SMPN 10 Kota Serang.

standards of scientific experimentation, which involves following particular procedures. In this research, pre-experimental research methods used to examine the use of peer correction in improving students' skills in writing a descriptive paragraph at SMPN 10 Kota Serang.

A prepared team is employed in the design of one group pretest-posttest. In this layout, an assignment was carried out twice, specifically, the pretest occurred the pretest happens before treatments, as well as the posttest happens after

treatment. According to Sugiyono (2013:75) that the one group pretest-posttest design approach has the following research design:

$$O_1 \times O_2$$

Note:

O_1 = Pretest

\times = Treatment

O_2 = Posttest

This concept involves conducting the test twice, namely in between undergoing an investigation. Tests that are carried out before getting treatment are called pretests. Pretest was given to the class (O_1). After the pretest, the researcher gave treatment (\times), at the final stage the researcher gave the posttest (O_2).

Pretest and posttest were employed both as research instruments throughout this study. This pretest's objective seems to evaluate and appraise the students' abilities to use peer correction. After employing peer correction to check and evaluate the students' writing skills, the students took a posttest. To determine regardless of whether there has been a

development in the learners' performance, pre and posttests were included in writing a descriptive paragraph using peer correction technique.

The researcher utilized a data analysis approach which a quantitative approach by employing pre-experimental for data analysis. The researcher employed a few procedures to analyze the data. It started by examining the n gain. Next, the researcher examined the data's consistency with determine regardless between the task data had a normally distributed range. To examine the data's normality, the researcher utilized One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Furthermore, to discover out if the peer-correction method has helped students in the seventh grade write better, a hypothesis was used. This research used data analysis technique to answer the questions and solve existing problems. The statistics were gathered by the pre and posttest, and collected as specify through SPSS 16.0 by utilized descriptive analysis, normality test, and hypothesis test.

FINDINGS

The study's aim was determine and evaluate the peer-correction technique's improvement on the writing abilities of students in SMPN 10 Kota Serang's seventh grade. The researcher employed the simple random sampling technique to gather the research sample. In light of this, the VII I class was chosen as the sample. Thirty students were enrolled in class.

Premised on experiment findings obtained prior to the actual treatment, the researcher of this subsection presented the test's frequency distribution, proportions, and mean item. In this research, the scoring grade taken from Arikunto (2006), this appears in the given table 1.

Table 1. Scoring Grade

Score	Criteria of Competence
80-100	A (Very Good)
66-79	B (Good)
56-65	C (Enough)
40-55	D (Less)
30-39	E (Bad)

Table 2. The Score of Pretest

NO.	NAME	ASPECTS					PRETEST SCORE
		C	O	V	S	M	
1.	AS	17	13	13	9	2	54
2.	AA	20	13	10	11	2	56
3.	AK	17	12	10	10	2	51
4.	AZ	20	13	10	11	2	56
5.	CAK	20	13	10	11	2	56
6.	DA	16	9	10	10	3	48
7.	ESS	17	13	13	9	2	54
8.	FH	17	12	10	10	2	51
9.	GMK	16	9	10	10	3	48
10.	GM	16	9	10	10	3	48
11.	H	17	12	10	10	2	51
12.	HLK	20	13	10	11	2	56
13.	JADS	17	12	10	10	2	51
14.	KMP	17	13	13	9	2	54
15.	LA	17	12	10	10	2	51
16.	MFM	20	13	10	11	2	56
17.	MRM	16	9	10	10	3	48
18.	MDD	17	13	13	9	2	54
19.	MFU	16	9	10	10	3	48
20.	MIS	17	13	13	9	2	54
21.	MRA	17	13	13	9	2	54
22.	NR	17	12	10	10	2	51
23.	NTK	20	13	10	11	2	56
24.	PA	20	13	10	11	2	56
25.	RHA	17	12	10	10	2	51
26.	RP	17	12	10	10	2	51

27.	RN	17	13	13	9	2	54
28.	S	16	9	10	10	3	48
29.	SM	16	9	10	10	3	48
30.	SF	20	13	10	11	2	56
TOTAL							1570
MEAN							52.33

The results of the students' pretests were used to gather information about the students' descriptive text writing abilities.

Table 3. Score of Posttest

NO.	NAME	ASPECTS					POSTTEST SCORE
		C	O	V	S	M	
1.	AS	25	14	14	16	4	73
2.	AA	23	14	14	19	4	74
3.	AK	24	14	14	15	4	71
4.	AZ	23	14	14	19	4	74
5.	CAK	23	14	14	19	4	74
6.	DA	22	14	14	12	4	66
7.	ESS	25	14	14	16	4	73
8.	FH	24	14	14	15	4	71
9.	GMK	22	14	14	12	4	66
10.	GM	22	14	14	12	4	66
11.	H	24	14	14	15	4	71
12.	HLK	23	14	14	19	4	74
13.	JADS	24	14	14	15	4	71
14.	KMP	25	14	14	16	4	73
15.	LA	24	14	14	15	4	71
16.	MFM	23	14	14	19	4	74
17.	MRM	22	14	14	12	4	66
18.	MDD	25	14	14	16	4	73
19.	MFU	22	14	14	12	4	66
20.	MIS	25	14	14	16	4	73
21.	MRA	25	14	14	16	4	73
22.	NR	24	14	14	15	4	71
23.	NTK	23	14	14	19	4	74
24.	PA	23	14	14	19	4	74
25.	RHA	24	14	14	15	4	71
26.	RP	24	14	14	15	4	71
27.	RN	25	14	14	16	4	73
28.	S	22	14	14	12	4	66
29.	SM	22	14	14	12	4	66
30.	SF	23	14	14	19	4	74
TOTAL							2133
MEAN							71.10

The results of the students' posttests were used to gather information about the students' descriptive text writing abilities.

The table below contains a statistical description of the N Gain outcomes:

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
NGain	30	.35	.41	.3951	.02751
Valid N (listwise)	30				

The researcher discovered that the N Gain was 0.3951 per the calculations made above using SPSS 16.0. It was determined that the N Gain writing test fell within the medium category based on the scoring grade.

Identifying whether the statistics were regularly divided or not, the researcher performed the normality test. The objective of the normality test was on the pre and posttest.

The table below illustrates the output of the normality test results utilizing SPSS 16.0.

Table 5. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		PRETEST	POSTTEST
N		30	30
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	52.33	71.10
	Std. Deviation	3.066	3.078
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.207	.254
	Positive	.168	.185
	Negative	-.207	-.254
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.132	1.390
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.154	.042

Considering the aforementioned table, it was determined that each pretest and posttest's significance value was higher than 0.05. The finding that the sig. on the pretest is 0.154 and higher than 0.05 (0.154 > 0.05) indicates that the data is normally distributed. Its posttest's score, which is 0.042 and higher than 0.05 (0.042 > 0.05), indicates that the statistic follow a normally distributed. Nevertheless, this could possibly be argued that each data element is distributed normally.

Within the study, alternative hypothesis (Ha) and null hypothesis (Ho) were both present. The alternative hypothesis was the abilities of the learners increased in writing a descriptive paragraph utilizing peer-correction technique and the null hypothesis was there was no increase in the learners' writing abilities on

descriptive paragraph employing peer-correction technique.

The basis for the decision to accept or reject H_0 in this test is as follows:

1. If the significant value is > 0.05 then H_0 is accepted or H_a is rejected.

2. If the significant value is < 0.05 then H_0 is rejected or H_a is accepted.

The output from the statistical data analysis performed with SPSS 16.0 is displayed in the following table.

Table 6. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	PRETEST - POSTTES T	18.76	.858	.157	-19.087	18.446	-119.751	29	.000

It demonstrates the outcome of the hypothesis test, it can be seen that the significance of t obtained is -119.751 . The t test does not take into consideration the positive and negative symbols, hence the outcome of $-119.751 < 2.045$ (t table). Therefore, it is certain that H_a is accepted whereas H_0 is rejected. Therefore, it could also be inferred that Peer-Correction has an improvement on the writing abilities of SMPN 10 Kota Serang students in the seventh grade.

It is apparent from the results presented above that the significance value is 0.000 . Thus, this might be remarked Peer-Correction has an improvement on the writing skills of seventh grade students at SMPN 10 Kota Serang since the significant value is $0.000 < 0.05$ in reference along with the stance framework for the Paired Sample t -Test.

DISCUSSION

In this research, included an entire sample size of 30 people which attended experimental team, the researcher carried out a pre-experimental using the peer-correction

technique on students in the seventh grade at SMPN 10 Kota Serang. This research's problem was whether or not the utilization of the peer-correction technique affected how certain descriptive text was written. One group pretest-posttest was the chosen research design. The information gathering comprised a pre and posttest in accordance with the study's objective, which was to ascertain the improvement of peer-correction on the capacity for composing descriptive text.

The pretest conducted before the implementation of the peer-correction technique, students' writing skills for descriptive texts were less strong because they were still having difficulties in writing activities, such as a limited vocabulary, spelling mistakes, and misconceptions about writing.

The researcher conducted treatment on the second meeting and the third meeting in the class. The researcher clarified more about descriptive text employing peer-correction technique as a learning tool. The students were given a piece of paper that showed a peer-correction symbol, and the researcher explained how to use the peer-correction symbol as the corrector of the pretest they had done. As the implementation of peer-correction in order to instruct writing, learners were more engaged in writing lessons, particularly when composing descriptive texts, due to the peer-correction technique.

Following the initial treatment, the researchers performed a posttest. The students instructed by the researcher to write descriptive text premised on the picture and the correction using peer-correction technique by their classmates. However, students' capacity to write descriptive texts improved after peer-correction as a technique was used. Following the administration of the treatments and the posttest, it was discovered that there were substantial variations, the posttest result was higher than the pretest result between the two tests.

The pretest mean score was 52.33 , while the posttest mean score was 71.10 , as can be shown. The results of the students' data revealed that using peer-correction as a technique improved the students' ability to write

descriptive texts. The result showed that peer-correction as a technique was beneficial and validated by earlier research by Nor Anisa Fitri Dayanti (2020), which also showed that peer-correction as a technique was beneficial and successful. It therefore plays a significant part in the learning method. It provided an answer to the question of this research, "Is there an improvement in students' skills in Writing a descriptive paragraph using peer-correction technique?"

CONCLUSION

The researcher is expected to sum up this thesis after carrying out the research utilizing aforementioned results. The researcher discovered that there were different scores between the pretest and posttest based on the statistical analysis. In comparison to the pretest, the posttest's mean score was higher. The mean of the students' pretest was 52.33, and their overall writing test score was 1570 before they were given peer-correction in the classroom. Hence, the researcher carried out treatment twice. The researcher provided further information concerning descriptive text by peer-correction technique as a learning tool. The students were given a piece of paper that showed a peer-correction symbol, and the researcher explained how to use the peer-correction symbol as the corrector of the pretest they had done. After that, the researcher conducted posttest. The outcome of the learners' posttest mean was 71.10, and their overall writing test score was 2133. The discrepancy between both test is substantial, according to the calculation of the t-test and t-table results for the 0.05 significance level. The score for t-test was $-119.751 < 2.045$ (t table). Therefore, it is certain that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected, also apparent from the results presented above that the significance value is 0.000. Since the significant value is $0.000 < 0.05$

Students at SMPN 10 Kota Serang in the seventh grade significantly improved their writing skills by using peer-correction as a language learning tool. When offered the opportunity to apply peer-correction as a learning tool in language learning, the learners' writing skills for descriptive texts improved following the intervention. In the posttest, they produced better descriptive text through more significant material into a well-organized text.

in reference to the Paired Sample t-Test decision making foundation, it can be contended that Peer-Correction has an improvement on the writing skills of seventh grade students at SMPN 10 Kota Serang.

According on the conclusion of the study, the researcher intends to submit the following suggestions:

1. For the teachers

To avoid the boredom of the class for the students, the teacher ought to be willing to guide English using variety of methods. In being able to help students understand writing texts more clearly, the study advised teachers to use peer-correction when teaching writing.

2. For the students

Students ought to more engaged and inventive when doing the activity after receiving peer correction of their work in hopes of improving their writing performance. By employing diverse methods, which anticipated that leaners will more engaged in the activity of collaborative learning.

3. For further researcher

This study is intended to also be utilized as further source and to influence future researchers to investigate on peer correction as it applies to different kinds of text, which are recount text, procedure text, or narrative text.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, M and Anderson. 2003. *Text Types in English 1-2*. Australia: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Arikunto, S. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Ayisah, Jannatun S. 2013. *Increasing Students' Ability in Writing of Recount Text Through Peer Correction at the SMA Negeri 5 Bandar Lampung*. <http://jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id/index.php/123/article/view/805> (Accessed on April 6th, 2022 at 15:18)
- Brookes, A. & Grundy, P. 2005. *Beginning to Write: Writing Activities for Elementary and Intermediate Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dayanti, Nor A. F. 2020. *The Effect of Peer Correction on Students' Narrative Text Writing of the Eleventh Grade of SMAN 4 Plangka Raya*. <http://digilib.iain-palangkaraya.ac.id/3331/> (Accessed on April 11th, 2022 at 22:03)
- Dewi, N. K. (2020). *The effect of self-and peer-correction techniques on students' writing competency*. *Lingua Scientia*, 27(1), 34–44. doi:10.23887/lis.v27i1.22524. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JJBI/article/view/22524>
- Dwiyanti, K. E., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2021). *Assessment for writing skills in online learning*. *Lingua Scientia*, 28(1), 8–19. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JJBI/article/view/29069>
- Hansen. Liu. 2005. *Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response*. Oxford university press.
- Hansen. Liu. 2005. *Guiding Principles for Effective Peer Response*. Oxford university press.
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How To Teach Writing*. Cambridge United Kingdom: Longman.
- Huy, N. T. 2015. *Problems Affecting Learning Writing Skill of Grade 11 at Thong Linh high school*. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*,3(2).
- Melni. 2017. *The Effect of Peer Response Technique on Student's Achievement in Writing Descriptive Text at Second Grade of SMP Muhammadiyah 02 Medan in 2016/2017 Academic Years*. <http://repository.uinsu.ac.id/3464/> (Accessed on January 19th, 2022 at 10:45)
- Pardiyono. 2007. *Pasti Bisa. Teaching Genre-Based Writing*. Yogyakarta: CV. Andi Offset.
- Richards, J. C and Renandya, W. A 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.CV
- Suryani. 2009. *Penerapan Teknik Koreksi Teman Sebaya untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Karangan pada Siswa Kelas X AP 2 SMKN Murni 2 Surakarta Tahun Ajaran 2008/2009*. PDF.