

# **IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY OF NARRATIVE TEXT BY USING PEER CORRECTION TECHNIQUE AT THE FIRST GRADE OF SMAN 1 GADINGREJO, PRINGSEWU**

Eny Wanti, Cucu Sutarsyah, Huzairin

FKIP Universitas Lampung

Email: [enywanti72@yahoo.com](mailto:enywanti72@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** There are two main objectives of this research (1) to find out how peer correction technique improves the students' activities in teaching-learning process (2) to find out how peer correction technique improves the students' writing ability in writing a narrative text. This research uses classroom action research. The subject of the research is the students of class X at SMAN 1 Gadingrejo in the academic year 2011/2012.

The result of this research is that, there was 25.92% of improvement from the first cycle until second cycle in learning process. It happened since the teacher asked the students to change the position in order to make the teaching-learning process running well. The passive students in the left row sat next to the active students in the right row. It was done in order to make the passive students become more active. By changing the students' position, it encouraged the passive students being more active since they sat next to the active students. Meanwhile, there are 23 students (85.18%) whose scores had achieved the target of the indicator in learning product. It was found that the students' writing scores improved when the teacher focused on the specific errors based on the correction checklist that was given. Correction checklist provided specific errors to enable and help the students in correcting their peer's work. By using it, the students felt easier when they should focus on some errors. It made the students know what should be corrected when peer correction was implemented. They could learn from the mistakes that their friends had made and also they could learn from their friends who gave the correction to make their writing better.

**Keywords:** peer correction technique, writing, narrative text

## **MENINGKATKAN KEMAMPUAN MENULIS NARATIF MELALUI PEER CORRECTION PADA SISWA KELAS SATU SMAN 1 GADINGREJO PRINGSEWU**

Eny Wanti, Cucu Sutarsyah, Huzairin

FKIP Universitas Lampung

Email: [enywanti72@yahoo.com](mailto:enywanti72@yahoo.com)

**Abstrak:** Ada dua tujuan dari penelitian ini yaitu (1) untuk menemukan bagaimana teknik koreksi dengan teman meningkatkan aktivitas siswa dalam proses belajar mengajar (2) untuk menemukan bagaimana teknik koreksi dengan teman sejawat meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa dalam menulis teks narasi. Penelitian ini adalah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa-siswi kelas X di SMAN 1 Gadingrejo tahun akademik 2011/2012.

Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah terdapat peningkatan sebesar 25.92% dari siklus pertama hingga siklus kedua selama proses pembelajaran. Hal ini terjadi karena guru memerintahkan siswa untuk pindah posisi yang bertujuan agar proses belajar mengajar berjalan dengan baik. Siswa yang pasif yang berada di barisan sebelah kiriduduk bersebelahan dengan siswa aktif di barisan sebelah kanan. Hal ini dilakukan untuk membuat siswa yang pasif menjadi lebih aktif. Dengan merubah posisi duduk siswa, hal ini mendorong siswa yang pasif menjadi lebih aktif karena mereka duduk bersebelahan dengan siswa yang aktif. Selain itu, ada 23 siswa (85.18%) yang mampu mencapai indikator dalam menghasilkan produk pembelajaran. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa nilai menulis siswa meningkat ketika guru fokus kedalam beberapa poin kesalahan berdasarkan daftar koreksi yang telah diberikan. Daftar koreksi berisi tentang beberapa poin untuk mengoreksi teks narasi siswa yang bertujuan untuk memudahkan dan membantu siswa dalam mengoreksi hasil menulis teman sejawat mereka.

Dengan menggunakan daftar koreksi tersebut, siswa merasa lebih mudah untuk mengoreksi ketika mereka harus fokus ke beberapa poin kesalahan yang mungkin terjadi. Hal ini membuat siswa mengetahui beberapa hal yang harus dikoreksi ketika koreksi dengan teman sejawat diimplementasikan. Mereka dapat belajar dari kesalahn yang telah dibuat oleh teman mereka dan mereka juga dapat belajar dari teman mereka yang mengoreksi hasil kerja mereka untuk membuat hasil menulis mereka menjadi lebih baik.

Kata kunci: teknik mengoreksi denga teman sejawat, menulis, teks narasi.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a crucial part in learning English. The students are expected to be able to express their ideas in the written form based on the indicators at School Based Curriculum (KTSP). In this research, the researcher is as the teacher and she found that most of the students from the first year of the school still have difficulties in producing a narrative text. There are only 60,9 % students from the first year of the school was not good enough in writing a narrative text. It showed that some students are experienced in their writing tasks due to the lack of grammar and vocabulary that the students need in order to be able to write their thoughts in English composition. Therefore, it is difficult to the students to convey their ideas clearly.

Seeing this phenomenon, the researcher identified some factors that may cause students' problem in writing text. First, students' limited vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, it makes them difficult to write their ideas clearly. Second, they still confuse in using the appropriate grammar. It causes them making some mistakes in their writing. Third, some of them are afraid of making mistakes and they have less of confidence in writing. Automatically, the students lack knowledge in writing English.

At present, there is a technique of correction that make it possible for the students to learn by themselves from their own mistakes from their draft of written work and this technique is known as peer correction. But most teachers still use the traditional technique. Until recently, they are still doing the correction of the students' draft by themselves. As a result, the students will not know what mistakes that they had made and what correct ways they should do. In the other words, this technique does not give the chance for the students to learn by themselves from the mistakes they have made. According to Jacobs (1989:68) in Fatriana (1996) that peer correction is a part of larger category of educational activities in which students work together in groups. But they are scarcely used by teachers in Indonesia. It occurs because either the

teachers do not have knowledge and mastery practicing the technique or the information about this technique is not widespread.

Concerning the problems that the researcher identified, the researcher conducted a classroom action research to improve the students' activities in writing class and improve the students' writing ability of narrative text by using peer correction technique. The researcher conducted this research to see how effective peer correction is to improve the students' activities and students' writing ability during the teaching-learning process.

## **II. METHODS**

The research was a Classroom Action research. This research was conducted based on the problem that was identified and tried to find the solution. The solution that was conducted was teaching writing by using peer correction technique. The teacher taught the students based on the lesson plan. Then, the observer noted the important things in teaching and learning process. Moreover, the observation results during teaching and learning process were analyzed that was about the strength and the weaknesses which were done by the teacher and students in teaching-learning process of writing narrative text using peer correction technique and learning product (referring to students' narrative text). This Classroom Action Research consists of four stages in each cycle, they are: 1) Planning, 2) Action, 3) Observation and Interpretation, and 4) Analysis and Reflection (Wiriaatmadja, 2008:66).

This research was conducted at SMA N 1 Gadingrejo. It was conducted based on the problem that was faced by the students and the teacher when they were in writing class. The subject of the research was the students of class X 2 of SMAN 1 Gadingrejo in the academic year 2011/2012. The number of the students was 27 students.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In reference to this research, the result showed that peer correction technique made the students actively involved in teaching-learning process. Besides, it improved the students' writing ability in narrative text. This research answered that peer correction technique assisted the students in writing a narrative text. Higgins (1987) states that peer correction occurs when one learner corrects another one. The using of peer correction technique by using correction checklist as the students' guidelines in this research helped the students to be more active since the students corrected their peers' works. It occurs because when the students corrected their peers' works, they corrected it by using guidelines to guide them. The guidelines given encouraged the students to be more active in correcting their peers' works by themselves. When they were confused in correcting a word, they opened the dictionary. They asked something unclear to the other students or to the teacher to make sure about the errors that they found. Moreover, they asked to the teacher about the guidelines if they confused in correcting it. Furthermore, the research also answered the research question of how peer correction technique improves the students' activity in teaching-learning process. Meanwhile, the research also answered the research question of how peer correction technique improves the students' activities. The table shows the students' participation in the first and the second cycle.

Table 1. Table of Students' Participation

No	Stages	Students involved in the activity	Percentage
1	Cycle I	14	51.85%
2	Cycle II	21	77.77%

According to the previous explanation of the students' activities during the teaching-learning process in cycle I, the indicator of the research had not been fulfilled. Some students were not able to respond the teacher's questions. Meanwhile, the students who sat in the left row tended to cheat each other when the teacher explained the

materials and some of them were confused in understanding the instruction given by the teacher when the teacher asked the students doing peer correction. According to the table and the observation note taken in cycle I (Appendix 5), it was found that there were 14 students (51.85%) who actively involved in teaching-learning process. It meant that the indicator of students' activities had not been fulfilled. Therefore, it was necessary to conduct the second cycle.

In the cycle II, the researcher only focused on the weaknesses that were found in cycle I. The solution to solve the problem that was moving the students in the left row to the right row beside the active students and asking the students to keep paying attention to the teacher's instruction in doing peer correction. Meanwhile, it was found that one of the components of writing especially for language use was still low and it needed to be improved. It was the using of simple past tense in narrative text and the solution that was the teacher discussed and explained more about the use of the tense in narrative text, especially simple past tense. After conducting cycle I and cycle II, it was found that there was an improvement during teaching-learning process from the first to the second cycle. The result showed that 25,92% of improvement. There were 21 students (77.77%) who actively involved in teaching-learning process. In the cycle II, the students followed the lesson seriously and became more active in asking something that was unclear and answering the teacher's questions. They became more courageous to ask about the errors found in their peer's works if they got confused or were not sure about it (see appendix 6).

Shih (1986) in Douglas states that one of some approaches in teaching writing is focusing on the process of writing that leads to the final written product. The teacher kept focusing on teaching-learning process without ignoring the final product of students' writing. It showed the improvements from cycle I to cycle II after the teacher did some solution to solve the problems. Actually, the successful of the learning process influenced the students' writing ability. Thus, the learning product

improved when the technique was implemented. The result can be presented as follows:

Table 2: Students score in each component of writing at cycle I and cycle II

Criteria	Cycle I					Cycle II				
	C (%)	O (%)	V (%)	L (%)	M (%)	C (%)	O (%)	V (%)	L (%)	M (%)
Excellent	-	1 (3.70)	-	-	3 (11.11)	-	7 (25.93)	2 (7.41)	-	11 (40.74)
Good to average	7 (25.93)	24 (88.89)	12 (44.44)	5 (18.52)	13 (48.15)	15 (55.56)	20 (74.07)	23 (85.19)	9 (33.33)	13 (48.15)
Fair to poor	19 (70.37)	2 (7.41)	15 (55.56)	22 (81.48)	10 (37.04)	12 (44.44)	-	2 (7.41)	18 (66.67)	4 (14.81)
Very poor	1 (3.70)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note:

C: Content, O: Organization, V: (Vocabulary), L: Language Use, M: Mechanics

Table 2 shows that students writing ability improved when peer correction technique was implemented. There were some components used in scoring the students' writing, those were content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics. Among those five aspects, in cycle I, it was found that the lowest score of students' writing components was in language use. In language use aspect, actually the students had understood about tense that was used in narrative text but some of them still made mistakes in writing. For example, student RY wrote 'The bus *go* quickly'. Actually, the tense that was used in narrative text was simple past tense, but he used simple present tense. Therefore, it was wrong. What she meant that was 'The bus *went* quickly. Having seen the students' composition, it was caused by the students had not understand about the form of verb II and it was found that they still used wrong tense. But, after the teacher taught and recalled their minds about tense, they understood and most of them wrote a narrative using appropriate tense in their writing. In addition, the highest score in students' writing component was in organization aspect. Most of

the students could organize their ideas in chronological orders. Besides, they were good in sequencing the events happened in their writing.

Considering some problems and weaknesses in the first cycle, the researcher tried to find out the best way in order to solve the problems found in the cycle I to improve the students' writing ability. Having seen the lowest score in writing narrative text, the teacher focused on the solutions in language use aspect, the teacher asked the students to practice more in writing to minimize their grammatical errors especially the using of simple past tense. Furthermore, the teacher gave the students more explanation about grammar especially simple past tense that was used in writing a narrative text. In order to make the students' vocabulary better, the teacher asked the students to open the dictionary or asked the teacher and other students in using suitable words in their writing. In mechanics aspect, the teacher reminded the students that they should keep paying more attention in mechanics aspect. The teacher asked them to write more carefully in order to minimize errors in spelling some words. It was done by checking the words that would be written in the dictionary so that they would be wrong in spelling. Moreover, the teacher also reminded the students to capitalize the first letter of people's name and use appropriate punctuation marks.

After conducting the cycle II, it was found that the students' writing ability improved after the teacher implemented peer correction technique. In the cycle I, there were 13 students (48.14%) whose scores achieved 70 or more. Furthermore, in the cycle II, there were 23 students (85.18%) whose scores in writing had achieved the target of the indicator after the teacher implemented peer correction technique. This meant that the result of students' writing scores showed 37.04% of the improvement. Therefore, this result had already fulfilled the indicator of the target. It happened since the students only corrected specific errors based on the guidelines. Therefore, it made the students easier to correct their peers' works.



According to Newkirk (1984) the students should be given specific errors to look for rather than being asked to look for general error, therefore it was better that the students were given a correction checklist which provided specific errors to enable them in correcting their peer's work. In line to this theory, it was found that the students' writing scores improved when the teacher focused on the specific errors based on the correction checklist that was given. The correction checklist helped the students in correcting their peers' works. By using it, the students felt easier when they should focus on few errors therefore it made the students know what should be corrected when peer correction was implemented.

In summary, it can be concluded that the students' writing ability improved when peer correction technique by using correction checklist in writing class was implemented. It can be seen from the result in cycle I to cycle II. There was 37.04% of improvement from the first cycle to the second cycle during the observation done in students' learning products. It was found that the students' writing scores improved when the teacher focused on the specific errors based on the correction checklist that was given. Correction checklist provided specific errors to enable and help the students in correcting their peer's work. By using it, the students felt easier when they should focus on some errors. It made the students know what should be corrected when peer correction was implemented. They could learn from the mistakes that their friends had made and also they could learn from their friends who gave the correction to make their writing better.

There were 25.92% of improvements from the first cycle to the second cycle during the teaching-learning process. It happened since the teacher asked the students to change the position in order to make the teaching-learning process running well. The passive students in the left row sat next to the active students in the right row. It was done in order to make the passive students become more active. By changing the students' position, it encouraged the passive students being more active since they sat next to the active students.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusions

In line with this research, the researcher draws some conclusions as follow:

1. It is found that the application of peer correction technique by using correction checklist improves the students' activities in writing narrative text during the teaching-learning process. This technique also improves the students' interest in learning writing and also encourages the students to be more active during the teaching-learning process in the class. It can be seen from the results of the students' observation sheet. It shows that in cycle 1, there are 14 students (51.85%) who actively involved in teaching-learning process. Then in Cycle 2, there are 21 students (77.77%) who are active in the class. They are actively involved during the teaching-learning process. It means that there are 25.92% of improvement in the second cycle.
2. Peer correction technique is proved to be able to improve the students' writing ability of narrative text since peer correction occurs when one learner corrects another one (Higgins,1987). It is proved by the data that shows the students' improvement in writing a narrative text in cycle 2 (37.04% improvement) in each components of writing, those are content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics (see table 6).
3. Students' writing ability improves when peer correction technique by using correction checklist in writing class is implemented. It is found that the students' writing scores improves when the teacher focuses on the specific errors based on the correction checklist that was given. By using correction checklist, the students feel easier when they should focus on some errors. They can learn from the mistakes that their friends had made and also they can learn from their friends who give the correction and suggestion to make their writing better.
4. The students' teaching learning process improves when the teacher asks the students to change the position. It is done in order to make the teaching-learning process running well. The passive students in the left row sit next to the active students in the right row. It is done in order to make the passive students become

more active. By changing the students' position, it encourages the passive students being more active since they sit next to the active students.

### **Suggestions**

In accordance with the result of the research and the conclusion stated above, the researcher would like to give some suggestions, especially for English teacher. The suggestions are stated as following:

1) The English teachers are suggested to use peer correction by using correction checklist in correcting the students' works since by implementing peer correction, it improves the students' activities and the students become more active in teaching-learning process.

2) The English teachers who want to apply peer correction are suggested to teach the students about the importance in using appropriate vocabulary, language use especially the use of tense in a text. The teacher also reminds the students to pay attention in using the appropriate punctuation, spelling and capitalization in writing a narrative text. Therefore, it makes the students more understand about how to write a good writing.

3) The teachers who want to apply peer correction should be aware of students' failure in correcting the errors of their peers. The teacher should make sure that the students correct the right correction. If it happens, the solution is that the teacher rechecks the students' correction so the teacher will know the wrong correction and then discuss it to the students. Therefore the students know and understand about the wrong correction that they made and the right correction.

### **REFERENCES**

Arikunto, S. Suhardjono. and Supardi. 2006. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Astuti, Eka Mulya. 2010. *English Zone for Senior High School Students Year X*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

- Brown, Douglas H. 2004. *Language Assessment – Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Fatriana, N. 1996. *A Comparative Study between Peer Correction and Self Correction in Improving Students' Skills in Writing a Descriptive Paragraph at the Second Seven of SMUN 2 Tanjung Karang*. Paper (unpublished). B. Lampung: Lampung University.
- Gebhard, Jerry G. 1996. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language or Second Language – A Teacher Self-development and Methodology Guide*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Harris, David P. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Heaton, J.B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test*. Hong Kong: Longman Group (FE) Ltd.
- Linderman, Erika. 1983. *Basic Writing a Practical Approach*. New York: Little Brown and Company.
- Lampung University. 2008. *Pedoman Penulisan Karya Ilmiah Universitas Lampung*. B. Lampung: Lampung University Press.
- Lorch, Sue. 1984. *Basic Writing – A Practical Approach*. Canada: Little Brown Company.
- McCrimmon, James. 1984. *Writing with A Purpose*. Houghton Mifflin Company. USA/Boston.
- Raimes, Ann. 1938. *Technique in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T.S. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sepnita, Ana. 2005. *Minimizing Students' Written Errors in Using Determiners by Means of Peer Correction*. Paper (unpublished). B. Lampung: Lampung University.
- Setiyadi, Bambang Ag. 2005. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
- Smalley, Regina L. *Refining Composition Skills*. United States of America: Macmillan A Publishing Company.

Toolan, Michael. 2001. *Narrative – A Critical Linguistic Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Yufrizal, Hery. 2008. *An Introduction to A Second Language Acquisition*. Bandung: Pustaka Reka Cipta.

Wiriaatmadja, Rochiati. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Bargiel, Kamilla. 2009. *Correction Techniques Preferred by Students During the Process of Learning A Foreign Language*.

Retrieved from:

[http://www.eslking.com/library2/collections/language/acquisition/sla/bargiel/correction\\_techniques\\_in\\_fl.pdf](http://www.eslking.com/library2/collections/language/acquisition/sla/bargiel/correction_techniques_in_fl.pdf). accessed on Sunday, January, 12, 2012, 09:20:12