

Employing Self and Peer Editing Techniques to Teach Writing Recount Texts for Students with High and Low Motivation

EvitaArdyPrabasiwi^{1✉}, Warsono²

¹Mondial Education

²Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:

Received 10 August 2017

Accepted 18 October 2017

Published 01 December 2017

Keywords:

professional competence development, efforts, and ESP teachers

Abstract

This current study aims at exploring the effect of self-editing technique and peer editing technique for teaching recount text writing to students with high and low motivation and explaining whether there is significant interaction among teaching technique, writing skill, and students' motivation. This study is an experimental research with a 2 x 2 factorial design. Respectively, the results of the present study have revealed that firstly, there is no significant difference between pretest and posttest result of students with high motivation students that are treated with self-editing technique. Secondly, there is significant difference of pretest and posttest scores of low-motivated students who are treated by self-editing technique. Thirdly, it is described that peer editing technique has significant effect to be treated to students with high motivation in improving the writing skill of recount text. Fourthly, peer editing technique is not effective to be applied for low-motivated students because there is no significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of low-motivated students treated by peer editing technique. Fifthly, there is no difference in the improvement between students with high and low motivation in writing recount texts through peer and self-editing technique. The summary of the analysis shows that both techniques, peer and self-editing techniques are applicable to treat high and low-motivated students in teaching recount texts writing.

© 2017 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉Correspondence Address:

Graha Candi Golf No.2, Semarang

E-mail: evitasiwi@gmail.com

p-ISSN 2087-0108

e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Teaching writing is such a complex task that we need a wide array of tools, techniques, and approaches to accomplish the goals (Hill, 2011). Dealing with writing techniques, there have been a lot of researchers who conducted research on finding applicable techniques to improve students' writing skill. Peer editing technique is considered as one of the steps in the writing process that help students evaluate and improve the quality of their written work in many ways (Hastuti, 2014: 2). In this technique, the students are encouraged to be critical as they have to check their peer's work. Mangelsdorf (1992) as cited by Hastuti (2014) states that peer reviews achieve the following: provide students with an authentic audience; increase students' motivation for writing.

Recount text is a specific genre to teach because of its social function and its familiarity to students' life. Recount text as one of the genres has appeared in both written and oral. It also can be a central medium in dealing with others by giving and sharing experience. Furthermore, Marta and Gandes (2005:10) have proposed the social function of recount text that is to retell past events for the purpose of informing or entertaining. They also state that recount text has its characteristics. This study was carried out to determine the comparison between self-editing and peer editing technique in improving students' writing skill of personal recount text. The researcher examined whether there was or not the significant differences in applying the techniques in order to improve students' writing skill.

Mondial Primary School is a national primary school which is located in Semarang. To improve their English proficiency, since the first grade, the students have been guided to write their experience in the form of weekly journal (see Appendix 1). They have to write what they did and had on their weekends. The teachers help them to correct their writing assessment by giving the written feed backs. This kind of feedback is expected in helping the

students to correct their works for the next assignment.

This activity has several purposes. Besides enhancing students' writing skill, this activity also helps students to enrich their vocabulary mastery. The students do this assignment as a take-home assignment. Their parents may help them to arrange the assignment. However, in classes, the teachers will guide the students to work independently finishing their assignments. The students' writing works will be checked and responded by the teacher. It is hoped that the students would be helped to enhance their writing skill by the teachers' responds and comments. In grade 5, the students start to learn about how to write a complete personal recount with its generic structure and language features. They are hoped to be able to write a correct recount text with less grammar errors, spelling, and punctuation mistakes.

However, the problem that is mostly faced by the teacher of grade 5 is that the grammar errors, spelling, and punctuation mistakes. In their weekly journal, it seems that the teachers' feedback does not really help the students to be aware to the mistakes that they have made in the previous journal. In this research, the writer would show how self-editing and peer editing technique helped the students to enhance their writing skill, especially in writing recount texts. In this research, the writer gave the students the scope that they had to correct and edit. The scopes were grammar error, spelling and punctuation mistakes. Also, the students were guided to write the generic structure of the recount text. This treatment are hoped to help the students to write a recount text better.

METHODS

In this study, the writer used quantitative research, specifically experimental study, as the research design to explore and describes the issue based on the data collection. This study is describing and explaining the effect of using self-editing technique and peer editing technique in teaching writing recount text of students with high and low motivation. This study describes

the case of grade 5 students of Mondial Primary School academic year 2015/2016. The study involved 28 students which were grouped into two, experimental group 1 and experimental group 2.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study aims at finding out the effectiveness of self-editing and peer editing techniques in teaching writing recount texts at Mondial Primary School, Semarang. There are two groups in this research. The first experimental group namely *5A* was treated by self-editing technique and the second experimental group namely *5B* was treated by using peer editing technique.

There was try out activity before doing the research. The try out questions were in the form of writing test. The instruction in the try out was reliable. The valid and reliable instruction was used in the pretest and posttest.

Motivation questionnaire distribution was conducted in the first meeting of the research. It was used to classify students with high and low motivation.

Pretest was conducted in the next meeting. It was used to compare the result of students with high and low motivation before they were treated by using peer editing and self-editing techniques with the result of posttest after they were treated by using peer editing and self-editing techniques. The form of pretest was in the form of writing test.

The researcher, as the teacher, implemented self-editing technique for teaching written recount texts in the first experimental group. The curriculum used in teaching process was School-Based Curriculum. There were three meetings for teaching the class.

In the first meeting, the researcher introduced the technique implemented to the students. Then, the researcher explained the definition of recount text. After that, the researcher gave students the text of a recount text. The teacher asked the students about the generic structure of the text and also the language features used in the recount text.

In the second meeting, the researcher explained the elements of recount texts, i.e., the use of past tense. The researcher, as the teacher, recalled their memory about the use of past tense. After that, the researcher gave the students some sentences using past tense. Then, the researcher explained about it.

After the students got taught about the use of past tense, the students were asked to make 10 sentences using past tense. The researcher guided the students when they were working. After they were done, they were asked to check their work by themselves. Then, the researcher and students discussed it together.

In the third meeting, the researcher gave the students another text of a recount text. The students were guided to analyze the generic structure of the text and also the language features of the text. The researcher then explained them about the chronological connection used in the text, such as, *then*, *after*, *next*, etc. after that, the students were asked to make their own recount text based on their experience. After they were done, the researcher asked them to recheck their works. The researcher asked them to correct the mistakes that they found in their works. The researcher guided and helped them to work. After that, the researcher discussed their works together with the students.

The researcher, as the teacher, implemented peer-editing technique for teaching writing recount text in the second experimental group. The curriculum used in teaching process was School-Based Curriculum. There were four meetings for teaching the class.

In the first meeting, the researcher introduced the technique implemented to the students. Then, the researcher explained the definition of recount text. After that, the researcher gave students the text of a recount text. The teacher asked the students about the generic structure of the text and also the language features used in the recount text.

In the second meeting, the researcher explained the elements of recount texts, that was the use of past tense. The researcher, as the teacher, recalled their memory about the use of

pastTense. After that, the researcher gave the students some sentences using past tense. Then, the researcher explained about it. After that, the students had to make some sentences using past tense. After that, they had to ask their partner to check and give comments towards what the sentences they constructed. As soon as they were done correcting their friends' works, they had to check their own works which had been checked and responded by their friends. Then, the researcher and students discussed it together.

In the third meeting, the researcher gave the students another text of a recount text. The students were guided to analyze the generic structure of the text and also the language features of the text. The researcher then explained them about the chronological connection used in the text, such as, *then*, *after*, *next*, etc. after that, the students were asked to make their own recount text based on their experience. After they were done, the researcher asked them to recheck their works. The researcher asked them to correct the mistakes that they found in their works. The researcher guided and helped them to work. After that, the researcher discussed their works together with the students.

The sample of the research was taken purposively for statistical test. It was used to see mean, median, standard deviation, minimum score, and maximum score.

The data of normality test of pretest and posttest were analyzed by using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for one sample by SPSS 18.0. For the normality of pretest, it shows that P values of the first experimental group pretest are 0.879 and 0.973 which are higher than α 0.05. Meanwhile, P values of the second experimental group pretest are 0.997 and 0.930 which are higher than α 0.05. It can be concluded that the data of the first and second experimental group pretest have normal distribution.

For the normality of posttest, it shows that P values of the first experimental group posttest are 0.942 and 0.904 which are higher than α 0.05. Meanwhile, P values of the second experimental group posttest are 0.673 and 0.925 which are higher than α 0.05. It can be

concluded that the data of the first and second experimental group posttest have normal distribution.

The data of pretest and posttest in both of experimental groups have normal distribution. It indicates that the data are appropriate to be given to the students. The data of homogeneity test of pretest and posttest were analyzed by using Levene's test for Homogeneity of Variance. For the homogeneity test of pretest, it shows that P value is 0.346. It indicates that P value is higher than α 0.05 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. It can be concluded that the data of pretest are homogeneous.

For the homogeneity test of posttest, it shows that P value is 0.169. It indicates that P value is higher than α 0.05 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. It can be concluded that the data of posttest are homogeneous.

The data of pretest and posttest in both of experimental groups are homogeneous. It indicates that the data are appropriate to be given to the students.

According to the first research question, the mean score of pretest of self-editing technique to students with high motivation is 88,14 and the mean score of posttest of self-editing technique to students with high and low critical thinking is 90,29.

Meanwhile, the value of sig (2-tailed) in the pretest and posttest result of self-editing technique to students with high motivation is 0.78 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. So, there is no significant difference between pretest and posttest result of students with high motivation students that were treated with self-editing technique in teaching written recount text.

Dealing with the result of the first question, it could be concluded that self-editing technique was not an effective technique to be implemented in teaching written recount text for high motivated students.

Related to the second research question, the mean score of pretest of self-editing technique to students with low motivated students is 80,57 and the mean score of posttest

of self-editing technique to students with low-motivated student is 84,29.

Meanwhile, the value of sig (2-tailed) in pretest and posttest result of self-editing technique to students with low motivation student is 0.040 meaning that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, there is significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of low-motivated students who were treated by self-editing technique.

Dealing with the second research question, due to the significant difference between pretest and posttest scores, it can be concluded that self-editing technique was effective to be applied in teaching written recount text for students with low motivation.

In relation with the third research question, the mean score of pretest of peer editing technique to students with high motivation is 88,43 and the mean score of posttest of peer editing technique to students with high motivation is 94,14.

Meanwhile, the value of sig (2-tailed) in pretest and posttest scores of peer editing technique to students with high motivation is 0.24 meaning that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, there is significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of peer editing technique to students with high motivation student.

To sum up the third research question, peer editing technique has good effect for the students with high motivation because the mean score of posttest is higher than the pretest score or before the technique had been applied.

In accordance with the fourth research question, the mean score of pretest of low-motivated students treated by peer editing technique is 77,71 and the mean score of posttest of students with low-motivated students treated by peer editing technique is 81,71.

Meanwhile, the value of sig (2-tailed) in pretest and posttest result of students with low motivation treated by using peer editing technique is 0.21 meaning that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, there is significant difference between students the scores of pretest and posttest of the students with low motivation

treated by peer editing technique. To summarize the fourth research question, the students with low motivation has better affect to be treated by peer editing technique.

According to the fifth research question, the mean score of pretest of students with high and low motivation treated by peer editing technique is 87,93 and the mean score of posttest of students with high and low motivation treated by self-editing technique is 87,29.

Meanwhile, the value of sig (2-tailed) in posttest result of students with high and low motivation treated by peer editing and self-editing technique is 0.824 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. So, there is no significant difference between students with high and low motivation treated by peer editing and self-editing technique.

To sum up the fifth research question, the two techniques applied to students with high and low motivation has equal result. It means that self-editing technique has good effect as well as peer editing technique to be applied in teaching written recount text.

Related to the sixth research question, P value of teaching techniques is 0.0773. It is higher than α 0.05 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. It indicates that there is no significant difference between self-editing technique and peer editing technique on the result of posttest. The P value of motivation is 0.000. It is lower than α 0.05 meaning that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It indicates that there is significant difference between students with high and low motivation on the result of posttest.

The P value of teaching techniques* motivation is 0,258. It is higher than α 0.05 meaning that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected. It indicates that there is no interaction between teaching techniques and motivation. From whole result, it can be concluded that there is no interaction among teaching techniques, writing skill, and students' motivation in teaching writing recount texts to students with high and low motivation.

From the research conducted, it can be concluded that there are several changes in the

characteristics of students. They can enhance their writing skill through self-editing and peer editing technique. They also have bigger spirit in their learning process. They are encouraged to work in pairs and also improve their focus through implementation of their editing in their learning process.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated whether peer editing technique can be employed effectively to improve high and low motivated students' skill in writing personal recount texts and how students who used peer editing technique differ from those who employed self-editing technique. Concerning the theories, findings and discussion explored in the previous chapters, some conclusions can be drawn as follows:

The first result based on the data analysis shows that self-editing technique is not an effective way to be implemented to improve high-motivated students in writing personal recount texts. It was shown from the result of ANOVA test that the (H_0) is accepted and the (H_1) is rejected. It means that there is no significant difference between pre-test and post-test score of high motivation students. It is not effective to students with higher motivation in writing recount texts. The second conclusion of low motivated students who were taught by using the same method shows that the (H_0) is rejected and (H_1) is accepted. It means there is a significant difference between pre-test and post-test or there is positive effect. It can be concluded that self-editing technique is effective to be applied in teaching written recount text for students with low motivation. The third conclusion shows that the statistical calculation of the students who have high motivation taught by using peer editing technique shows a significant difference. The output of calculation proved that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. It means there were significant differences between the pretest and post test scores of the students with high motivation who were taught using peer editing technique.

The fourth conclusion from the data analysis shows that the (H_0) is accepted and H_1 is rejected. There was no significant difference between the pre and post test scores of the students with low motivation who were treated by peer editing technique. It means peer editing technique is not effective to teach recount text students with lower motivation. The fifth, the summary of the two statistical data show that the two techniques, peer and self-editing technique are applicable to treat high and low-motivated students to teach recount texts writing. The last finding of the research uncovers the fact that there is no interaction among teaching techniques, student motivation, and writing skill. It shows that both techniques can be employed to teach writing personal recount text. Students with low-motivation treated with self-motivation achieved better than high-motivated students. Meanwhile, the students with high-motivation students who were treated with peer-editing techniques showed higher scores than low-motivated students. It is concluded that both techniques were applicable to be applied to teach writing recount text. In this case, the role of the teachers is very important in leading students' intention and attention in learning. The teacher should guide the students in applying the two techniques. In order to get great willingness of the students to write, the teacher must provide interesting themes for students to write. In this research, the two techniques have proven that they could help students to write a recount text.

REFERENCES

- Berg, C. E. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 215– 237.
- Brandet, C. (2008). Integrating feedback and reflection in teacher preparation. *ELT Journal*, 62, 37-46.
- Cohen, et al. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. Routledge. London New York.

- Diab, N. M. (2010). Effects of peer-versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts. *System*, 38, 85-95.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). *Does error feedback help student writer?* New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. (8th edition). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon .
- Galvis. (2009). Peer editing: a strategic source in EFL students' writing process. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal Number*, 12.
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 30-43.
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, 46, 274-284.