The effect of different types of correction on the students' ability in writing descriptive text

Maulia Emelda
maulia.emelda22@gmail.com
M. Zaini Miftah
m.zaini.miftah@iain-palangkaraya.ac.id
English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Institut Agama Islam Negeri Palangka Raya, Indonesia

Abstract

This research aimed to investigate the effect of peer correction and self-correction on the students' ability in writing descriptive text. This research applied a quantitative method with a quasi-experimental research design. 106 population samples of the three classes were taken from the students of the English Education Department at IAIN Palangka Raya. The technique of collecting the data used was the writing test. In analyzing the data, some procedures used were such as administering pre-test, conducting treatments, administering post-test, and analyzing the data. The results showed that there is a significant effect of peer correction and self-correction on the students' ability in writing descriptive text. It can be seen from the mean score between pre-test (55.13) and post-test (72.89) of the experimental group (Class A) using peer correction indicating that students' scores increased after the treatment, and the mean score of pre-test (58.89) and post-test (73.34) of the experimental group (Class B) using self-correction indicating that students' scores increased after the treatment. It is considered that peer correction and self-correction as the writing instruction technique can help them in writing especially descriptive text.

Keywords: peer correction; self-correction; writing ability; writing descriptive text; EFL writing class

INTRODUCTION

Writing, as one of the productive skills that should be developed in instructional activities, is considered to be the most complicated problem for students. The teaching of writing in the Indonesian EFL context still has problems. The trend problems are that in terms of technical writing and the teaching strategies implemented by teachers (Jafaruddin, 2006; Kusumaningtyas, 2005; Miftah, 2015; Nirwani, 2007). Therefore, the research of developing students' writing ability in EFL writing classes should always be conducted.

Teachers have traditionally provided feedback on errors to students; however, in current teaching approaches, other ways of providing feedback and correcting have been incorporated. According to Bitchener et al. (2005), self-correction is indirect feedback where the teacher provides students with choices that would allow them to discern the correct form by themselves.

Studies on self-correction (Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001; Kubota, 2001; Maftoon, Shirazi, & Daftarifard, 2011) have found its positive effect such as the reduction of the number of errors made by the students. Other findings are that self-correction was more effective than teachers' correction and recasts, plus it favored the learners' positive attitude towards error correction and triggered meta-cognitive discussions in the classroom which could provide opportunities for learning. Fahimi and Rahimi (2015) also found that self-assessment instruction prepares students to plan and revise their texts as well as to evaluate the progress of their writing. The results make a case for instructing and involving students in self-correction practices with the objective of not only improving their writing but also their metacognitive skills.

According to Yang (2010), self and peer correction empower the students to monitor, evaluate, and edit their texts to improve them since self-correction facilitates the identification of grammatical errors. In addition, peer correction helps them to notice others' opinions about their texts. In this way, students provide and receive support from each other building a true learning community which is the aim of the educational model.

Also known as peer feedback or peer review, peer correction has proved to be an effective means of aiding writing development since it actively involves learners in the learning and teaching process. Kamimura (2006) has shown that peer feedback offers many ways to improve learners' writing. This method consists of learners giving and receiving feedback about their writing from their peers, that is, other learners. It may be implemented in the classroom to "enhance learner autonomy, cooperation, interaction and involvement" (Sultana, 2009, p. 12). Thus, comparing one's writing to others' offers the opportunity to broaden and deepen learners' thinking and understanding of their writing process and language use in two ways: As readers, they enhance their critical reading skills and as writers, learners foster their critical thinking skills when revising their pieces of writing based on peers' feedback (Moussaoui, 2012).

Some of the most important benefits of implementing peer correction in the classroom are shown. Learning responsibility is shared with learners which show them that their opinion is valued. Both teachers and learners gain insights into the writing process. Learners also actively participate in the correction activity to provide a more supportive atmosphere as the feedback received from classmates. As a result of these, the authoritative role of the teacher is no more reinforced (Pishghadam & Kermanshahi, 2011, p. 218). It saves time and effort for many EFL instructors and allows teachers to assess learners' writing regularly thereby reducing the negative effects of time constraints and large class sizes (Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006). Besides, it is not uncommon that learners give feedback according to given criteria established by the

teacher which may be checklists, feedback sheets, error codes, and error logs. These tools are helpful for the process of error correction and provide learners with a guide to classify errors which may reduce levels of anxiety.

In the writing class of the English Education Department at IAIN Palangka Raya, the teachers tend to use peer feedback activities during the revision stage of the writing process. Self-correction is seldom used in the writing class. In the present research, it focused on implementing feedback activities by combining peer correction and self-correction. It investigated the effectiveness of the strategy to be implemented in the writing class since this strategy tends to be more effective in teaching writing. Therefore, the research questions are:

1. Is there any significant effect of peer-correction in writing the descriptive text?
2. Is there any significant effect of self-correction in writing the descriptive text?
3. Is there any interaction effect of peer- and self-correction in writing the descriptive text?

This research is aimed at investigating the effect of peer correction after being taught through peer- and self-correction, of self-correction after being taught through peer- and self-correction, and of peer correction and self-correction after being taught through peer- and self-correction in writing descriptive text. It hoped that the results of the research help the English lecturers in general in particular to be accurately aware and realize that peer- and self-correction can improve the students' writing ability and the students are expected to be no longer dependent on their teachers' feedback.

METHOD

Research Design

In this research, it applied a quasi-experimental design. This research intended to find out the students' achievement in writing descriptive text and the aspects of writing that improve the most after being taught through peer-correction and self-correction. The design of this research was two group Pretest and Posttest design (Arikunto, 2010; Ary et al., 2010). It used two classes as an experimental class that receives the treatments (peer-correction and self-correction for each class). The students got pre-test, the treatments in four meetings, and post-test.

Population and Sample

The population in this research was the third-semester students of the English Education Department at IAIN Palangka Raya. To be the sample of the research, they were the students who had the same characteristics studying how to write descriptive text in the Paragraph Writing class – 33 students from class A, 38 students from class B, and 35 students from class C.

Research Instrument

The instrument of the research used was writing test. It was conducted in the first meeting and the last meeting. The tests were about asking the students to make a descriptive text based on the topic (person/place). It was done to see the improvement of the students writing a descriptive test after given the treatments.

Data Collection

To collect the data, it was through the procedures as follows. First, determining the population and selecting the samples. Second, selecting and arranging the materials to be taught as a pre-test; The researcher chooses the material from the students' handbook, based on the syllabus and the topic is about describing someone.

Third, administering pre-tests; A pre-test is needed to know the ability of the students to write in descriptive text. It was asked the students to write a descriptive text of a person/place.

Fourth, conducting treatment. The treatments were conducted in three meetings based on the lesson plan. In the peer-correction class, the researcher explained the characteristics of descriptive text such as tenses, vocabularies, and content. Then they were asked to make a descriptive text of person/place/etc. Then they exchanged their draft to their partner and make some notes as correction of error. And after that, they made revision based on the notes. In the self-correction class, they were asked to make a descriptive text of a person/place. While the students were asked to attend their work, the researcher explained the components of descriptive text such as tenses, vocabularies, and content. And they checked and took some notes if there were mistakes in their work. Then made revision based on the notes. In Table 1, it shows the procedures of the data collection during the writing class using peer and self-corrections.

Finally, administering the post-test. The post-test was conducted after the treatments. This post-test was similar to the pre-test. The researchers asked the students to write a descriptive text of place, person/place.

Data Analysis

To analyze the students' writings, it was assessed by using an analytical scoring rubric. The criteria of writing are content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics adapted from Weigle (2002). It used the same percentages as the value in each aspect of writing to see the influence of the techniques with balance. After gaining the scores, the data were calculated using one-way ANOVA. It interpreted the result of one-way ANOVA and discussed and concluded the result of data analysis.

Table 1. The procedures of the data collection

Meeting	Experimental Group A (Peer Correction)	Experimental Group B (Self Correction)	Control Group
1	Administering the pre-test	Administering the pre-test	Administering the pre-test
2	• In this stage, the writer selects the general subject, restricts the subject, generates and organizes the idea. • The writer sets of paper the ideas in his mind into words, sentences, text and so on.	• In this stage, the writer selects the general subject, restricts the subject, generates and organizes the idea. • The writer sets of paper the ideas in his mind into words, sentences, text and so on.	• In this stage, the writer selects the general subject, restricts the subject, generates and organizes the idea. • The writer sets of paper the ideas in his mind into words, sentences, text and so on.
3	• Their conduct into a group. • Correcting the content and the form. The focus is on the organization of writing. • Correcting vocabulary, punctuation, and grammar. This relates to the use of the right vocabularies, punctuations mark, and present tense. • Correcting writing errors, word duplications, and omission. This aimed at the mistakes of spelling in writing. The use of multiple words in the same meaning and also omitting unnecessary words.	• They are correct by themself. • Correcting the content and the form. The focus is on the organization of writing. • Correcting vocabulary, punctuation, and grammar. This relates to the use of the right vocabularies, punctuations mark, and present tense. • Correcting writing errors, word duplications, and omission. This aimed at the mistakes of spelling in writing. The use of multiple words in the same meaning and also omitting unnecessary words.	• Explaining the characteristics of descriptive text. • Asking the students to read and discuss a descriptive text.
4	As soon as you have planned, you directly execute writing with the techniques that you have learned then practice it. After writing the draft that you have done, do not forget to revise it. Finally, the writing process should be accomplished.	As soon as you have planned, you directly execute writing with the techniques that you have learned then practice it. After writing the draft that you have done, do not forget to revise it. Finally, the writing process should be accomplished.	• Assigning a topic • Asking the students to brainstorm ideas, make an outline, and write a rough draft to be submitted for feedback from classmates
5	Writing the final revision	Writing the final revision takes	Publishing the final

	takes some times, hence it should be done carefully. Re-editing is necessary proofreading is needed. Then you are ready to hand into your lecturer afterward.	some times, hence it should be done carefully. Re-editing is necessary proofreading is needed. Then you are ready to hand into your lecturer afterward.	result by showing the results of their work to classmates.
6	Administering the post-test	Administering the post-test	Administering the post-test

FINDINGS

Fulfillment of Assumptions of Normality and Homogeneity

The data should fulfill two assumptions – an assumption of normality and homogeneity. The students' pretest scores of the three groups were equated to find out how peer correction and self-correction affected the students' ability in writing.

Table 2. Normality of Pre-test and Post-test Score of Experiment Class A
(One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		76
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	6.86337853
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.112
	Positive	.087
	Negative	-.112
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.974
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.299

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

The criteria of normality test if the value of (probability value/critical value) is higher than or equal to the level significance alpha defined ($r > \alpha$), it means that data distribution is normal. Based on the calculation using SPSS 20 program (see Table 2), it could be concluded that data was normality distributed. It found that the value of the significance was 0.299, it means that the distribution of the data was normal because of the value of significance greater than 0.05.

Table 3. Normality of Pre-test and Post-test Score of Experiment Class B
(One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		66
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	7.08739977
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.163
	Positive	.163
	Negative	-.091
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.322
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.061

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

The criteria of normality test if the value of (probability value/critical value) is higher than or equal to the level significance alpha defined (r >α), it means that data distribution is normal. Based on the calculation using SPSS 20 program (see Table 3), it could be concluded that data was normality distributed. It found that the value of the significance was 0.061, it means that the distribution of the data was normal because of the value of significance greater than 0.05.

Table 4. Normality of Pre-test and Post-test Score of Control Class
(One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		70
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	0E-7
	Std. Deviation	8.09263142
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.105
	Positive	.105
	Negative	-.057
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.879
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.423

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

The criteria of normality test if the value of (probability value/critical value) is higher than or equal to the level significance alpha defined ($r > \alpha$), it means that data distribution is normal. Based on the calculation using SPSS 20 program (see Table 4), it could be concluded that data was normality distributed. It found that the value of the significance was 0.423, it means that the distribution of the data was normal because of the value of significance greater than 0.05.

Table 5. Homogeneity Test on Pre-test Score of Experiment and Control Class
(Test of Homogeneity of Variances)

Score			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.416	2	103	.661

Based on Table 5, it can be concluded the homogeneity test of mean was 0.661. Therefore the significance was higher than 0.05 (0.661 > 0.05). It means that the data in the pre-test experiment and control class were homogenous.

Table 6. Homogeneity Test on Post-test Score of Experiment and Control Class
(Test of Homogeneity of Variances)

SCORE			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.599	2	103	.551

Based on Table 6, it can be concluded the homogeneity test of mean was 0.551. Therefore the significance was higher than 0.05 (0.551 > 0.05). it means that the data in the pre-test experiment and control class were homogenous.

The Result of ANOVA of Experiment Class and Control Class

Table 7 shows that the F score from the result calculation was 1.893 with a significance score of 0.156. It has found H_o was accepted from the comparison between F_o ($F_{observation}$) and F_{table} was higher than F_o 1.893(1.893 > 0.05), which means the data were homogeneous.

Table 7. ANOVA on Pre-Test of Experiment and Control Class

SCORE					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	244.276	2	122.138	1.893	.156
Within Groups	6646.780	103	64.532		
Total	6891.057	105			

Based on Table 8, the F score from the result calculation was 36.689 with a significance score of 0.00. It means that there is a significant effect of the score by using peer correction and self-correction techniques.

Table 8. ANOVA on Post-Test of Experiment and Control Class

SCORE					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2758.868	2	1379.434	36.689	.000
Within Groups	3872.641	103	37.598		
Total	6631.509	105			

Testing Hypothesis

After the researcher knew that the data are normal and homogeneous, the data were analyzed by using ANOVA to know the significance of the treatment effect

Table 9. Standard Deviation and Standard Error of Experiment Class A and B

Group Statistics					
	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SCORE	POST TEST A	38	73.05	5.633	.914
	POST TEST B	33	73.58	6.230	1.085

Based on Table 9, it can be concluded that the total score of experiment class A of the mean (X_1) was 73.05, the standard deviation was 5.633 and the result of the standard error of mean calculation was 0.914 and the total score of experiment class B of the mean (X_2) was 73.58, standard deviation calculation was 6.230 and the result of the standard error of the mean was 1.085. It means that it has an interaction effect of the students in writing ability by using peer correction and self-correction.

To Interpret the result of ANOVA calculation using SPSS 20, it found that the F score from the result calculation was 36.689 with the significance score 0.00. F_{table} was higher than F_o 36.689 (36.689 > 0.05). So, there were differences in the score points between the experimental group and the control group.

DISCUSSION

It was analyzed the normality and homogeneity of the data. The purpose of analyzing the normality to see whether the data obtained in the research has been normally distributed or not. The purpose of the analysis of the homogeneity was to see the data was homogeneous or heterogeneous.

The analysis result of the normality test shows that in a pre-test, the experimental and control classes were normally distributed. The significance score in the pre-test of the experiment class A was (0.661>0.00), and experiment class B was (0.661>0.00) and post-test experiment class A, experiment class B, and also control class. It means that the data were normality distributed.

The analysis result of the homogeneity test shows that in a pre-test, the experimental class and control class was homogeneous. The significance was higher than 0.05 (0.661>0.05), and the post-test experiment class and control class was homogeneous in which the significance was higher than 0.05 (0.661< 0.05).

The analysis of the testing hypothesis shows that it was to answer the problem of this research whether there is significance between peer correction and self-correction in writing descriptive text. The result showed that the value of sig (two-tailed) was 0.713 > 0.05, so there were differences in the score points of the experimental group and control group. It proved the students in the experiment group taught using peer correction and self-correction writing descriptive text have higher scores than those in the control group taught using the traditional method.

Therefore, in the present research, the results show that the experiment class A has the mean score of 55.13 in pre-test before using peer correction technique; class B has the mean score of 58.86 in pre-test before using self-correction; and the control class has the mean score of 57.07 in pre-test was 57.07 that means the score is bad.

Besides, the mean score of the experiment class A in the posttest was 72.89 after being given treatment using peer correction; and the mean score of the experiment class B in the posttest was 73.34 after being given treatments using self-correction. However, the mean score of the control class in the posttest was 62.21 using the traditional method. In short, after being given treatment using peer and self-correction, the students improved their ability in writing descriptive text.

The results of the present research confirm the previous research conducted by Putri (2010) that peer correction and self-correction gave a significant effect on students' writing ability. It also confirms Ganji's (2009) research that the different methods of feedback have a significant effect on students in writing.

CONCLUSION

The present research shows that using peer and self-correction gave significant effects on the ability of the third-semester students of the English Education Department of IAIN Palangka Raya in writing descriptive text. The students' scores in writing the descriptive text of the experiment group taught using peer and self-correction were significantly improved. It proved the students' scores of the post-test are higher than those of the pre-test in the experiment group. The mean score between pre-test (55.13) and post-test (72.89) of the experiment class A using peer correction class indicates the increase of the students' scores after the treatments. Also, the mean score of pre-test (58.89) and post-test (73.34) of the experimental class B using self-correction class indicates the increase of the students' scores after the treatments. In short, the research question could be answered well, and it proved peer correction and self-correction successfully used. Therefore, it is recommended that the teaching strategy or technique of peer correction and self-correction can be as an alternative method for the English teachers in EFL writing class to improve students' ability in writing descriptive text. For future research, it can investigate the contribution of peer feedback and self-correction combined with ICT based media into writing development in the context of the Indonesian EFL classroom.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik.* Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). New York: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205.

Fahimi, Z., & Rahimi, A. (2015*).* On the impact of self-assessment practice on writing skill. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 730-736.

Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, peer-correction and self-correction: Their impacts on Iranian students' IELTS essay writing performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 6*(1), 117-139.

Hanrahan, S., & Isaacs, G. (2001). Assessing self- and peer assessment: The students' views. *Higher Education Research and Development, 20*(1), 53-70.

Jafaruddin. (2006). *Improving students' ability in writing recounts by using picture series in outlining*. Malang: Unpublished Thesis. State University of Malang.

Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal, 23*(2), 12-39.

Kubota, M. (2001). Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task. *System, 29*(4), 467-480.

Kusumaningtyas, D. N. (2005). *Improving the second-year students' skills in writing paragraphs through Segment-Chain activities at SMA Negeri Kunir.* Malang: Unpublished Thesis. State University of Malang.

Maftoon, P., Shirazi, M. A., & Daftarifard, P. (2011). The effect of recast vs. self correction on writing accuracy. *Brain: Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 2*(1), 17-28.

Miao, Y., Badger, R., & Zhen, Y. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*(3), 179-200.

Miftah, M. Z. (2015). Enhancing writing skill through writing process approach. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language (JEFL), 5*(1), 9-24.

Moussaoui, S. (2012). An investigation of the effects of peer evaluation in enhancing Algerian students' writing autonomy and positive affect. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69*, 1775-1784.

Nirwani, S. (2007). *Applying autonomous writing instruction model to improve the second-year students' writing skill of SMAN 7 Malang.* Malang: Unpublished Thesis. State University of Malang.

Pishghadam, R., & Kermanshahi, P. N. (2011). Peer correction among Iranian English language learners. *European Journal of Educational Studies, 3*(2), 217-227.

Putri, A. (2013). *The influence of peer correction in students' descriptive text writing at SMKN 2 Metro.* Unpublished Thesis. Lampung : Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Lampung.

Sultana, A. (2009). Peer correction in ESL classrooms. *RAC University Journal, 6*(1), 11-19.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, Y.-F. (2010). Students' reflection on online self-correction and peer review to improve writing. *Computers & Education, 55*(3), 1202-1210.