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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research is to find out whether there was a significant difference of students’ writing competence achievement before and after being taught using Peer Editing technique. The research was conducted at SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar from October up to November for eighth grade in Agama class. This technique helps the students critique and review the partner exercise. Peer Editing is divided into three procedures; they are Planning, The “Pitch” and Training, and Implementation. In Implementation is consist of Critique Period and Assessment Phase. After applying this strategy, the students’ score are above the KKM (Kriteria Kelulusan Minimal): 72. The result of this research based on the data collected from the students showed that the t_value in cycle 1 is 0.96 and in cycle 2 is 0.1 with the level of significance 5% and 1% are 2.069 and 2.110 from the d.b. is 23. The t_value in cycle 1 and cycle 2 are higher than t_table 2.069 > 0.96 < 2.110 and 2.069 > 0.1 < 2.110. It means that there is an improvement of students’ writing competence after being taught using Peer Editing technique. It also proved that Peer Editing technique was successfully helpful the students in critiquing and reviewing the text with their partner.
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INTRODUCTION

English is very important in recent year because it is a global language. Many countries in the world use English as the first language to communicate each other such as in business, industries, politics, education, social, culture, and many other professions. The English role is very important because it is used by many countries and also it has a long history. England has a power to make a colony everywhere.

In Indonesia, English is as a second language which is used by many people. Although as a second language, English in Indonesia has developed fastly in education. Beside it, English is used in administration, such as when we interact with foreigners or when we go to another country and it must use English to convey the message. English is also used by the Ambassador from other countries to communicate.

There are four language skills of teaching learning English which it should be mastered by the students, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. One of important skills is writing because when it is one of the way to convey the message to the other besides speaking. According to Terrible (in Harmer, 2001: 258) “Writing process is more complex than this of course, and the various stage of drafting, reviewing, redrafting and writing, etc. are done in a recursive way: we loop backwards and move forwards between this various stage.” So, it means that writing is important because it needs a carefulness to choose the word and arrange it to make a good sentence.
From the preliminary research in SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar, the researcher found some problems in 8A class, such as: (1) their vocabulary mastery was not enough; (2) their grammar was still messy; (3) they did not pay attention to the punctuation; (4) they often practiced writing in the school; (5) they did not have motivation in learning English.

According to Lehre (2012: 10), “Writing competence includes a set of different abilities which are necessary for composing good texts.” According to Krashen and Lee (2004: 10), “writing competence is when write something down on the page, it makes a representation of our thoughts, of cognitive structures.” While according to McLeod (in Pajares and Johnson, 1994: 315-316), “writing competence is as much an emotional as a cognitive activity, affective components strongly influence all phases of the writing process.”

Harmer (1998: 79) says that there are four reasons for teaching writing to students of English as a foreign language. First is reinforcement: some students acquire languages in a purely oral or aural way, but most of use benefit greatly from seeing the language written down. The visual demonstration of language contraction is invaluable for both our understanding of how it all fits together and as an aid to commit the new language to memory. Student often find it useful to write sentences using new language shortly after they have studied it. Second is language development: we can not be sure, but it seems that the actual process of writing (rather like the process of speaking) helps us to learn as we go along. The mental activity we have to go through in order to construct proper written texts is all part of the ongoing learning experience. Third is learning style: some students
are fantastically quick at picking up language just by looking and listening. For the rest of us, it may take of a little longer. For many learners, the time to think things through, to produce is language in a slower way, in invaluable. Writing is appropriate for such learners. It can also be quiet reflectively activity instead of the rush and brother of interpersonal face-to-face communication. Fourth is writing as skill: by far the most important reason for teaching writing, of course, is that it is a basic language skill, just as important as speaking, listening and reading student need to know how to write letters, how to put written report together, how to reply to advertisement – and increasingly, how to write using electronic media. They need to know some of writing’s special conventions (punctuation, paragraph construction etc).

According to Lee-Ann Kastmant (2004: 9-10, 149), Peer editing, also referred to as a peer review requires that we distinguish it from other group related activities, for peer review is frequently lumped together with a variety of activities to illustrate the broader appeal of collaborative learning. Peer review is an exercise in which students review each other’s written work. Peer review is often connected to revision—a part of the writing process in which writers refine and make substantive changes to their written work.” According to Liu and Hansen (2002: 40), “Peer Editing refers to the use of learners as sources of information, and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken on by a formally trained teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other’s drafts in both written and oral formats.
in the process of writing.” According to Hill (2011: 671-700), “Peer Editing is form of collaborative learning which students review and critique each other’s work.”

There are some steps of Peer Editing as follows:

1. Planning

   To properly use Peer Editing, teacher must set aside sufficient time for planning the course, its objectives, and the appropriate placement of a Peer Editing assignment.

2. The “Pitch” and Training

   The right “pitch” by the teacher and training for students makes all the difference in the exercise’s success. The ideal pitch explains the exercise and allays law students’ anxieties and competitive natures that can otherwise detract from students’ willingness to share work with classmates. To minimize any resistance, teacher must be methodical in deciding how they will introduce the peer-editing exercise. Also, teachers must provide their students with sufficient training so students have confidence in their ability to complete the assignment.

3. Implementation

   At the start of class, professors should remind students how the exercise will be structured and distribute the checklist or critique form to the class. In-class Peer-Editing exercises have two phases, as follows:

   a) Critique Period

   First, after brief assignment reminders, students read, review and critique their peers’ work and complete the checklist.
b) Assessment Phase

Second, students participate in a debriefing session with their partners or groups and then another session with the entire class.

(Hill, 2011: 687-699)

Based on the reasons above, the researcher decided to conduct a research entitled IMPROVING STUDENTS’ WRITING COMPETENCE ON DESCRIPTIVE TEXT BY USING PEER EDITING (A Classroom Action Research at the Eight Graders of SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar in 2015/2016 Academic Year).

METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The type of this research was classroom action research (CAR). The research was conducted in 2 cycles involved 6 meetings. According to Somekh (2006: 7), “Action Research is conducted by a collaborative partnership of participants and researchers, whose roles and relationships are sufficiently fluid to maximize mutual support and sufficiently differentiated to allow individuals to make appropriate contributions given existing constraints. According to Cohen and Manion (in Cohen, 2000: 226), “Action Research is a small-scale intervention in the functioning the real world and a close examination of the effects of such an intervention”. Zuber-Skerritt (in Cohen, 2000:228) states that “Action Research is critical (and self-critical) collaborative inquiry by reflective practitioners being accountable and making results of their inquiry public self-evaluate their practice
and engaged in participatory problem-solving and continuing professional development”.

Figure 1. Cyclical Classroom Action Research Model based on Stephen Kemmis and Taggart (in Burns, 2010: 9).

There are five procedures of action research, as follows:

1. Identifying Problems and Planning

   The researcher identified the problem before planning the action. The problem referred to students’ low speaking skill. It was known after the researcher interviewed with the teacher and did observation in the teaching learning process.

2. Implementing The Action

   In general, implementing the action in teaching learning process, the researcher had some steps as follow: giving pre-test, review the last lesson, teaching writing competence using Peer Editing technique, and giving post-test.
3. Observing

Observation is one of technique which is used in collecting the data. This phase involved in observing systematically the effects of the action and documenting the context, actions and opinions of those involved. The researcher observed all the activities in teaching learning process while her collaborative observer helped to observe the teaching learning process conducted in the class.

4. Reflecting

In conducting the evaluation process, the researcher gave pre-test before starting the action and at the end of cycle one, students were given post-test. The test was in the form of written test. In this test, the students answered the following questions writtenly in order to know how well their vocabulary, grammar, content, organization, and mechanic. After giving the test, the researcher analyzed the result of the test to know the students’ speaking proficiency. Then, the researcher had made an analysis based on the result of the test had been done by the students and her observation during the action carried out to make a reflection about what she had being done so far. It was also claimed to find the weaknesses of the activities that had been done.

5. Revising the Plan

Based on the weaknesses and the strengths of the activities had carried out in improving students’ writing competence in descriptive text
by using Peer Editing Technique, the researcher had revised the plan for the next cycle.

{Kemmis and Taggart (in Burns, 2010: 8)}

In this research, the students were given the test to measure their ability. The tests gave in three ways, they are: pre-test, post-test 1, and post-test 2. The pre-test conducted before the action. Pre-test was administered in order to find out the students’ writing competence before the actions, and post-test was administered in order to find out the increase of the treatments towards the students’ writing competence after being given the treatments. Pre-test and post-test were used to get the data to analyze the hypothesis.

Before the researcher did the action, she did an interview with the student and the English teacher about English lesson especially in writing. This activity was done to know about the students’ difficulties during the writing English lesson and their achievement. According to Hopkin (1993: 124), “interviewing in classroom research can take four form: it can occur between teacher and pupil, observer and pupil, pupil and pupil, and occasionally teacher and observer.”

After had an interview, the researcher observed all the students during teaching learning process. She also observed the teacher during teaching process. The result of the observation was as an important note to know the appropriate method and strategy that was used to be applied and what kinds of efforts that should be done to increase students’ desire especially in reading comprehension.
According to Marshal (1995) in Sugiyono (2009: 226) through observation, the researcher learns about behavior and the meaning attached to those behaviors.

After finishing the research, the researcher collects and analyzes the data. Erikson and Davis (in Burns 1999: 152) state that data analysis is the point where statements or assertions about what the research shows are produced. In this research, the researcher used two kinds of techniques. They are qualitative and quantitative data.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. RESULT OF THE RESEARCH

From the result of interview and observation, the researcher concluded that the students’ reading problems were lack in vocabulary and grammar. Another problem, they got difficulty in mechanic, grammar, and also organization. Besides from the technical difficulty in writing competence, the students also have their own psychological problem, that they did not have motivation in learning English. Considering that English is difficult lesson to be learnt is one of factor caused they were not have an interest in learning English.

From the collected data, the researcher analyzed the students’ writing competence score. The pre-test was conducted on October 22nd, 2015. The type of pre-test was individual test. The mean score of pre-test was 53.6. This score is lower than the KKM that is 72. Then, the researcher applied the QAR strategy to solve the problems faced by the students in two meetings. After that, the researcher gave
them post-test 1. The result of post-test 1 showed good improvement of students’ mean score. It could be seen from the result of the pre-test and post-test 1. The researcher compared the result of pre-test and post-test. The mean score of pre-test was 53.6 and the post-test was 71.3. The students’ achievement and students’ motivation was also increased. The students seemed more understood about the material. They did the task and assignment seriously although the class was little noisy.

Although the students’ score was still under the KKM, but Peer Editing technique made changes for the students. In cycle 1, the researcher found some strength and the weaknesses during the lesson. She found that the students’ understanding about the writing material was increase but it was not optimal yet. So, the researcher decided to conduct the next cycle to reach the goal of the research. For the next cycle, the researcher was revising the plan. In the cycle two, the researcher planned two meetings as the first cycle. To anticipate the boredom, the researcher tried to change the step in the main activity. In cycle 1, the students work individually. In cycle 2, the researcher asked the students work in pairs. Each pairs would get the same text, but different from the previous meeting.

The result of post-test 2 showed a significant improvement in students’ score. The students’ mean score in cycle 2 was 78.3. The students’ mean score in cycle 2 achieved the KKM score that is 72. The students were so enjoy and enthusiastic in joining the class. They were more confident to deliver their ideas or opinions to answer the questions. They were also active working in pair and discussed the material.
B. DISCUSSION

The researcher discussed about the research finding of the research concerning the students’ responses toward the teaching learning writing of descriptive text using Peer Editing technique and the problems occured by the researcher during the research.

This research showed that students’ achievement could improve significantly. Their score increased significantly after this technique had been applied. The class was more fun, they were more active and they were not afraid to ask the researcher when they could understand the text easier after they used Peer Editing technique. In Post Test I (71.3) had significantly improved from Pre-Test (53.6) or had increased by 18 points or about 1.8 %. While the Mean of Post-Test II (78.3) had increased from Post-Test I (71.3) or by 7 points or about 0.7 %. Based on the analysis using t-test, the result between pre-test and post-test 1 was 0.96. It was consulted in the t-table and the result was that $t_0 > t_1$ in significance 5 % ($0.96 > 2.110$). It meant that there was significance improvement which was described before in the teaching and learning of writing competence using Peer Editing technique. Then the result of analysis using t-test between post-test 1 and post-test 2 was 0.1. It could be concluded that $t_0 > t_1$ in significance level 5 % ($0.1 > 2.110$). It meant that there were significance from learning of reading using Peer Editing technique in post-test 1 and post-test 2. The analysis showed the improvement of the students’ score. Peer Editing technique was suitable for teaching and learning writing and at last the researcher found in the research. The improvement can be seen from the result of students’ pre-test and post-test which was done in every
cycle. It could be summarized that there was significant improvement of the students’ skill in writing descriptive text step by step based on the stage of Peer Editing technique.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research, the researcher could draw the conclusion considering the improving students’ writing competence using Peer Editing technique at 8A of SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar in 2015/2016 Academic Years.

The improvements of students’ writing was shown by the increase of students’ mean score through pre-test, post-test 1 and post-test 2. The score of pre-test was 53.6 while the score of post-test was 71.3 in cycle 1, and the score of post-test was 78.3 in cycle 2. The students’ writing competence increased in all aspects; meanwhile the KKM (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal) was 72, so Peer Editing technique could improve the writing competence at 8A of SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar.

The atmosphere of teaching learning English was different. The students became active in classroom, enthusiastic, excited and motivated during teaching learning process. The students gave more attention to the lesson and they were attracted to do the exercise during teaching learning process. The students more focused on the lesson during the activity in teaching learning process. The activities of Peer Editing technique attracted the students’ motivation and interested to the
students. The researcher found that that Peer Editing technique made the class becomes conducive.

After the researcher analyzed the data, she concluded that Peer Editing technique could improve the writing competence at 8A of SMP Penda (Pendidikan Daerah) Mojogedang Karanganyar in 2015/2016 Academic Years.


