



Using Self-Correction and Peer-Correction Techniques to Improve Students' Writing Skills: A Comparative Study

June 2022 – Volume 8, Number 1

<https://doi.org/10.24014/ijelt.v8i1.18494>

Ade Yanti

adeyanti9511@gmail.com

Universitas Islam Negeri Syekh Ali Hasan Ahmad Addary Padangsidempuan

Abdul Hadi

abdul.hadi@uin-suska.ac.id

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau

Dodi Settiawan

dodi.settiawan@uin-suska.ac.id

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau

Abstract

This research aimed to examine and compare the effects of using self-correction and peer-correction techniques on improvement of students' writing skills at Language Development Centre of a state Islamic university in Sumatera. The data were gathered using pre-test, post-test, writing assessment sheet and guidance sheet of self and peer correction techniques. This quantitative research was carried out by using an experimental method. The population consisted of 34 classes, and the samples were taken through cluster random sampling. As a result, 3 classes, consisting of 77 second-semester students, were selected. The research hypotheses were tested by using the Wilcoxon and Mann-Whitney tests. The results showed that, first, there was a significant difference in the students' writing skills before and after using the self-correction technique. Second, there was a significant difference in students' writing skills before and after using the peer-correction technique. Third, there was a significant difference in writing skills between the students who were taught using the self-correction technique and those who were taught using the peer-correction technique. The results also showed that the peer-correction technique had a more significant effect size on the scores for the students' writing skills.

Keywords: *self-correction technique, peer-correction technique, students' writing skill*

Introduction

In the area of English language teaching and learning, writing is categorized as one of the productive skills. By writing, a writer produces a text. At university level, for example, students are taught how to write sentences or texts in English. Students are taught step by step, wherein every stage of writing has its own purpose. Through these steps, the students are trained to be able to conduct a good composition.

According to Nadler as cited in Laksmi (2020), writing is the use of appropriate letters and symbols according to the standard usage of a given language. But writing a good composition sometimes has always been a big problem for some students, especially for those who study English at a Language Development Centre. This is because they tend to have low ability in basic skills of writing due to inaccuracy in vowel-consonant letters, incorrect punctuation, misspelling, lack of vocabulary mastery, and lack of grammar mastery. The information above was derived from a free interview with lecturers at the first author's language development center and a comparison of the students' writing results after learning English for about 3 months and doing examinations twice. Furthermore, it was also found that the lecturers at the language development center did not have enough time to give feedback on students' errors all the time carefully.

Many techniques can help students to sort out difficulties in their writing, especially in responding to their errors or in the feedback step. The techniques that can be used in this step are outlining, analyzing, modelling, written comments, talking about the paper, checklist, self-correction technique, and peer-correction technique (Raimes, 1983).

Nowadays, most of the language teaching and learning process in every institution applies a communicative approach, in which the activities of teaching are focused on student centered learning. In the communicative approach, learners' independence should be encouraged in learning and the teacher acts as the facilitator of learning. Hence, the appropriate techniques that the researcher will use in this research to overcome students writing difficulties are self-correction technique and peer-correction technique. The teacher need not check the students writing entirely. Students do and check their writing independently.

Research about self-correction technique and peer-correction technique showed that both techniques make good progress in reducing errors and increasing students' writing quality. Research by Cahyono and Amrina showed that the students who were given peer feedback and self-correction techniques had a better ability to write essays than those who were not given peer feedback and self-correction techniques (Cahyono & Amrina 2016). Another research by Ramirez and Gullen (2018) in their study "self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills," found that both strategies benefited students' writing skills and self-awareness, which resulted in the development of critical self-assessment of their writing and responsibility for their own learning, among other outcomes.

Several types of research are carried out, such as the self-correction technique and peer-correction technique, to increase students' writing skills. Some studies take the techniques individually, and some others also take them in an integrated way. The studies employ

both qualitative and quantitative approaches. The results showed that both techniques, the self-correction technique and peer-correction technique, have a good effect in increasing or overcoming students' writing difficulties. But most of the studies above were carried out with EFL students who chose English as their major and had an interest in it. In contrast, there is minimal research about these techniques that are implemented in the context of learning English at a Language Development Centre. Through this overview, this research can add variation and fill the gap that previous research has not achieved yet in order to answer the following research questions: (1) Is there any significant difference in students' writing skills before and after using self-correction technique? (2) Is there any significant difference in students' writing skills before and after using peer-correction technique? and (3) is there any significant difference in writing skills between students who used self-correction technique and those who used peer-correction technique?

Self-Correction

According to Nation (2008), self-correction is a technique where the learners should correct their mistakes themselves by checking their work carefully. Andrade and Du (2007), explain that self-correction technique is a process in which students reflect on and evaluate the quality of their work and their learning, know explicitly stated goals or criteria, assess their work for strengths and faults, and update it. It means self-correction technique enhances students' knowledge of their work based on the self-correction technique guidance sheet. Furthermore, Harmer (2004) states that correction is a fascinating process in the teacher-student relationship in the classroom.

In addition, Maftoon and Shirazi (2010) argue the self-correction technique is an indirect feedback in which the teacher provides students with options so that they can determine the correct form on their own. In addition, the self-correction technique consists of two basic activities: (1) monitoring and evaluating the quality of their thoughts and behavior during learning, and (2) identifying ways to enhance their understanding and abilities (Mcmillan & Hearn, 2008).

The Advantages and Disadvantages of Self-Correction Technique

For self-involvement, students need to learn independently and solve the problems by themselves. Therefore, in writing cases, students have to know the importance of doing self-correction technique. According to Spiller (2012), there are 4 advantages of self-correction technique, namely:

1. encourages students' involvement and increases independence and responsibility
2. encourages students to reflect on their role and contribution to the process of writing.
3. emphasizes the development of students' decision-making abilities
4. get involved in the process and are encouraged to take part ownership of this process).

Some studies state that self-correction technique is not ideal for some reasons to enhance students' results in writing. According to Andrade and Du (2005), self-c-correction technique has some disadvantages. They are:

1. Additional briefing time can increase a teacher's workload.
2. The validity and reliability are low.
3. Students feel ill-equipped to undertake the Self-Correction technique.
4. Students may be reluctant to make judgments regarding their own work.

The Procedures of Self-Correction Technique

Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) mention some steps of self-correction technique as follow:

1. Teacher gives instruction to each student to read their writing individually.
2. Teacher asks students observe their own writing.
3. After observing, teacher asks students to check their writing, students began to aware about something weird about writing their.
4. Teacher gave encouragement and asks students to check whether there was any mistake in their writing,
5. Teacher asks students corrected their mistakes.
6. The teacher re-checked the correction made by the students.

Peer-Correction Technique

Peer-correction technique is a technique in which learners receive feedback on their writing from each other. It can be done in pairs or in a small group (Nation, 2008). While according to Cahyono and Amrina (2016), feedback given by fellow students is called peer feedback. Peer-correction technique, according to Jacobs as cited in Adi (2017), is a type of instructional activity in which students collaborate in a group setting. As a result, peer work helps individuals prepare to write without the benefit of their peers to fix their mistakes. It can be stated that peer-correction technique is a strategy that allows students to work in groups of two. Peer-correction technique is a technique where the students correct their drafts in pairs. Each pair will check the draft and correct the mistakes based on what they have known.

The Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer-Correction Technique

Peer correction is a language-learning technique that allows pupils extra opportunities to learn about their mistakes and to improve their writing. There are several reasons why peer-correction technique is useful in improving students' writing ability. First, according to Jacobs et al (1981), learners preferred peer feedback for they thought that peers could provide more ideas and locate problems they had missed. Second, Martilova (2013) found that when students are treated with peer-correction technique, their accuracy in writing descriptive paragraphs improves. Third, peer-correction technique can help students to give and get criticism on their writing from their classmates as part of this corrective strategy. It can be used in the classroom to help students improve their performance autonomy, cooperation, interaction, and involvement (Sultana, 2009). Fourth, through peer-correction technique, students are involved in the process of correction as much as possible because in this way they can learn from each other and gain more autonomy. Fifth, according to Vygotsky as cited in Ganji (1998), peer-correction technique emphasizes on the social origin of language and thought. He believed that "communicative collaboration with adults and peers contributes to the development of self-regulation, which is the capacity for independence. Sixth, peer-correction technique is chosen as a part of a large category of learning activities requiring students to work together in a group. Peers have contributed in terms of preparing themselves to write without the help of the instructor during the process of their writing. Moreover, since they work in pairs, they learn to face risks in completing the writing assignment (Jacobs, 1989). Seventh, peer correction also provides a significantly positive influence on students' idea construction in

writing that can increase their writing competency (Harmer, 2004). Eight, peer-correction technique also provides the pair an opportunity to learn within a supportive community in order to feel safe enough to take risks. Ninth, some of the most important benefits of implementing peer-correction in the classroom are that the learning responsibility is shared with learners which shows them that their opinion is valued; and for the teacher, it saves time and effort for many EFL instructors (Miao, Badger, & Zhen, 2006). The last, peer-correction technique involves learners receiving feedback on their otherwriting from ea. It can be done in pairs or in a small group (Nation, 2008).

Aside from the benefits of adopting peer-correction technique in writing instruction. When a teacher employs this technique, there are several difficulties. The followings are some of the drawbacks of peer correction (Sultana, 2009):

- 1) Some students may be hesitant to address their classmates' mistakes because doing so would risk their friendship
- 2) If the learner lacks correcting skills, it may be slower and less effective
- 3) There is a chance you'll make a mistake (Martilova, 2013)

The Procedures of Peer-Correction Technique

Some authors such as Kamimura and Zeng (2006), as cited in Sultana (2009), have shown that peer feedback offers many ways to improve learners' writing. This method consists of some procedures in which learners give and receive feedback about their writing from their peers.

Technically, there are some steps of doing peer-correction;

1. Teacher asks students to select the topic
2. Teacher introduces preparation of writing
3. Teacher provides the checklist guideline
4. Teacher divides the students into pairs or small group
5. Teacher ask students to exchange their first draft with their partner
6. Teacher asks students read and assess their friend's writing based on the guideline (Raimes,1983).

Writing skills

Writing is a talent in which we communicate our ideas, feelings, and thoughts in words arrangements, sentences, and paragraphs utilizing some of our bodily components (Raimes, 1983). Writing is necessary for students. Writing has numerous benefits because it allows a person to express his or her personality, foster communication, build thinking skills, make logical and persuasive arguments, allow a person to later reflect on and re-evaluate his or her ideas, provide and receive criticism and prepare for school and employment. (Chappell, 2011).

Writing skill is one of productive skills in language teaching. There are many definitions of writing offered by experts. Theoretically writing skill requires the students to be able to express their ideas, feelings and thoughts which are arranged in words, sentences and text using eyes, brain and hand (Raimes, 1983).

Writing Recount Text

Recount text is considered as one of the common kinds of text that we can find in everyday life. The purpose of recount text is to reconstruct past experiences by retelling events in original sequence (Hyland, 2003). The main goal of this text is to retell an event that happened in the past. Hyland also stated that social purpose recounts “tell what happened.” which document a series of events and evaluate their significance in some way. Then, the purpose of the literary recount is to relate a sequence of events so that it entertains, and this generally includes the writer’s expressions of attitude about the events.

Recount text is typically told to entertain by dealing with a sequence of events that establishes a relationship between a writer/reader and speaker/listener (Hyland 2003). Recount is a kind of genre that has a social function to retell event for the purpose of informing or entertaining. The tense that is used in recount text is past tense. Social purpose of recount text is to reconstruct past experiences by retelling events in original sequence.

Generic Structure of Recount Text

In writing based on genre, the writer needs to concern to the generic structure of the text genre to create a good composition. Recount text as one kind of text genre also has generic structure. Cavanagh as cited in Sari (2018) lists the following structure of recount texts:

- a. Orientation: The first stage tells us about who, what, where, and when, to help the reader place the events in time and place.
- b. Sequence of events: This is the retelling of the events in sequence, which is organised in time. Personal Comments: These are found interspersed throughout literary recounts and may reflect evaluations.
- c. Reorientation: This is only used in literary recounts to “round off” the sequence of events

How to Write a Good Recount Text

Writing a good recount text means requires attention to its language features. According to Lee (2017), these are features of writing a good recount text:

- a. Begins with an orientation, establishing who was involved, where, and when the events happened
- b. Sequences the past events in a clear order
- c. Ends appropriately – e.g., with a feeling, a thought, or a comment
- d. Uses the past tense accurately
- e. Uses time words appropriately
- f. Uses a range of appropriate words to describe the events

Writing Assessment

Writing assessment commonly done by teachers, but students also have responsibility in assessing their learning by participating actively in the assessment process, e.g., engaging in peer and/or self-assessment (Lee, 2012).

In order to assess students writing, a teacher needs to provide an appropriate scoring system to measure the quality of students writing. These are some scoring systems and the rubric of how to assess students’ writing in common.

In this research, an appropriate rubric assessment was used in order to fulfill the criteria of scoring students' writing. This rubric is a combination of writing indicators stated in Hughes (2003) and in Lee (2017). Writing indicators from Hughes seems appropriate in measuring students' writing in academic or in general context. While, writing indicators by Lee is more related and specific to measure students' writing of recount text especially in writing personal experience. *Content and Structure* in Lee has represented writing indicators *Content and Organization* in Hughes, *Language features* in Lee is represented by *Grammar and Vocabulary* in Hughes. While the discussion about basic writing skills such as spelling, punctuation and capitalization or *Mechanic* are not stated in Lee's indicators but stated in Hughes. These indicators are also important on steps to create a good composition. Moreover, the problem that was found in this study about student's lack of mastery of basic writing skill include punctuation, spelling, and capitalization. Therefore, to apply an appropriate instrument for assessing students' writing skill in this study, researcher created a new rubric adapted from writing indicators from Lee, *Content and Structure* and *Language features* complete with *Mechanics* from Hughes.

Table 1. Indicators for assessing students' writing skill

Recount Evaluation	– Score	Criteria	Remarks
<i>Content and structure mastery</i>	4	A very clear orientation, establishing who was involved, where, and when the events happened	
	3	A generally clear orientation which provides necessary background information	
	2	Some missing information in the orientation	
	1	Lots of missing information in the orientation	
	4	Past events are sequenced in a very clear order	
	3	Past events are generally clearly sequenced	
	2	Some events not in the right order	
	1	Past events are all over the place; hard to figure out a clear sequence	
	4	Very appropriate and impressive ending – ending with a feeling, a thought, or a reflection	
	3	Appropriate ending	
	2	An ending is provided, but it is not very appropriate	
	1	No ending is provided	
	<i>Language Features mastery</i>	4	Past tense verbs almost completely accurate
3		Tense generally accurate	
2		Quite a number of tense errors	
1		Full of tense errors	
4		Very appropriate and accurate use of time expressions to link up events	
3		Generally good use of time expressions to link up events	
2		Some time expressions to link up events	
1		No time expressions to link up events	
4	A large range of appropriate words to describe events		

Mechanic mastery	3	A good range of words to describe events
	2	Some good words to describe event
	1	An extremely limited range of words to describe events
	4	All punctuations, spelling, and capitalizations are used correctly.
	3	75% punctuations, spelling, and capitalizations are used correctly.
	2	50% punctuations, spelling, and capitalizations are used correctly.
	1	25% punctuations, spelling, and capitalizations are used correctly
Maximal score		4 x 7 = 28

Methodology

The study employed quantitative experimental research design with the purpose of examining the differences on students' writing skills after using self-correction technique and peer-correction technique at the Language Development Centre of a state Islamic university in Sumatera.

The population of this research consists of all of the students at the Language development center of the state Islamic university in the 2021/2022 academic year. The total number of students is 939 students and three classes were chosen by using purposive sampling. They are FTIK 2 where the treatment of peer-correction technique was used and FTIK 3 where the treatment of self-correction technique was used and FTIK 4 as the control class.

The instruments of this research were (1) *tests* to measure students writing skill before and after the treatments, (2) *writing indicators sheet* to measure students' writing results, and (3) *guideline sheets* to help the students use both techniques. The data for students' writing skill before the use of self and peer correction techniques were collected by doing pre-tests. The students of FTIK 3, FTIK 2 and FTIK 4 were asked to write a story of their past experiences. Next, students in FTIK 3 and FTIK 2 classes were given treatments. Students in FTIK 3 were given self-correction technique and those in FTIK 2 were given peer-correction technique. After completing the treatments for students in both classes, post-test was administered to students in FTIK 3, FTIK 2 and FTIK 4. They were asked to write a story of their past experiences that is different from the one they wrote in the pre-test. Next, to test the hypothesis the researcher used non parametric test: Wilcoxon Test and Mann Whitney Test because of the data distribution was not normal.

Results and Discussion

Results

1. The effect of self-correction technique on students' writing skill

The results of the data analysis showed that there was a significant difference in students' writing skills before and after employing the self-correction technique.

Table 2. Significance score of Wilcoxon test (X1)

Post-Test Experimental 1 - Pre-Test Experimental 1	
Z	-4.350 ^b
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001

From Table 2, it can be seen that the output of the Wilcoxon test shows that the significance score was <0.001. By comparing the degrees of significance, if probability is > 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected because the significance was $0.001 < 0.05$. This means that there was a significant difference in students' writing skills before and after using the self-correction technique.

2. The effect of peer-correction technique on students' writing skill

The results of the data analysis showed that there was a significant effect of implementing the peer-correction technique on the students' writing skill.

Table 3. Significance score of Wilcoxon test (X2)

Post-Test Experimental 2 - Pre-Test Experimental 2	
Z	-4.330 ^b
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	<,001

As can be seen in Table 3, the output of the Wilcoxon test shows that the significance score was <0.001. By comparing the numbers of significance, if the probability is > 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected because the significance was $0.001 < 0.05$. This means that there was a significant difference in students' writing skills before and after using the peer-correction technique.

2. The students were taught to write recount texts by using self-correction and peer-correction techniques. The result of data analysis showed that there was a significant difference in writing skill between students who used self-correction technique and students who used peer-correction technique. The results also showed that the use of peer-correction has a more significant effect than the use of self-correction on students' writing skills. The results of post-tests for experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 were analyzed by the Mann Whitney Test and are presented in the following table.

Tables 4 and 5. The Analysis of Mann Whitney test on the Post-test score X1 & X2

Test Statistics ^a	
	Students' Writing Skills
Mann-Whitney U	200.000
Wilcoxon W	551.000
Z	-2.556
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.011

a. Grouping Variable: CLASS

Ranks				
CLASS		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Students' Writing	Post-Test Experimental 1	26	21.19	551.00

Skills	Post-Test Experimental 2	26	31.81	827.00
	Total	52		

From the tables above, the output of the Mann Whitney test showed that the significance score was 0.011. If the score of significance is less than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis (H_a) is accepted; if the score of significance is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. The significance was $0.011 < 0.05$. Thus, H_a is accepted while H_0 is rejected. There is a significant difference in students' writing skill between students who used self-correction technique and students who used peer-correction technique.

The table also showed that the mean rank of post-test of experimental 2 was higher than the mean rank of post-test of experimental 1 ($31.81 > 21.19$). It can be concluded that the use of peer-correction technique has a more significant effect than the use of self-correction technique on students' writing skill.

The descriptive data of the pre-test score and post-test score of the experimental groups 1 and 2 and the control group are presented in the following table, which was obtained from the output of SPSS 25.

Table 6. The Result of the Gained Score

Group	Pre-test	Post-Test	Gained score
Experimental 1	21.92	23.73	1.81
Experimental 2	23.27	25.19	1.92
Control Group	19.8	20.72	0.92

Based on the pre-test and post-test scores administered to the experimental classes, it can be seen that there is significant improvement in students' writing skill after doing the treatment. The mean score of pre-test administered to experimental group 1 is 21.92 and the mean score of the post-test is 23.73, with a gained score of 1.81. It shows that the students' skill to write recount text after using self-correction technique significantly improved. The mean score of pre-test administered to experimental group 2 is 23.27 and the mean score of the post-test is 25.9, with a gained score of 1.92. It shows that the students' skill to write recount text after using peer-correction significantly improved. The mean score of the pre-test administered to the control group is 19.80 and the mean score of the post-test is 20.72, with a gained score of 0.92. It shows that the students' skill to write recount text after being taught using conventional teaching also improved, but not as significantly as the students' writing skill in experimental group 1 and 2. The mean scores of the post-test in experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 also show that students' writing skills were categorized into the excellent category. However, the mean score of the post-test in the control group showed that students' writing skills were categorized into the pretty good category. In conclusion, students in both of the experimental groups have significant improvement after using their respective correction techniques in five meetings. However, the

improvement of writing skills for students who used peer-correction technique is higher than that for students who used self-correction technique ($1.92 > 1.81$).

Discussion

This section presents a discussion of the results of this study. Discussion of the results is presented with reference to relevant theories and previous studies about using self-correction and peer-correction techniques to improve students' writing skill. It is expected to offer some new insights about how to improve students' writing skill.

First, the result of this study shows that implementing self-correction technique could improve students' ability in writing recount texts in English. Comparing the pre-test and post-test scores, it was proved by the the result that there was improvement of score in students' writing skill. This result is related to a study conducted by Adi, Sutarsyah, and Nurweni (2017) entitled "the use of self-correction technique in teaching recount text writing". This study shows that students conducted good correction in writing their recount text by using self-correction technique. It means that by employing self-correction technique, students can reduce their writing errors and at the same time also increases their writing quality. In other words, self-correction technique also encourages students to be able to identify specific problems with their written work and motivated them to revise their work until they are able to produce better quality work.

Second, peer-correction technique could improve students' writing skill. Comparing the pre-test and post-test scores, it can be concluded that there is improvement of students' writing skill. This is similar to a study by Ganji (2009) that found peer-correction technique as more effective than the traditional teacher-correction, and that peer-correction technique was found to be the best method of giving feedback.

By comparing the scores post-tests administered to experimental classes and control class, it can be concluded that both techniques have improvement effect up to 2 times higher than the improvement effect in control class ($1.92/1.81 > 0.92$). This is in line with other studies such as Cahyono and Amrina (2016), which also showed that students learning to write by using peer-feedback and self-correction techniques were better in increasing their score of writing essay than those learning to write without using peer-feedback and self-correction. Another study from Ganji (2009) also supports this result in which students learning to write by using both self-correction and peer-correction techniques were much better than those with traditional teacher-correction.

Previous researchers investigating the effect of these techniques on students' writing stated similar result that both self-correction and peer-correction techniques give significant effects on improvement of students' writing ability. In practicing both techniques, the researcher provides the instruments and guidelines that were needed to do correction or to find the mistake in students' paper by error coding or other techniques that indicate students' errors without spending much time to find the mistakes in detail. It would not be far different from conventional way that the teacher corrected the students' paper thoroughly and carefully as mentioned in chapter 1. On one hand, these techniques increase students' writing performance, but on the other hand, at once they also come up with a new problem on spending much time to do both techniques.

Furthermore, some previous researchers generalize the writing assessment adapted from Hughes (2003) (*Content, Organization, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Mechanics*) in measuring students' writing result on purpose of writing certain genre of text such as descriptive, recount, and narrative texts.

In this study, the researcher provides guidelines in practicing both techniques of self-correction and peer-correction by adapting writing assessment rubrics from Hughes (2003) and Lee (2017) (see Chapter 2), which was recreated and combined into a new form of rubric that is more relatable in assessing students' writing of recount text. Furthermore, the content of the guidelines refers to the students' ability in writing recount texts provided with a place to put the error findings based on items of the assessment category. As stated by Lee (2017), rather than to focus on what students fail to do, it was better to concern on what students "can do". But to support this, students need to have a deep comprehension of what they are going to write (e.g.: writing recount text).

Third, referring to result of this study, it shows that implementing peer-correction technique is more effective than self-correction technique. This result is also related to previous research that has similar result that peer-correction has more significant effect than self-correction (Laksmi, 2020). The result implies the necessity to apply the peer-correction technique than self-correction technique when teaching Junior High School students to write English texts. However, both techniques can be used in teaching in all level of students. But the researcher prefers using the phrase "has more significant effect" to "is more effective" in comparing both techniques. Both techniques were proved to have the potential to increase students' writing ability. Teachers play important role in choosing the best techniques that meet students' needs. Self-correction technique is suitable for students to enhance their internal motivation or to enhance their writing awareness. Peer-correction technique is suitable for students with low internal motivation. Thus, collaborating with their friends can increase their motivation.

Conclusion

Several conclusions can be drawn results of this study and the discussion presented above. First, self-correction technique significantly improves the students' writing skills. In addition to other techniques that have been proved to increase the students' writing skills, self-correction can be one of the solutions.

Second, peer-correction technique also significantly improves students' writing skills. It can be concluded that self-correction can be one of the solutions besides other techniques that have been proved to increase students' writing skills. Third, after comparing the results, it shows that there is a significant difference in writing skills between the students who learned to write by using self-correction technique and those who learned to write by using the peer-correction technique. It is proven that the students who used the peer-correction technique had a higher gained score in the post-test than students who used the

self-correction technique in learning to write recount texts. Both techniques can be implemented in the classroom to assess results of the students' writing based on their needs.

References

- Adi, Y. P., Sutarsyah, C., & Nurweni, A. (2017). The Use of Self-Correction in Teaching Recount Text Writing. *U-JET*, 6(1).
- Andrade, H. and Du, Y. (2005). Student perspectives on rubric-referenced assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, Volume 10 Number 3.
- Andrade, H, & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria referenced self-assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 32(2), 159-181.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of second language writing*.
- Cahyono, B.Y., & Amrina, R. (2016). Peer feedback, Self-Correction technique, and writing proficiency of Indonesian EFL students. *Arab world English journal* vol. 7 no. 1 March 2016.
- Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, Peer-Correction technique and Self-Correction technique: their impacts on Iranian students' IELTS essay writing performance. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(1).
- Gay, L., R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application sixth edition*. New jersey: Prentice Hall inc.
- Harmer, J. 2004. *How to teach writing*. Harlow: pearson education ltd.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press : Cambridge Language Education.
- Hughes, A. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Jacobs, H. L. Et al (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Massachusetts: Newbury house.
- Laksmi, S. D. N. (2020). The effects of self-and Peer-Correction technique on students' writing competency. *Lingua scientia*, 27(1).
- Lee, E. (2012). Peer correction vs. Self-correction in English writing. In *proceedings of the 17th conference of pan-pacific association applied linguistics*.
- Lee, I. (2017)., *Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Context*.
- Maftoon, P., Shirazi, M. A., & Daftarifard, P. (2010). The effect of recast vs. self-correction on writing accuracy: the role of awareness. *Brain. Broad research in artificial intelligence and neuroscience*, 2(1), 17-28.
- Martilova S, M. (2013). Increasing students' accuracy in writing descriptive text through peer correction at the second year of SMPN 22 Bandar Lampung. Bandar Lampung: Lampung university.

- McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational horizons*.
- Miao, B. Z. (2006). A Comparative Study of Peer and Teacher Written Feedback in A Chinese EFL Writing Class.
- Nation, I.S.P., 2008. *Teaching ESL EFL Reading and Writing (Esl & Applied Linguistics Professional)*. New York: Routledge 270 Madison Ave.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford university press, 200 Madison ave. new york, ny 10016 (isbn-0-19-434131-3, \$5.95).
- Ramirez, B, I., & Guillén C. P. M. (2018). Self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills. *Profile issues in teachersprofessional development*.
- Sari, A. F. (2018). *An Analysis Of Generic Structure On Recount Text Written By Tenth Grade Students of SMA 8 Kota Jambi*.
- Spiller, D. (2012). Assessment matters: self-assessment and peer assessment. *The University of Waikato, 13*.
- Sultana, Asifa. (2009). Peer Correction in ESL Classroom. BRAC University Journal, vol. , no. 1.
- Chappell, V. (2011). What makes writing so important? Retrieved December 27, 2022, from | <http://www.marquette.edu/wac/WhatMakescahyWritingSoImportant.shtm>.