

## **THE USE OF SELF-CORRECTION AND PEER-CORRECTION TECHNIQUE IN ENHANCING STUDENTS' WRITING SKILL**

**Ni Made Wersi Murtini**

Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar-Indonesia

[wersimurtini@unmas.ac.id](mailto:wersimurtini@unmas.ac.id)

### **ABSTRACT**

This research utilized self-correction and peer-correction techniques on enhancing the writing skills of first-semester students in the English Language Education Study Program. Preliminary observations indicated that many students in semester 1B struggled with writing accuracy and fluency. The study aimed to determine whether the implementation of self-correction and peer-correction techniques could improve these students' writing skills. Conducted as classroom action research, the study was completed in three cycles, with data collected through a series of assessments: pre-test, post-test 1, post-test 2, and post-test 3. The results revealed a significant improvement in the students' mean scores from the pre-test to the post-tests, demonstrating that both correction techniques contributed positively to their writing development. This research concludes that the integration of self-correction and peer-correction effectively enhances students' writing skills, fostering a more accurate and reflective approach to language use.

**Keywords:** writing, writing skill, self-correction, peer-correction.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In foreign language learning, proficiency in both spoken and written communication is essential, with writing recognized as a particularly valuable skill. Alongside speaking, writing is one of the most critical skills that students must acquire, as it is used extensively in everyday communication. Writing is a dynamic process involving the expression of ideas through symbols, organized into coherent, readable text. It is both a physical and cognitive activity, as Nunan et al. (2003) describe: the physical act involves putting words on paper, while the mental aspect encompasses generating, organizing, and articulating ideas. Writing thus engages

complex brain activity to manage the flow of thoughts and communicate meaning effectively.

Mastery in writing is often seen as an indicator of students' overall language competence. According to Kingston et al. (2002), success in English learning can largely be predicted by students' proficiency in productive skills, particularly writing. Despite its importance, students frequently face challenges in developing strong writing abilities, as evidenced by their writing performance and their approach to writing tasks. Many students struggle with generating ideas independently, and their writing often lacks appropriate vocabulary choices,

grammatical accuracy, and coherence — key elements of effective writing. Observations from first-semester students in the English Language Education Study Program (ELESP) at FKIP Unmas Denpasar, particularly in class 1B, reflect these issues. Students are very easy to get bored in learning writing and find it very difficult to do (Murtini, 2023). Students experience difficulties with idea generation, capitalization, spelling, cohesive text construction, and grammatical accuracy. These challenges contribute to a lack of interest in writing, as many students find writing tasks tedious and overly challenging.

Addressing these challenges requires engaging strategies that not only support students in overcoming technical writing issues but also foster interest and motivation. Tools like educational applications can be particularly effective in capturing students' attention, making writing practice more engaging. Within this context, self-correction and peer correction emerge as promising techniques for improving students' narrative writing skills. These methods actively involve students in the writing process, allowing them to identify and rectify their errors while learning from their peers' perspectives.

Self-correction, which promotes reflective practices, encourages students to take ownership of their learning by enabling them to identify and correct their own mistakes. This method is associated with improved writing performance, as students become more aware of common errors and learn to apply linguistic rules more accurately (Itmeizeh, 2016; Yang, 2011). Based on what has been stated by Yanti et al., (2022), here are some steps which was done by the researcher in implementing self-correction technique:

1. The teacher instructs each student to read their own writing individually.
2. The teacher guides the students to carefully review their own work.
3. After reviewing, the teacher prompts the students to identify any parts of their writing that seem unclear or odd.
4. The teacher motivates the students and encourages them to look for errors in their writing.
5. The students are then asked to correct the mistakes they have found.
6. Finally, the teacher reviews the corrections made by the students to ensure accuracy.

On the other hand, peer correction offers unique benefits by fostering a collaborative learning environment.

Through peer feedback, students are exposed to diverse perspectives on writing, which can deepen their understanding of writing mechanics and enhance both their analytical skills and their writing quality (K. Cho & MacArthur, 2011; Y. H. Cho & Cho, 2011; Saptanno & Souisa, 2021). Peer correction has also been shown to create a sense of community among learners, which can increase motivation and reduce the anxiety often associated with writing (Ruru & Sulisty, 2021). Here are some steps in implementing peer-correction technique based on (Yanti et al., 2022):

1. Students choose a topic.
2. The teacher explains writing preparation steps.
3. A checklist guideline is provided.
4. Students are grouped in pairs or small teams.
5. Drafts are exchanged for peer review.
6. Students assess each other's writing using the checklist provided.

Despite the potential of self-correction and peer correction to enhance students' writing skills, there is a gap between the current state and the ideal implementation of these techniques. While these approaches are known to improve

writing performance, skepticism regarding students' ability to provide constructive feedback and varied levels of initial motivation can affect their effectiveness (Tsuroyya, 2020; Yanti et al., 2022). Furthermore, students often lack adequate training in giving meaningful feedback, which limits the potential of peer correction as a learning tool. Consequently, there is a need for research that explores strategies to address these challenges, making self-correction and peer correction more accessible and effective for diverse student populations.

The researcher is therefore motivated to conduct a study titled "The Use of Self-Correction and Peer-Correction Techniques in Enhancing Students' Writing Skills". This research aims to investigate if these techniques could improve students' narrative writing abilities and to explore how self-correction and peer correction can foster a more interactive, reflective, and motivational learning environment in writing instruction. Through this study, the researcher seeks to bridge the gap in understanding how these correction methods can be optimized to enhance students' engagement and improve their writing skills.

The following sentence indicates that the researcher is highly interested in doing a study called “The Use of Self-Correction and Peer-Correction Technique in Enhancing Students’ Writing Skill” to determine whether the first semester English Language Education Study Program students at FKIP Unmas Denpasar can enhance their writing skills through the use of self-correction and peer-correction in the academic year 2024/2025.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

Classroom action research was used in the current study, which examines the use of peer and self-correction in narrative paragraph writing for first semester 1B students in the IEC class of the English Language Education Study Program FKIP Unmas Denpasar in the academic year 2024/2025.

Classroom action research, according to Ary et al. (2014), is a process in which teachers collaborate to enhance their own teaching methods in order to incorporate change and enhance education. The researcher evaluated the effectiveness of her classroom activities throughout the study and made plans for adjustments in light of the results.

Prior to beginning the research process or administering treatment, preliminary observations and data from pre-test results showed that the respondents’ writing skills needed a great deal of care and attention.

The classroom action research (CAR) design was employed in this investigation. Two sessions made up each of the cycles in which this research was conducted. According to Kemmis and McTaggart, each session involves a combination of planning, activity, observation, and reflection (Burns, 2009). Action research is a component of a broader educational trend that has been going on for a while, claims Burns (2009). Therefore, in action research, the teacher participates in the personal teaching scenario while also acting as an investigator or explorer. Therefore, one of the main goals of action research is to pinpoint the problematic situation or topic that the participants—who could include teachers and students—think merits further, methodical investigation.

The researcher prepared the course plan, instructional materials, pre-test, and post-test. The researcher employed the Peer-Correction and Self-Correction mediums to explore teaching writing skills. The researcher observed how using peer

and self-correction enhanced participants' writing skills during the observation phase. Reflection is the final phase. The researcher gathered information to ascertain whether peer and self-correction may improve pupils' writing skills.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Pre-Test**

Before using Self-Correction and Peer-Correction to teach writing a narrative, a pre-test was administered to gauge the participants' writing proficiency. On the basis of the given themes, participants were asked to write a narrative paragraph. The pre-test data yielded an average value of 60.96. The minimal passing score for this study is 80. Action was necessary to enhance the participants' writing abilities because the pre-test score fell short of the passing threshold.

### **Cycle I**

Cycle I was accomplished in four continuous phases: planning, action, observation, and reflection. Self-correction and peer-correction technique were employed as the techniques in this cycle under the topic “My School Holiday” by the researcher. In planning, the researcher prepared the teaching material consisted of lesson plan which includes the

implementation of self-correction and peer-correction technique, writing material, worksheet, and post-test 1. The learning material is taught to the subjects was about narrative paragraph.

After the planning was completed, then the next step was action. In cycle 1 session 1, the researcher taught the narrative paragraph by explaining the generic structure and language feature. The researcher asked the subjects to do the worksheet and at the end, they were asked to practice writing a narrative paragraph. At the end of the learning process, the researcher applied the self-correction technique by telling the students checking their writing, checking their spelling, grammar/structure, and focusing with other mistakes that they made.

In session 2, the students continued to do some corrections to their writing. The researcher asked them to do peer-correction which allow them to check their friends' writing, discuss it and get feedback from each other.

### **Post-test I**

The post-test I was administered to all subjects, totalling 25 students. They completed Post-test 1 as narrative paragraph writing. The average post-test 1

score was 67.16. The cycle was restarted since it did not meet the passing grade.

## **Cycle II**

Cycle II was implemented following the steps conducted in Cycle I. This cycle aimed to address the shortcomings of the previous cycle to ensure the students could achieve the minimum passing grade. The researcher assigned the topic “My Trip with Family” for the narrative paragraph writing activity. The stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection were consistently carried out.

In the planning stage, the researcher prepared a detailed lesson plan, teaching materials, writing worksheets, and Post-Test II. The teaching materials focused on narrative writing, emphasizing the generic structure and linguistic features of a narrative paragraph.

The action stage began with the first session, where the researcher introduced the generic structure and language features of narrative paragraphs to the students. Students were guided through the writing process, starting with drafting their narrative paragraphs. At the end of the session, the self-correction technique was applied. Students were encouraged to analyze their own writing by checking grammar, spelling, and overall structure.

During the second session, the focus shifted to peer-correction. Students exchanged their work with classmates, reviewed each other’s writing, and provided constructive feedback. This process enabled students to recognize and learn from both their own and their peers’ mistakes.

## **Post-test II**

A post-test II was also administered to each of the 25 subjects. They wrote a narrative piece of work. The average score for post-test II was 76.08. When compared to the average post-test I score of 67.16, this demonstrated an improvement in topic achievement. However, this number was below the 80-point passing grade threshold. The researcher has thus advanced to cycle III.

## **Cycle III**

Cycle III followed the same structure as the previous cycles, with refinements based on the findings of Cycle II. For this cycle, the assigned topic for narrative writing was “My First Day as a University Student.”

In the planning phase, the researcher developed a lesson plan, instructional materials, and the post-test for Cycle III. Additional emphasis was placed on providing clear guidance and support to

address recurring challenges from the earlier cycles.

The action phase included two sessions. In the first session, the researcher explained the generic structure and linguistic features of narrative paragraphs. Students were asked to draft their paragraphs and perform self-correction, focusing on identifying and revising errors in their grammar, spelling, and organization.

In the second session, students engaged in peer-correction activities. They exchanged their drafts with classmates, analyzed each other's work, and provided feedback to refine their narratives further. This collaborative approach aimed to enhance their understanding and skills in narrative writing.

### **Post-test III**

All 25 participants completed the post-test III. They finished the narrative writing test. The post-test III average score was 82.64. This was higher than the average post-test II score of 76.08. Because this statistic exceeded the minimum passing grade of 80, the study was terminated because more than 80% of the subjects passed the minimum passing grade criteria.

The average values of the pre cycle, cycle I, cycle II, and cycle III were

calculated as follows: 60.96; 67.16; 76.08; and 82.64. The classroom action research could be terminated if the achievement indicator of 80% of subjects attaining the passing grade of 80 was fulfilled.

### **CONCLUSION**

The data analysis findings can be summed up as follows after teaching narrative paragraph writing to first semester 1B students in the IEC Class of English Language Education Study Program FKIP Unmas Denpasar using self-correction and peer-correction.

Pre-cycle, post-test 1, post-test 2, and post-test 3 average scores all increased, indicating a considerable improvement in the subjects' writing skills. Writing proficiency, which was first assessed as "less" in the pre-cycle, significantly increased in cycle III. This improvement showed that the writing abilities of the first semester students of 1B in IEC class of the English Language Education Study Program FKIP Unmas Denpasar may be enhanced by employing self-correction and peer-correction as learning resources.

### **REFERENCES**

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. A. (2014). Introduction to Research Education. In *Journal of science studies in Mashhad* (Vol. 59).

- Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Burns, A. (2009). Doing action research in english language teaching: A guide for practitioners. In *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners*. Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203863466>
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2011). Learning by Reviewing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(1), 73–84.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021950>
- Cho, Y. H., & Cho, K. (2011). Peer reviewers learn from giving comments. *Instructional Science*, 39(5), 629–643.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9146-1>
- Itmeizeh, M. J. (2016). Impact of Peer Correction on Reducing English Language Students' Mistakes in Their Written Essays in PAUC and Learners' Attitudes towards This Technique. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(11), 2068.  
<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0611.02>
- Murtini, N. M. W. (2023). The Use of Storyjumper in Teaching Descriptive Text Writing to EFL Students. *JOSELT (Journal on Studies in English Language Teaching)*, 4(2).
- Ruru, T. A. N., & Sulisty, T. (2021). Peer review in writing activities: outcomes and perceptions of EFL students. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (J-REaLL)*, 2(1), 156.
- Saptenno, W. Y., & Souisa, T. R. (2021). Students' Peer Feedback in EFL Writing Class of English Study Program. *HUELE: Journal of Applied Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 1(1), 01–16.  
<https://doi.org/10.30598/huele.v1.i1.p01-16>
- Tsuroyya, C. (2020). Students' Perception On Peer Correction For Academic Writing Performance. *The Journal of English Literacy Education: The Teaching and Learning of English as a Foreign Language*, 7(1), 11–19.  
<https://doi.org/10.36706/jele.v7i1.10674>
- Yang, Y. F. (2011). A Reciprocal Peer Review System to Support College Students' Writing. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(4), 687–700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01059.x>
- Yanti, A., Hadi, A., & Settiawan, D. (2022). Using Self-Correction and Peer-Correction Techniques to Improve Students' Writing Skills: A Comparative Study. *Indonesian Journal of Integrated English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.24014/ijjelt.v8i1.18494>