

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING PEER AND SELF-EDITING TECHNIQUES TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE COMPOSITION (A STUDY OF 3RD SEMESTER STUDENTS AT THE INSTITUTE OF BINA SARANA INFORMATIKA -FLA-IBSI) JAKARTA INDONESIA

Dr. Sri Arfani¹ and Dr. Idris HM Noor²

¹Lecturer at the Institute of Bina Sarana Informatika (FLA-IBSI), Indonesia.

²Senior Researcher at the Office of Educational Research and Development, Ministry of Education and Culture, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT: *The purpose of the research is to know a significant effect of the use of peer and self-editing techniques to improve the students' writing descriptive composition. This research is an experiment which compares the peer and self-editing techniques of teaching writing of 3rd semester students at the Foreign Language Academy, the Institute of Bina Sarana Informatika (FLA-IBSI). The total samples of this research were 40 students. Each of the experiment and the treatment class is 20 students who were given different treatments, one as a treatment class for a peer editing and the other one as a control class for a self-editing. The research finding is that the students taught by using peer editing technique reached higher improvement than those students taught by using self-editing technique.*

KEYWORDS: The effectiveness, peer and self-editing technique, writing skill

INTRODUCTION

Writing as one of the productive language skills plays a key role in English as a foreign language for the learners of FLA-IBSI. It is considered to be the most complex and difficult skill to be learned. Writing like other language skills has its own features and conventions which makes it unique (Hartoyo 2011:111). This uniqueness is still considered as difficulty for students. Therefore, for almost all of FLA-IBSI, writing is a difficult particularly in developing their ideas due to their lack of motivation, practice and exposure in writing composition. Writing skill also deals with the words usage (Harmer 2007:9-10) where people live in a world of sign, symbols represented in a form of words. People may interpret symbols and signs by writing words. It leads to focus on contextual manipulating of teaching types of text such as descriptions, narratives, definition, exemplification, classification, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, and generalization.

Based on researchers experience in teaching writing, the students find many difficulties in developing their ideas in composing their writing. It cannot be denied that the writing is a complex organization involving spelling, grammar, sentence, vocabulary and structure in paragraph. To enhance their writing skill, students need to have more practice. Due to the difficulties of the writing, Nunan (1989:36) argued that learning to write fluently and expressively is the most difficult of the macro skills for all language users regardless whether the language in question is a first, second or foreign language”.

The constraint of the fourth semester students of FLA-IBSI both morning and evening classes of the second semester in writing descriptive composition is that the differences between

English and Indonesian language system of spelling, pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and to compose the topic in a descriptive writing. These constraints are not only in generating and organizing of ideas but also in translating their ideas into readable texts (Richards and Renandya, 2002:303).

In order to improve the students skill and competence in writing a descriptive composition, the researcher as a lecturer has implemented several techniques supported by interesting learning material. However, the results are not satisfied due to the lack of students' motivation and interest in writing descriptive composition. The students often make mistakes when they write the first draft of the descriptive composition, such as unorganized ideas, organize and develop the sentences, even though they have given some techniques of writing composition. It is contradicted with their needs to compose clear and logically descriptive writing in the form of organization, logical developments of ideas, sentence structure and quality of expression.

They provide reader based feedback that shows students writer effect that the writing is having on peer audience (Patterson, 2003:239). Other advantages of using peer editing technique are; 1) it involves students working together to evaluate and revise each other writing on their peers, 2) students can share ideas, create an atmosphere of corporation, develop independence and responsibility, identify strengths and weaknesses in their writing and reinforce editing skills, 3) peer editing decreases the amount of paperwork for teachers, 4) peer editing is technique that result in active, make students active and motivated them in the learning and writing process, 5) peer editing allows students to function as audience and respond to other students writing as well as enables students to use each other's comment while revising their draft, 6) peer editing encourages students respond each other ideas both in terms of language, content, and making suggestion for changes their comments, to contribute for successfully of the final product, 7) self editing technique encourages students to become independent learners and increase their motivation, 8) peer editing technique may reduce error in writing, and 9) peer and self editing technique always offers a feedback of each other writing that can improve students' writing skill. To accommodate the advantages of these techniques, the students are suggested to do an effort and be independent doing their writing text. They are suggested to write and organize the the contents accurately. It is hoped that students to do self-edit effectively before submitting the essay as an evaluation for better their score. Kasule and Lunga (2010:1) comment that assessment in many cases in higher education involves essay writing and a submission of one draft only.

The research questions for this study can be formulated as stated bellow:

1. Is there an effect of peer editing technique to improve the students' writing descriptive composition?
2. Is there an effect of self editing technique to improve the students' writing descriptive composition?
3. Is there any significant differences of improvement in descriptive writing skills students taught using peer editing technique and those students taught using self editing technique?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Writing is a complex process that allows writers to explore thoughts and ideas, and make them visible and concrete (Ghaith, 2010:14). Writing encourages thinking and learning for it motivates communication and makes thoughts available for reflection". In the field of English teaching, there are four basic areas namely reading, speaking, listening, and writing. Each of area plays a significant role in developing and enhancing student's skill and ability in learning English. Writing as a productive skill is a major skill area because it contributes to intelligence by requiring analysis and synthesis of information. To produce written language the learner must attain skills in fundamental basic task in writing letters, words, punctuation and very brief sentences. It is a level at which learners are trying to master the mechanics of writing (Hartoyo, 2011:111). Creating writing is not just about skill, but it is more than how the writers can encourage or extend their thinking, ideas, and motivate themselves to communicate with other people through writing (Fulwiller, 2002: 6). More over, writing makes our thoughts visible, changing our thinking into print, allowing us to develop and encourage our ideas (Harmer 2007: 9-10). In short, writing is not private; it is always a form of social dialogue, a way of talking to someone (Gould, 1998:x-x1). Writing is a discovery process, a way of finding out what you are thinking and what you want to say in particular situation and a process of building larger units from smaller ones, that is, the writing uses words to make sentences, sentences to make paragraphs, and paragraphs to make compositions-letters, reports, and college themes (Harmer 1986:2). In short, writing is most likely to encourage thinking and learning when students view their writing as a process in writing.

Process of writing

Writing needs a step by step process to attain the good result, starting with composing ideas, understand the what to write, know how to use grammar, words, sentence, paragraph, and the end with text production. states that the writers need to rearrange the ideas and end up as an orderly sequence that will inform or persuade the reader in starting to write (Grenville 2001:72, Gelb 1962:1-4). In doing writing composition, writers should recognize and know the basic approach to begin to shape the ideas into an outline . In doing writing well in sequence, Furthermore Grenville, defined writing as having three basic parts and it is known as writing organization: 1. Beginning an introduction. 2. A middle Development.3. End a conclusion of paragraph.

Further, Oshima and Ann (1999:101-103) propose an essay should have three main parts, namely: 1). An introductory paragraph, 2). A body and at least one, but usually two or more paragraph, 3).A concluding paragraph. The introductory paragraph indicates the information from each paragraph. First, an essay has body of paragraph, it is develop the topic stated in the introduction, second in the same ways the supporting sentences develop the topic of sentence in a paragraph. Third, the body of paragraph usually is the longer part of the essay, and it is contains support for the thesis sentences. Fourth, the concluding paragraph is summarizing of the information in the essay or in this part have many contain of the writer's opinion or prediction of the topic.

The introductory paragraph indicates the information from each paragraph. First, an essay has body of paragraph, it is develop the topic stated in the introduction, second in the same ways the supporting sentences develop the topic of sentence in a paragraph. Third, the body of paragraph usually is the longer part of the essay, and it is contains support for the thesis

sentences. Fourth, the concluding paragraph is summarizing of the information in the essay or in this part have many contain of the writer's opinion or prediction of the topic.

From those six -steps of writing proposed by Grenville (2001:71), writers can analyze their own mistake and at least make themselves realize what they are going to write and they can tell the reader what they are thought. Furthermore, the writers can be reducing some of ambiguous in meaning to their writing.

Based on theories above, Writers should acquire something in their essay for creating student's essay writing. They can read it only for themselves, although, their essay or composition it is not to be published. From those basic concepts of writing, researcher wants to use them all in the process of getting a valuable data to find out the effectiveness of using peer editing and self editing technique toward descriptive composition as technique of giving feedback in teaching writing for his research.

Kinds of Writing

Students who want to be good at writing skill, they should be familiar with some kinds of writing of exposition to inform and to explain the object, persuasive writing is to shape a logical argument, narration is to tell a story, and description is to describe something.

Techniques in writing

Writing is very important form of communication. It is a way of discovering ideas as well as a way of expressing it. Therefore, few writers are able to express their ideas and words together perfectly on the first draft. Most of writers produce several drafts, or experimental version of a piece of writing before finishing a final draft. If people cannot write well, they will miss many opportunities in their life and carrier. So that writing well request student to learn a variety of techniques used for different writing purposes. Learn a variety of writing techniques that can help students to improve their Some of techniques in writing that can be used to enhance students writing skill are peer editing and self editing technique writing and become proficient writer.

Peer Editing Technique

Peer editing is an interactive process of reading and commenting on a classmates, read each other paragraphs, and make helpful comments to improve your classmate's content and organization and therefore his or her clarity (Oshima and Ann 1999:29)

According Hyland and Oshima states that Peer editing is a major process in academic writing for English as a foreign language. It involves students' taking part for editing each other's writing. They will know the strengths and weaknesses in their writing. Peer editing helps build students' sense of identifying and providing them with chances to learn from each other and enhance their awareness of their abilities and knowledge.

Gaudini in Hadley (2002:331) defines that peer editing is the class editing process in which students help one another improve their writing through a series of passes. Peer editing is the processes through which students respond to and provide feedback on their peers' writing highlighting the positive and the negative aspects in a way to help each other reach better written products. The peer editor does not correct the paper's mistakes, but helps the writer fix their own mistakes by showing the area of the error and therefore making it clearer for the

writer. It is easier to spot another person's mistakes than to spot your own and it always helps to show your writing to be looked at by another person.

In sum, peer editing allows students to function as audience and respond to other students' writing, thus, it enable students to use each others' comments while revising their draft. It is process when a pairs or group of students working together on a piece of writing, they can respond to each other's ideas both in terms of language and content in making suggestion in changes and contributing to the success of the finished product.

Self Editing Technique

According to Marten (2010:77) that self assessments a process during which students reflect on the quality of their work, compare it to explicitly stated criteria, judge how well their work reflect the criteria and make appropriate revisions. Furthermore, Andrada in Marthen defined that self assessment is formative process during which students recognize the strength and weaknesses in their work and take

To be a good writing, the demand to conduct self edit is an alternative to understand the errors and mistakes that have to be corrected in order to get high score when it is evaluated. In the context of teaching and learning writing skill at the university, students are given a test as an evaluation of their progress in the form of formative test. Having corrected by a lecturer, students usually get a feedback from the lecturer in order students know how to be a self edit their writing such as the inaccuracies text, contents, organization, and mechanics. By understanding the technique of a self edit, students are capable enough of making the deliberate efforts and be responsible of their writing. The effect of doing this technique, students are able to be independent writer (Kasule and Lunga (2008: 238-241). Students also edit their writing themselves thoroughly about level errors, revise essay, sentence fragment, run on sentence, parallelism, mixed structures, misuse of the comma, omission and repetition. Therefore, the writer suggest that the implementing of self editing technique of teaching writing descriptive composition may involve writing paragraph draft, doing self editing technique, revising, and discussing the student difficulties. It is clear that self editing technique encourages students to become independent learners and can increase their motivation. Student can become better learner when they engage in deliberate thought about what they are learning and how they are learning it.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Setting and Time

The research was done at FLA-IBSI Jakarta from September to December 2016. This college was chosen due to the problems of the students' constraints in writing during teaching the subject of writing composition. Besides, this college is also willing to facilitate the research of peer and self editing in writing during the class writing subject. The population of this experiment research were taken from the two classes, the first class was taught by using peer editing technique as an experimental group and the second class was taught by using self editing technique as a comparison group. Researcher conducted pre test from two classes before treatment. Then, the treatments were given eight meetings per group. They only get once a week for essay writing English subject for 120 minutes per session. The Research Design

Design

This research is a quasi experimental research design comparing the two techniques of peer and self editing. Researcher tried to find out whether there is an improvement of using peer editing technique or self editing technique about students writing descriptive composition.

Table 1. The experimental design

Class/group	Pre test	Treatment	Post test
Peer editing technique	Xp1	T1	XP2
Self-editing technique	XS1	T2	XS2

(Jack and Norman)

Peer editing technique: Experiment group

Self editing technique: comparison group

XP1: Pre-test for the experimental group

Xp2: Post test for experimental group

Xs1: Pre test for comparison group

Xs2: post test for comparison group

T1: Treatment with peer editing technique

T2: Treatment with Self editing technique

Table 1 shows the experimental and comparison group where the experimental group is taught by peer editing technique while the comparison group is taught by self editing technique.

Variables

The independent variable consists of two groups and the other one is dependent variable. The independent variable is editing techniques consists of peer editing technique and self editing technique, while the dependent variable is the writing skill (Y). The techniques used are peer editing technique and self editing technique. There are two classes, class 3A as an experiment class was taught by peer editing technique and class 3B as a comparison class was taught by the self editing technique.

Population and sample

The population were 150 students from six classes of the third semester students of English Literature Department at FLA-IBSI. They were class 3a, 3B, 3c, 3d, 3e, and 3f. There were three morning classes and three evening classes. They have been taught how to compose a writing descriptive composition since they have been at the first semester.

A clustering random sampling were two classes chosen from the six classes of the fourth semester student consists of 20 to 27 active students each class. They were Class 3a and 3b. This randomly was used to decide for experimental group and comparison group. These 54 students were gathered into two classes using experimental classes for writing technique.

Data collection**Instrument****Writing test**

The data was collected using test of writing as an instrument. This test was used to measure the students' skill in using editing technique of writing administered twice. The test applies for pre-test and post-test. Types of test were essay for the two groups consists of writing an essay from one topic. The descriptive composition was written and edited by students themselves, the experimental group use peer editing technique while the comparison group used self editing technique. The researcher checked the content, writing organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics of the essay result of the students.

Writing scoring system

To score the process of the students' work, there is an analytical assessment in evaluation students' writing composition. Since the criteria for L1, the criteria are modification for L2. The criterium in excelent term are not used, since the excellent term is not applicable for an EFL setting. The technique of measuring the data as follows (Weigle: 2002).

FINDING

There are three sections in this chapter, first section is about description of the data, the second explains about the result of the research and the last section is about the discussion of the research finding and the effect of peer editing and self editing techniques in teaching writing descriptive composition. Statistical program for social science (SPSS) 18.00 was used to analyze the result of pretest and posttest.

Description of the Data

This section presents the result of pretest, posttest, and t-test analysis.

Table 2. The description of pre-test from experiment and comparison group

Group	Data	Statistic	Std. Error
1 (Experiment)	N	20	1.43
	Mean	64.75	
	Median	66.50	
	Variance	41.355	
	Std. Deviation	6.4308	
	Minimum	55.	
	Maximum	78.	
2 (Comparison)	N	20	1.45
	Mean	66.60	
	Median	65.00	
	Variance	42.568	
	Std. Deviation	6.5244	
	Minimum	58	
	Maximum	82	

Table 2 shows the mean in experimental group (IVa) is 64.75 and the comparison group (IVb) is 66.60. The minimum values in experimental group is 55.00 and comparison group is 58.00. The maximum value of experimental group is 78.00 and comparison group is 82.00. The median in experimental group is 66.50 and comparison group is 65.00.

Table 3. The description of post-test of experiment and comparison groups

Group	Data	Statistic	Std. Error
X1 (Experiment)	N	20	1.82
	Mean	74.65	
	Lower Bound	71.03	
	Upper Bound	78.27	
	Median	74.50	
	Variance	59.818	
	Std. Deviation	7.734	
	Minimum	62.00	
	Maximum	85.00	
	X2 (Comparison)	n	20
Mean		69.55	
Lower Bound		65.93	
	Upper Bound	73.17	
	Median	70.00	
	Variance	59.734	
	Std. Deviation	7.729	
	Minimum	50.00	
	Maximum	80.00	

Table 3 shows the mean in experimental group is 74.65. It means that the mean is higher than the mean in comparison group, where it is 69.55. The minimum value in experimental class is 62.00 and comparison group is 50.00. The maximum value in experimental group is 85 and the comparison group is 80. The medium in experimental group is 74.50 and comparison is 70.00.

The result of the research

The research reveals that the effect of peer editing technique improves students writing descriptive composition significantly. This conclusion is taken from the findings of the analysis of three research questions analyzed as it is in the following description.

The finding of the first research question about the effect of using peer editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition reveals that using peer editing is more effective in improving students' writing skill especially in writing descriptive composition. The detail description of the analysis found during the step of research process about the essay of writing test.

The essay test of writing were given to the students to know the students improvisation in writing descriptive composition, and to obtain the collected data score of test. Then, the step was followed by the analysis of data by using t- test statistical analysis by comparing the report of the post test and pre test scores of peer editing technique group. The pretest was done before the treatment was given. Pre test was given to find out what treatment was going to be conducted in each class. There were 25 students were listed in this group but two of them were absent in the pre test and it made 23 of the students were tested. After the treatment was done completely, a post test was given to the same students. In the post test, three of students were absent out of 23 students listed and it made only 20 of them following the post test. While the test result both post test and pre test of peer editing technique group is presented in table 4 below.

Table 4. Paired samples statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post test	74.65	20	7.734	1.729
	Pre test	64.75	20	6.431	1.438

Table 4 indicates the pretest displays a mean score for peer editing technique (64.75) than the mean score of posttest (74.65). However, to know the more accurate result of treatment of peer editing technique, therefore t-test statistical analysis was conducted.

The purposed of using t- test is to find out whether there is a difference or not between the two samples is significance with the level $\alpha = 0.05$. To find out the result of the program relating to the students' score of peer editing technique, statistical hypothesis are formulated as follows:

Ho: There is no significant effect of using peer editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

H1: There is a significant effect of using peer editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

To test the hypothesis above, the researcher used a paired –sample t-test. The test are “for research design where we want to compare two sets of scores...obtained from the same group or when the participants are measured more than once (for example, test scores before and after a course)” the result of the paired sample t-test is presented in table 5.

Table 5. Paired samples test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Post test pre test	9.900	9.514	2.127	5.447	14.353	4.654	19	.000

The treatment of peer editing technique is significant if the p- value is below $\alpha = 0.05$, and it is not significant if the p - value is above $\alpha = 0.05$. It can be seen at table 4 that the difference between the means is 9.900, and p -value is 0.000. Since the p-value is below $\alpha = 0.05$, H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted so, it tells us that the differences is significant. From this result, it can be concluded that there is an effect of using peer editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

To answer the second research question which is whether there is an effect of self editing technique to improve students' writing descriptive composition, a t-test statistical procedure was used by comparing the mean of the post-test and pre-test scores of the students who taught by self editing technique feedback. There were 27 students listed in the group, but three of students was absent in the pre test, and one of the student never enter to the class, while in the post test, three of student did not join the test. And it made only 20 students took the posttest. The score of pretest and posttest in self editing technique group are presented on appendix, while the summary of the test result in the form of the sum and the mean of both pretest and posttest of Self editing technique group is presented in table 5. Table 6. Paired Samples Statistic Group (Comparison Group) SET

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post test	69.55	20	7.729	1.728
	Pre test	66.60	20	6.524	1.459

Table 6 shows the mean of the pretest of self editing technique group is 66.60, while the mean the score of the posttest is 69.55. Self editing technique shows a lower mean score for pre test than the mean in the post test. It means that there is an improvement in teaching self editing technique.

However, to find out whether the improvement is significant or not, the mean score should be tested for its significance by using t-test statistical procedure, and a statistical hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H0: There is no significant effect of using Self editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

H1: There is a significant effect of using Self editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

To test the hypothesis another paired-samples t- test was used. The result of the paired sample t-test can be seen in the table 7.

Table 7. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences	t	df	Sig. (2tailed)	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		Lower	Upper		
Pair 1	Post test pre test	2.950	6.030	1.348	.128	5.772	2.188	19	.041

As previously mentioned, a treatment of a program is significant, if the p- value is below $\alpha = 0.05$ and it is not significant if the p- value is above $\alpha = 0.05$. Looking the table 4.9, it can be seen that the p- value is 0,041. It is less than $\alpha = 0.05$, so H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. It tells us that the improvement is significant. From this result, it can be concluded that there is an effect of using self editing technique on students' skill in writing descriptive composition.

To answer the third question of the research, whether there is any significant differences of improvement in descriptive writing skills gained by students taught using peer editing technique and those students taught using self editing technique. An independent sample t-test was used. It was used based on the statement of Dorney that independent- sample tests are for research designs where we are comparing the result of groups that are independent of each other.

There were 20 students in peer editing technique group and there were 20 students of self editing technique group. The scores of the post test of peer editing technique group (experimental group) and self editing technique group (comparison group) are presented in appendix 4, the mean and the standard deviation are presented in table 4.7 and the result of the independent sample t- test can be seen in table 8.

Table 8. Group Statistics PET and SET

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
gain	Peer Editing	20	9.90	9.514	2.127
	Self Editing	20	2.95	6.030	1.348

Table 8 shows that the mean of experimental group which taught by using peer editing technique is 9.90 which is greater than the mean of comparison group which taught by self editing technique which is only 2.95.

However, to find out whether the improvement is significant or not, the mean score should be tested for its significance by using independent t-test statistical procedure, and a statistical hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H0: There is no significance difference means of improvement in descriptive writing skills between students taught using peer editing technique and those students taught using self editing technique.

H1: There is a significance difference means of improvement in descriptive writing skills between students taught using peer editing technique and those students taught using self editing technique.

To find out whether the difference reaches statistical significant or not, let's take a look at table 8 which displays the result of the test.

Table 9. Independent Sample Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
gain	Equal variances assumed	3.531	.068	2.759	38	.009	6.950	2.519	1.851	12.049
	Equal variances not assumed			2.759	32.145	.009	6.950	2.519	1.820	12.080

In table 9, based on t- test, it can be observed that the p- value of 2-tailed is 0.009, it is less than $\alpha = 0.05$ which means that the differences of improvement is significant. The result explains that there is significant difference between the group which taught by using peer editing technique and the one which taught by using self editing technique.

From the three of t-test. It is concluded that peer editing technique has a significant effect on students' skill in writing descriptive composition and self editing is also has a significant effect on students' skill in writing descriptive composition. Moreover, the improvement which gained by the students who taught by peer editing technique is significantly different compared to those student taught by using self editing technique.

DISCUSSION

The first research question is whether the treatment of peer editing technique has an effect on students' writing skill in writing descriptive composition.

The result indicates that there is a difference between the mean in the pretest when they had not given treatment which was 64.75, and the mean in posttest when they had been given

treatment by peer editing technique was 74.65. The means difference is 9.900, as the p- value is 0.000, less than $\alpha = 0.05$, reaches statistical significance which tells that giving peer editing technique is effective in helping the students to improve their writing skill in writing descriptive composition. The result provides support for the argument that peer editing technique can improve classroom situation especially in writing class. The class is more vivid when the student' exchange ideas with pairs. Besides, based on the researcher's experience during applying the peer editing technique in the classroom, she found out that the students were more ready to be an autonomous learners due to their roles as the editors of their peers' works.

The second research question is whether there is an effect of using Self editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition.

The result of the research indicates that giving treatment of self editing technique is significant effect to students' skill in writing descriptive composition. It can be seen from the difference in means before the students were given a treatment which was in a pretest 66.60 and the mean of the score after they were given treatment which was in a post test only 69.55. The means differences is 2.95, as the p- value is 0.041, less than $\alpha = 0.05$, reaches statistical significance which shows that giving a self editing technique is effective to help the students improve their writing descriptive composition. The result provides support for the argument that self editing motivates students to become independent and better learners in what they are learning and how they are learning. The findings also raise conclusion as follows:

First, providing students with peer editing technique gives more progress and beneficial to improve students' skill in writing descriptive composition. This finding supports the significant role of students writing skill. It is consistent to the study which was done by Nahdi (2011:2) who claims that peer editing technique may improve students' ability in writing an expository paragraph. Peer editing technique creates better atmosphere of classroom during teaching and learning and more vivid when the student' exchange ideas with pairs.

The second conclusion is that by providing students with self editing technique improves the students in writing descriptive composition. On the other hand, Kasule and Lunga (2010:3) claims that self editing technique did not minimize students' mistakes. This statement is contradicted with this result of the research which indicates that giving treatment of self editing technique gives significant effect on the students' skill in writing descriptive composition.

The third research question is whether there is significant difference means of improvement in descriptive writing skill gained by students who taught by using peer editing technique and those students who taught by using self editing technique.

It can be seen the difference means of peer editing technique is 9.90 and self editing technique is 2.95, as the p- value is 0.009, less than $\alpha = 0.05$. The finding indicates that the students who were taught by using peer editing technique reached higher improvement than those students who were taught by using self editing technique of which the difference between both groups is significant. It explains that providing students with peer editing technique is more effective than self editing technique. This result is consistent to the previous studies as done by Diab (2010:1) who claims peer editing technique can improve students' writing expository paragraph. The result of the research shows a better performance of students who used the peer editing technique as it is claimed in theory of using peer editing technique is more effective than self editing in writing descriptive composition.

Implication to Research and Practice

Since the study has shown the greater advantages for learning process to improve the students' writing descriptive composition, it is therefore imperative on all students and lecturers to apply the peer and self editing during the teaching learning English as a whole and particularly in writing process. For students, it is a must to share their writing task to each other to be corrected the mistakes and give the feedback. For lecturers, this study inspires their teaching techniques to help students improve their writing skill. By applying these techniques, hopefully the teaching and learning in the class will be more joyful, then the students will be more happily.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Conclusion

To narrow down the conclusions of the research findings, the researchers come up with three main conclusion. In the first research question, there is an effect of using peer editing technique on students writing descriptive composition. The research reveals that that using peer editing technique is effective in helping the students improve their writing descriptive composition. Statistically, using peer editing technique is effective to improve students' writing descriptive composition. The second research question indicates that there is an effect of using self editing technique to improve students writing descriptive composition, however it is less effective than using peer editing technique. To answer the the third research question is that the peer editing technique is more effective than self editing technique where the score of students taught by using peer editing technique is higher than those taught by using self editing technique.

Recommendation

1. The lecturer should create method of editing activities by giving clear instruction to the students, be a role model for a writing descriptive composition, create a fun and a pleasure learning environment that make the students more active and enthusiastic in writing
2. It is suggested to students to do pair editing when finishing the draft of writing descriptive composition
3. It is also suggested to FLA-IBSI to set up a policy that all students should have a good academic writing particularly article for international journal as a condition to get a BA certificate graduate
4. FLA-IBSI should also prepare good facilities and sufficient budget to support the program.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The traditional way of teaching and learning applies the technique where the students do their writing task in the form of a text consisting of two or three paragraphs, then lecturers correct their mistakes. On the basis of the research findings, the teaching and learning process in the class changes from the traditional way of teaching and learning to an innovative way, applying the peer and self editing. However, these techniques should be investigated more thoroughly by conducting the relevance research in four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). It is important for lecturers and students work collaboratively to conduct research of developing

material for developing writing skill and the use of media such as IT to help students easily understand and practice writing descriptive composition accurately.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to FLA-IBSI for providing the funding of the research. The author is also thankful to Agus Supriadi, the chairman of English program at FLA-IBSI and English lecturers who support and help the researcher conduct the research. The author sends the deepest gratitude to both senior lecturers of Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka University, Elin Driana and Hartoyo, for their suggestions, advice, direction, input, and guide during the process of writing this article.

REFERENCES

- Gelb, I. J. (1962) *A Study of Writing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press.
- Ghaith, G. (2010) *Writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.nadasisland.com/ghaith-writing.html#activities>. 16 April 2012.
- Gould, E. et al. (2000) *The act of writing*. New York: Random House.
- Grenville, K. (2001) *Writing from start to finish: A six step guide*. New South Wales: Allen and Unwin.
- Hadley, Alice O. (2004) *Teaching Language in Context*. 3rd Edition: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Harmer, J. (2007) *How to teach writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hartoyo. (2011) *Language of assessment*. Semarang: Pelita Insani.
- Kasule, D. and Lunga, B. (2010) *How effective are students' self-Editing Endeavour? Evidence from L2 writing task: University of Boston. International journal for cross-disciplinary subject in education (IJCDSE), Volume 1.*
- Marthen, L. N. (2010) *Writing: Processes, tools and techniques*. New York: Nova Science Published, Inc.
- Nahdi, M. (2011) *Improving students' ability in using peer editing technique by using peer editing technique (a classroom action research at third semester student of English department study program of STKIP HAMZANWADI in academic year of 2010/2011)*. Surakarta:
- Nation. I. S. P. (2009) *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing task for the communication classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oshima, A and Ann H. (1999) *Writing academic english*. 3rd ed. White plains, New York; Addison Wesley Longman
- Peterson, S. (2003) *Peer influence on student revision of their narrative writing L1 Education studies in language and literature, University of Toronto p.239* retrieved from <http://ehow.com/about5072s01-advantages-peer-editing-students.html>.
- Richards, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. 2002. *Methodology in language teaching: An Anthology of Current practice*. Cambridge University.
- Unpublished Thesis of Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta.

APENDIX**Writing scoring system**

SCORE	LEVEL	CRITERIA
Content	30 – 21	Excellent to Very Good: knowledgeable; substantive; thorough development of thesis; relevant assigned topic
	26 – 22	Good to Average: some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited development of thesis; mostly relevant to topic, but lack details
	21 – 7	Fair to Poor: limited knowledge of subject; little substance; inadequate development of topic
	16 - 13	Very Poor: does not show knowledge of subject; non-substantive; not pertinent; OR not enough to evaluate
Organization	20 – 18	Excellent to Very Good: fluent expression; ideas clearly stated/supported; succinct; well-organized; local sequencing; cohesive
	17 – 14	Good to Average: somewhat choppy; loosely organized but main ideas stand out; limited support; logical but incomplete sequencing
	13 – 10	Fair to Poor: non-fluent; ideas confused or disconnected; lacks logical sequencing and development
	9 - 7	Very Poor: does not communicate; no organization; or not enough to evaluate
Vocabulary	20 – 18	Excellent to Very Good: sophisticated range; effective word/idiom choice and usage; word form mastery; appropriate register
	17 – 14	Good to Average: adequate range; occasional errors of words/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured
	13 – 10	Fair to Poor: limited range; frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage; meaning confused or obscured
	9 - 7	Very Poor: essentially translation; little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form; OR not enough to evaluate
Language Use	25 – 22	Excellent to Very Good: effective complex constructions; few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21 – 18	Good to Average: effective but simple constructions; minor problems in complex constructions; several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	17 – 11	but meaning seldom obscured

		Fair to Poor: major problems in simple/complex constructions; frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns,
	10 - 5	prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletion; meaning confused or obscured Very Poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules; dominated by errors, does not communicate; OR not enough to evaluate
Mechanics	5 4 3 2	Excellent to Very Good: demonstrate mastery of conventions; few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing Good to Average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured Fair to Poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; poor handwriting; meaning confused or obscured Very Poor: no mastery of conventions; dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing; handwriting illegible; OR not enough to evaluate