



**IMPROVING THE FIRST YEAR STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT  
THROUGH PEER EDITING TECHNIQUE AT SMAN I TONGAS  
PROBOLINGGO IN THE 2006/2007 ACADEMIC YEAR**

**THESIS**

Presented as one of the requirements to obtain the S-1 Degree  
at English Education Program, The Language and Arts Education Department,  
The Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,  
Jember University

**Written By:  
Surya Dewi Fatmawati  
NIM: 020210401164**

**ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
JEMBER UNIVERSITY  
2007**



**IMPROVING THE FIRST YEAR STUDENTS' WRITING ACHIEVEMENT  
THROUGH PEER EDITING TECHNIQUE AT SMAN I TONGAS  
PROBOLINGGO IN THE 2006/2007 ACADEMIC YEAR**

**THESIS**

**Written By:  
Surya Dewi Fatmawati  
NIM: 020210401164**

**ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM  
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
JEMBER UNIVERSITY  
2007**



## SUMMARY

### **Improving the First Year Students Writing Achievement through Peer Editing Technique at SMAN I Tongas Probolinggo in the 2006/2007 Academic Year;**

Surya Dewi Fatmawati, 020210401164; English Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jember University.

This classroom action research was intended to improve the first year students' writing achievement at SMAN I Tongas Probolinggo in the 2006/2007 Academic Year by applying Peer Editing Technique. The respondents of this classroom Action research (CAR) were class Xd that was determined purposively. The class Xd were chosen as the subjects of this research because the class had more complicated problem dealing with writing and their average score in writing was the lowest among five existing classes that was 59.2 in the first semester of 2006/2007 Academic Year.

This CAR consisted of two cycles, in which each cycle covered four main stages including: the planning of the action, the implementation of the action, classroom observation. Meanwhile, the supporting data were gathered from interview and documentation.

The result of the average score of the writing test in the first cycle was  $M=68.61$  that was classified in the fair category. This result did not achieved the standard average score requirement in this research that was  $M \geq 70$ . besides, based on the classroom observation that was done in the first cycle, it was found that the students' involvement in the process of writing activities was 60.5%. therefore, the actions were proceeded to the second cycle by revising the first action cycle such as: optimizing the students' participation in the process of writing activities, giving enough clues about the passive sentences, news item and the way to conduct peer editing to the students. The results of the average score of the writing test in the second cycle was better  $M=75.73$  that was classified in the good category. Besides, the students' involvement in the writing process improved from 60.5% in the first

cycle up to 83.7% in the second cycle. It means that both the students' writing test and the students' involvement in the writing process improved in the second cycle and fulfilled the target of this research.

Based on the results, it could be concluded that the use of peer editing technique could improve the first year students' writing achievement at SMAN I Tongas Probolinggo in the 2006/2007 Academic Year in two cycles. Then it is suggested to the English teacher to apply peer-editing technique as the alternative way of English teaching technique, especially in teaching writing a news item text. This is expected to facilitate and to help the students collaborate and share knowledge and experiences with their peers to solve the writing problems.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

TITLE.....	i
DEDICATION .....	ii
MOTTO .....	iii
CONSULTANTS' APPROVAL SHEET .....	iv
APPROVAL SHEET .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT .....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	vii
TABLE OF APPENDICES .....	x
SUMMARY .....	xi
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background of the Research .....	1
1.2 Problems of the Research.....	5
1.3 Scope of the Research .....	5
1.4 Operational Definition of the Research.....	6
1.5 Research Objectives .....	6
1.6 Significance of the Research.....	7
<b>II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Writing and the Teaching of Writing at SMA .....	8
2.2 The Elements of Paragraph Writing.....	10
2.3 Types of Paragraph .....	11
2.3.1 News item .....	11
2.4 Students' Problems in Writing.....	12
2.5 Writing Process .....	14
2.6 Revision .....	17
2.7 Editing.....	18
2.8 Peer Editing Technique .....	18

2.8.1	The Concept of Peer Editing.....	18
2.8.2	The Advantages of Peer Editing Techniques.....	21
2.9	Action Hypothesis.....	22
<b>III.</b>	<b>RESEARCH METHODS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1	Research Design.....	23
3.2	Site and Research Schedule .....	26
3.3	Subjects of the Research .....	27
3.4	Research Procedures .....	27
3.4.1	The planning of the Action .....	27
3.4.2	The Implementation of the Action.....	28
3.4.3	Monitoring and Evaluation .....	29
3.4.4	Reflection of the Action.....	30
3.5	Instruments of the Research.....	31
3.5.1	Writing Test .....	31
3.5.2	Observation .....	34
3.6	Data Analysis .....	35
<b>VI.</b>	<b>RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1	The Results Of Action Cycle I .....	36
4.1.1	The Results of Observation.....	37
4.1.2	The Results of Writing Achievement Test in Cycle I.....	39
4.1.3	The Results of the Reflection in Cycle 1 .....	42
4.2	The Results of Action Cycle 2 .....	43
4.2.1	The Results of Observation.....	43
4.2.2	The Results of Writing Achievement Test in Cycle 2 .....	46
4.2.3	The Results of Reflection in Cycle 2 .....	48
4.3	Discussion .....	48

<b>V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION</b> .....	52
5.1 Conclusion .....	52
5.2 Suggestions .....	53
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	
<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	