Peer Editing to Enhance Students' Critical Thinking on Recount Text

Maria Juni Sonia L. Pasaribu[1,] Viola Valentina[2,] Yariani Talunohi[3]
Alivian G Lumbanbatu[4] Azizah Husda[1*]

[1,2,3,4,5]English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and
Education,Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia

Abstract
Educational system changed to online learning because pandemic covid 19 spreads around the world. Teachers and students have to use an alternative way to carry out education through learning technology. Online learning creates a new way of communicating between teachers and students, especially when they send messages by learning platform so that in its implementation sometimes various variations appear in the use of language in learning or it is the use of slang words. The slang words are informal words or terms that have become a culture or habit in the daily conversations. This study aims to analyse the slang words used by students when learning English during online learning and also to find out the reason students use the slang words. The method used in this research was descriptive qualitative. The data was collected through the analysis of the conversation transcripts of the WhatsApp learning group and zoom comments, then an interview used to know students' perception about slang words. The result shows that students use slang words both in Indonesian and English when chatting with friends, expressing feelings, discussing and so on. Then, there are 13 Indonesian slang words and 15 English slang words that students common use in online conversation. Next, students assume that the use of slang words can make the learning atmosphere less tense, easy to understand, to short words and make the teaching and learning process more relaxed.

1. INTRODUCTION

English is typically the first foreign language taught at all level. It is also used to communicate with people of diverse ethnicities from other countries. Students are expected to acquire English in order to read and comprehend the vast literature and scholarly works published in the language on subjects such as science, business, economics, and technology, among others. When teaching English to middle school pupils, there are four pedagogical principles and lexical categories that must be covered. The four language components that comprise the four language abilities are Vocabulary, Pronunciation, Structure/Grammar, and Spelling (Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing). Each of these matters tremendously. Due to their interdependence, no single talent or characteristic can be deemed superior to the others. This research will focus specifically on narrative texts. A recount is a text that recounts past events or experiences. Its intent is to recount events. Orientation, events, and reorientation are the generic structures of a recount. Essentially, recount text resembles narrative. The narrative found in tales, folktales, legends, and fables is distinguished from the recount found in biographies and autobiographies. Contrary to what we find in the recount, there are conflicts among the store in the narrative; however, we find only a series of events as the fundamental structures. Thus, recount text is more engaging and complex to discuss compared to other types of texts.

The researchers have done some reading to support this study. First, Amelia (2020) investigated "The Impact of Using Peer Editing Towards Students' Writing Ability In Recount Text At The First Semester Of Tenth Grade of SMA Negeri 17 Bandar Lampung In The Academic Year of 2019/2020". Peer revising lets writers see how their work looks to

outsiders, the writer found. Judges evaluate your work. Peer-feedback workshops help students assess and improve their writing. Responding to peers' work improves reading and writing skills. Reacting to peers' writing and reading reviews helps students better. Students will correct each other's work and learn about their own writing processes. Students can learn from each other's work (Amelia, 2020).

The second study, The Impact of Using Peer Editing Technique Towards Students' Writing Ability in Descriptive Text At The Eight Grade of SMP Negeri 1 Limau Tanggamus, found that students' descriptive writing skills declined on a pre-test before using Peer Editing. Peer editing enhanced student descriptive writing. After therapy and testing, the experimental group had a higher post-test score than the control group. The scholar who created this method used it to help students write descriptively. Peer editing improved students' writing, especially thorough texts. Students' detailed writing improved after peer editing (Tias, 2018).

Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflections, reasoning, or communication, as a guide for belief and action .Students are expected to be more aware of and attentive to their recount text as a result of activities provided in the critical thinking skills module. Based on the results of the preliminary research, it can be concluded that in order to improve students' awareness and critical thinking in their recount texts, teachers need to discover an effective teaching strategy or technique (Eman Mohamed & Hasnaa Sabry, 2014).

A strategy that a teacher should seek out is one that maximizes students' criticism in recount text classes. Peer editing is one technique

that is believed to enhance students' critiques in narrative texts. In spite of the fact that native speakers frequently use elision when speaking English, they are not the only ones who do so. Many non-native speakers, including Indonesians, frequently use elision when speaking English. The application of critical thinking skills to narrative texts requires a technique to make the class more entertaining. Peer editing is one of Barkley's techniques derived from Collaborative Language Learning that will accustom students to a series of cognitive processes, such as reviewing, contemplating, and analyzing (Mercedes & Galvis, 2010). The three primary activities of the learning process correspond to the critical thinking skills of analyzing, synthesizing, reflecting, and evaluating the text: analysis, synthesis, reflection, and evaluation.

On the same hand, Peer Editing According to pupils who become editors and writers can benefit from peer editing. The result of editing will be constructive criticism that will aid in the improvement of students' narrative texts. While editing his partner's recollection text, the student will employ his recollection text skills and knowledge, which can then be applied to enhance and correct his own recollection text. This means that students will learn to improve their critical thinking skills while editing the recount texts of their peers, which will ultimately increase their awareness of errors in their own recounts. Students are required to peruse and provide feedback on one another's recount texts, making peer editing a crucial aspect of the process. In peer editing, the student is not only the author, but also the collaborator of other students who provide feedback. Students will have the opportunity to modify the narrative texts of their peers in a constructive manner (Ainsai & Poonlarp, 2017).

Educators of English as a Second Language (ESL) in Indonesia encounter a unique set of challenges when attempting to teach the

language to locals. Student complaints about certain instructors' classes demonstrate that they have problems. This is especially true in the field of writing instruction, where students require feedback from their professors at every stage of the writing process. Due to time constraints and a possible class size of forty, the professor cannot provide individual attention to each student. Therefore, their writing skills did not acquire a passing grade. Based on the information gleaned from the student feedback, the instructor then endeavours to implement an instructional strategy that will aid in the resolution of the issues. Peer revision is one of the most promising strategies for improving students' ability to compose Recount Texts. Students use peer editing to enhance the lucidity of one another's writing by providing feedback on its organization, topic, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Students engage in peer criticism when they read and discuss each other's writing to determine if their intended meaning has been conveyed and to obtain reader-perspective insight into their own writing. Teaching students to become proficient writers and readers is a two-way street. Peer editing allows students to develop confidence in their writing both in and out of class. This will enable them to reach their full writing potential. When students construct their own written content in response to a lecturer's explanation of genre characteristics, they engage in independent writing. Then, in the process of peer editing, each student's initial draft is revised by a classmate. That is, after all, the purpose of their independence. Based on the problems discussed previously, the writer takes a title of this "Skripsi" **"PEER EDITING TO ENHANCE STUDENTS' CRITICAL THINKING ON RECOUNT TEXT"**

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Definition Of Critical Thinking

Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflections, reasoning, or communication, as a guide for belief and action. Students are expected to be more aware of and attentive to their recount text as a result of activities provided in the critical thinking skills module. Based on the results of the preliminary research, it can be concluded that in order to improve students' awareness and critical thinking in their recount texts, teachers need to discover an effective teaching strategy or technique (Eman Mohamed & Hasnaa Sabry, 2014).

2.2. Definition Of Peer Editing

Peer editing is the process of having a peer read and edit a piece of writing, highlighting errors or ways to improve it. These errors may include misspellings, grammar mistakes and clarity issues. Peers can provide edits on a physical paper or use a word processing system to edit a paper.

Peer may include classmates, friends or coworkers. For example, in a classroom setting, a teacher might create a peer editing assignment in which two students share their essays, revise each other's papers and later discuss their suggestions. This can help them improve each other's writing. (Ainsai & Poonlarp, 2017)

3. METHODS

This study employs a qualitative approach. Whereas this research aims to understand how peer editing enhances students' critical thinking through recount text. Primarily this research would rely on observation and data collection since human-related problems depend primarily on

observation. According to that qualitative research is research that produces data in the form of descriptive verbal from people and observed behaviour (Moleong, 2016).

The research was conducted at SMA SWASTA FREE METHODIST MEDAN, with 4 classes consisting of science and social science classes. The science classes are known to be 2, and 2 classes for social ones. The researchers use random sampling in this research because random sampling is preferable in groups that are both homogeneous and uniformly selected. Everyone who meets the criteria has an equal chance of being chosen to take part in the study using this technique, which relies solely on random chance. There are advantages and disadvantages to using a random selection method. While this method guarantees a fair sample of the population at large, it can be difficult to implement when the population is diverse and spread out, and it is not always backed up by an easily available list of people to whom you can apply the method. Thus, the result showed to be science classes or so-called MIA (Mia 1, Mia 2). Each of the classes has 40 students in it, nevertheless, the research only needs one sample which eventually leads to the use of Mia 2 as a population sample.

 In this study, researchers used two cycles in obtaining data, namely cycle one and cycle two.

The data in this study are mainly primary qualitative data. In order to account for the accuracy of the data information received, the researchers collected data by reading and reviewing all related journals, researches and so on in order to collect and gather all data regarding peer editing and its effectiveness to increase critical thinking through recount text. These methods also include book and history recap, interviews, etc. Furthermore, after all the data is set and ready, the next stage is writing all the information gathered and finally starting to write.

4. Finding and Discussion

As previously mentioned, this study was conducted in two cycles, and each cycle produced different results. Each cycle ends with a discussion that includes the percentage of marks received by students. Finally, the test results of the peer-editing instructions given by their teachers determined their critical thinking skills. Here, each cycle is performed.

Pre-Cycle Activity

In this pre-cycle, the peer-editing review was not yet implemented. Thus, the score was taken from the very first visit to the schools. In this case, the teacher was only giving out tests based on previous materials.

Categories	Score Range	Frequency	Percentages
Very Good	85-100	0	0%
Good	75-84	6	15%
Sufficient	60-74	15	37.5%
Poor	50-59	12	30%
Very Poor	0-49	7	17.5%
Total	: 40 students		

According to the data presented in the table, none of the forty students had a very high score. Moreover, six students or 15 percent receive passing grades or are called as good. The greatest number of pupils, 37.5% students achieved passing scores within the range of 60 to 74. In addition, 12 students (30%) scored in the range of 50 to 59, which is considered to be below average. The last one is a very poor category, which unfortunately seven candidates received.

Activity in Cycle 1

In this cycle, the teacher serves as a role model for implementing the peer-editing method. The teacher gives a short course on how the recount text method will be used and will eventually be used through the peer-editing method

Categories	Score Range	Frequency	Percentages

Very Good	85-100	10	25%
Good	75-84	21	52,5%
Sufficient	60-74	5	12,5%
Poor	50-59	4	10%
Very Poor	0-49	0	0%

Total   : 40 students

Peer editing is a technique that can be used while improving narrative texts. Students are introduced to three key activities through peer editing:

In response to a sample of student recount text, offer:1. compliments, 2. ideas, and 3. corrections.The three stages indicated above are practiced in small groups and presented to the class. After that, the students practice independent editing under the direction of a PowerPoint tutorial and worksheet. Students are prepared to routinely participate in constructive peer revision of their peers' written work through this set of practice tasks (Tompkins, 2003).

According to Pharr, after finishing an essay draft, students might proceed by asking a classmate to make changes. This shows that peer editing encourages narrative text tasks including composition, arrangement, and rewriting (Pharr & Buscemi, 2005). The difficulty previously outlined is also suggested to be solved by peer review. Peer editing, as defined by Tompkins, is the revision of students' narrative works by their peers. The pupils' accounts will be enhanced by this activity's modification and editingStudents will check their recall texts for grammar and spelling mistakes. Students' capacity to critically evaluate a paragraph will also be improved by editing a friend's recount text. They read his friend's recalling text unconsciously and make an effort to understand it. Additionally, they are taught appropriate sentence construction, grammar, and even diction.

Still, by displaying the table, it is possible to observe that some progress was made. The very first change will be the fact that now there are 25% people who achieved the 85 - 100 score range. This is a significant upward move within their critical thinking through recount text, since previously none of the students achieved the very good category. The next one with the highest number of students will be a good category, there are 21 or 52,5% students that got the 75 - 84 score range. Furthermore, 5 students (12,5%) only had satisfaction score ranges. However, this cycle is not exactly a successful one, since there were still 4 students who did not pass the test with the poor category. Luckily, this time none of the students were having a hard time and received very poor scores(Husda, Tampubolon, et al., 2022).

These difficulties may have resulted from difficulties in instituting peer editing via recount text. Even though peer editing has numerous advantages, it is still highly recommended. Peer feedback can also present challenges and disadvantages, including inconsistency, bias, and conflict. Given that not all colleagues have the same level of expertise, experience, and motivation, the quality and quantity of feedback can vary considerably. Some peers may be excessively harsh or excessively lenient, vague or specific, subjective or objective. Some classmates may have different expectations, preferences, or standards than you or your instructor, which may result in perplexity or discord. Some colleagues may be hesitant to provide or accept feedback, or they may react negatively or defensively to criticism or suggestions.

On the other side, recounting text to test one's critical thinking itself was found hard by the students. Some pupils were just not willing to pour their own ideas, rather they tend to copy their friends, or some just said they have no idea what to write. Since the teacher is the main role here,

they tend to just follow everything without having any full understanding which makes it hard for them to analyze and work creatively

Activity in Cycle 2

The second cycle must be put into action following a cycle's reflection because the first cycle failed to help students' pronunciation abilities. The reflection's goal was to assess the challenges and consider each situation. The same as the prior iteration, this task was finished in two 60-minute meetings. This cycle was meant to bring all of the peer editing actions for the recount text to a close. The process literature was given to the pupils once more, but this time the teacher went over all of the teachings on speech organs and sounds. At this point, the teacher asked the class to speak out and ask questions whenever they had concerns.

.

Categories	Score Range	Frequency	Percentages
Very Good	85-100	25	62,5%
Good	75-84	15	37,5%
Sufficient	60-74	0	0%
Poor	50-59	0	0%
Very Poor	0-49	0	0%
Total	: 40 students		

After evaluating the results of the first cycle, the second one was done. As was already said, the first cycle's goal of helping the pupils' pronunciation was not achieved. Consequently, the second cycle needs to be finished. Out of 40 pupils, 25 or 62.5 percent received extremely high score ranges, and 15 or 37.5% received good score ranges, according to the data. (Husda, Asmoro, et al., 2022) None of the pupils obtain adequate, subpar, or even really terrible grades.

The teacher's responsibility in this activity is to provide useful advice rather than to assess and decide the text's content. Students make

an effort to hear and record the teacher's suggestions. The most important thing is that the teacher made an effort to offer criticism and encourage dialogue among students while amending the work, even if the pupils rejected the suggestions. The more invested the students are in their argument and the audience's reaction, the more likely it is that they will pick up revising techniques. According to the definitions given above, peer editing is a practice in which students trade narrative texts or written assignments to be edited or reviewed by a classmate. Peer editors will make changes, comments, or arguments in response to the previous action. Peer editing in the classroom has been shown to be beneficial in other studies. A study that used peer teaching to enhance students' independent learning found that peer editing helped both the teacher and the students (Deni & Zainal, 2009). The teacher learned vital information from this method that she may use to enhance both the way she teaches recount texts and the practice the students receive with them.

Peer editing in the English classroom has been found to improve students' critical thinking, according to studies. Nearly all of them benefited from the addition of peer revision in their recount text lesson. They were told to analyze paragraphs more critically and write paragraphs more carefully. Additionally, this study found that using peer editing as a teaching strategy improved students' critical thinking. When analyzing and writing about texts, they were more critical. Forty students agreed that critical thinking should be stressed in narrative text classrooms based on their interviews with other students. The previous finding suggests that teaching narrative materials is a good fit for peer revision. It also supports the idea that teaching recount texts through peer editing can help students become better at writing them. Due to peer

editing activities being connected to the purpose of the recount text, students are able to write a paragraph that is effective.

Based on the description of recount text indicators that was previously supplied, it is assumed that peer editing will improve students' capacity to create recount texts. Because they will be more cognizant while writing recount texts, they will be more careful with punctuation, word choice, and grammar when writing a paragraph or text. By revising their friend's recount text, they will be trained and habituated to writing better. The writers can also improve their recalling texts after their partners have edited their original drafts. Berg's research findings from 2013 (Bertrand) that compare the impacts of trained peer mistake correction (peer editing) with the effects without peer error correction in two groups lend credence to this assertion. Although there were organizational issues and ineffective peer response mechanisms, the quality of the recount texts and revision techniques had improved.

5. CONCLUSION

During peer editing, students trade writing or papers to be edited or reviewed by a peer. In reaction to the previous behavior, the peer editor will edit, make a comment, or make an argument. Because editing a friend's writing can improve a student's own writing abilities, this strategy is ideal for use in writing classes. In order to write better texts, he will learn to evaluate and spot writing faults. Conceptualizing, analyzing, evaluating, making assessments and conclusions, and problem-solving are all components of critical thinking..

Since teaching students to be more critical when creating recount texts will strengthen their abilities, particularly their understanding of sentence-by-sentence composition, syntax, spelling, etc., teaching students to be more critical in their learning is equally crucial. Peer editing in

writing classes can help students' critical thinking skills when it comes to separating the components of challenging narrative texts. Peer editing, particularly in writing classes, can meet critical thinking requirements, which is why it happens. In order to help students write better, it can be inferred that they both want to encourage them to be more critical when examining, commenting on, and assessing a piece.

REFERENCES

Ainsai, S. & Poonlarp, T. (2017). More Heads Are Better Than One: Peer Editing in a Translation Classroom of Efl Learners. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, *54*(December), 82–107.

Amelia, D. A. (2020). The Influence Of Using Peer Editing Towards Students' Writing Ability In Recount Text At The First Semester Of Tenth Grade Of Sma Negeri 17 Bandar Lampung In The Academic Year Of 2019/2020. *Tarbiyah And Teacher Training Faculty State Islamic University Studies Of Raden Intan Lampung*, *21*(1), 1–9.

Bertrand, B. J. (2013). Peer Editing in Composition for Multilingual Writers at the College Level. *EWU Dgital Commons*.

Deni, A. R. M. & Zainal, Z. I. (2009). *Peer-Editing Practice in the Writing Classrooms: Benefits and drawbacks*.

Eman Mohamed, A.-H. & Hasnaa Sabry, A.-H. A. H. (2014). Using Digital Storytelling and Weblogs Instruction to Enhance EFL Narrative Writing and Critical Thinking Skills Among EFL Majors at Faculty of Education. *International Research Journal*, *5*(1), 8–41.

Mercedes, N. & Galvis, D. (2010). Peer Editing : a Strategic Source in EFLStudents ' Writing Process. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, *12*(12), 85–98.

Moleong, L. J. (2016). Metedologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Vol. 2448). *Kakek Nenek*.

Pharr, D. & Buscemi, S. V. (2005). *Writing today: Contexts and Options for the Real World*. McGraw-Hill Companies.

Tias, A. P. (2018). The Influence Of Using Peer Editing Technique Towards Students' Writing Ability In Descriptive Text At The Eighth

Grade Of SMP Negeri 1 Limau Tanggamus In The Academic Year Of 2018/2019. *Tarbiyah And Teacher Training Faculty University Of Islamic Studies Raden Intan Lampung 2018*.

Tompkins, G. E. (2003). *Teaching writing: Balancing process and product*. Macmillan College.

Asrul, N. & Husda, A. (2022). Enhancing Pronunciation Skills Through Phonetic Method. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *14*(3), 4167–4176. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i3.394

Fajriyani, T. N. (2011). *IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING ABILITY THROUGH CLUSTERING TECHNIQUE (A Classroom Action Research in the Second Year of SMP Al-Hasra Bojongsari-Depok)*.

Husda, A., Asmoro, Y., Simanullang, M. & Situngkir, N. L. B. (2022). Enhancing Student's Motivation Through Spada Moodle E-Learning. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, *8*(3), 201–208.

Husda, A., Tampubolon, W., Okta, S. & Sibarani, R. (2022). Language Literacy Enhancement Through Zoom Cloud Meeting. *Buana Pendidikan*, *18*(1), 153–163.