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THE EFFECT OF PEER CORRECTION AND TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON THE PARAGRAPH WRITING ABILITY AT THE THIRD SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAM OF STAIN PALANGKA RAYA

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study are (a) to measure the effect of peer correction on students’ paragraph writing ability, (b) to measure the effect of teacher written feedback on students’ paragraph writing ability and (c) to measure the effect of peer correction and teacher written feedback on students’ paragraph writing ability.

The type of study was counterbalanced design and the researcher used quantitative approach in finding out the answer of the problems of study. The sample of the study was all the C class students of the third semester students of English Study Program of STAIN Palangka Raya with the total number was 16 students. The sample of study is determined using population research. The subject was given pre-test before treatment. Then the student of experiment class was taught by using peer correction and teacher written feedback techniques. Finally, the writer gave post-test to experiment class. The writer used SPSS 17.0 calculation to test Inter Rater Coefficient and Correlation to test reliability of the study, Kolmogorov-Smirnov to test normality, Levene’s test to test homogeneity and two ways repeated-measured ANOVA to test hypotheses.

The result of testing reliability, it was found that the $r_{value}$ (0.988) was higher than $r_{table}$ (0.622), it meant that the instrument of this research could be used as the instrumentation of the study. Then the result of testing normality found $d_{value}$ was lower than $d_{table}$ ($0.147 < 0.327$), it could be concluded that the data was in normal distribution. The result of testing homogeneity showed the significant value $0.583$ was higher than significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, it could be concluded that the data were homogeneous. The result of two ways repeated-measured ANOVA with SPSS 17.0 calculation the result of first hypothesis, it was found that the value of ($F_{value}$) (20.058) was higher than $F_{table}$ at the level of df =$0.1$ was 4.54. It was interpreted that alternative hypothesis ($h_a$) stating that peer correction gave effect on the students’ score of writing paragraph was accepted and null hypothesis ($h_o$) was rejected. The result of second hypothesis, it was found that the value of ($F_{value}$) (11.396) was higher than $F_{table}$ at the level of df =$0.1$ was 4.54. It was interpreted that alternative hypothesis ($h_a$) stating that teacher written feedback gave effect on the students’ score of writing paragraph was accepted and null hypothesis ($h_o$) was rejected. The result of third hypothesis, it was found that the value of ($F_{value}$) (22.781) was higher than $F_{table}$ at the level of df =$0.1$ was 4.54. It
was interpreted that alternative hypothesis (hₐ) stating that teacher written feedback gave effect on the students’ score of writing paragraph was accepted and null hypothesis (h₀) was rejected. It meant that both of peer correction and teacher written feedback techniques gave effect on the students’ paragraph writing ability at the third semester students of English study program of STAIN Palangka Raya.

**Key terms:** Peer Correction, Teacher Written Feedback and Paragraph Writing
PENGARUH KOREKSI TEMAN DAN KOREKSI TERTULIS GURU
PADA KEMAMPUAN MENULIS PARAGRAF PADA MAHASISWA
SEMESTER TIGA PROGRAM STUDI BAHASA INGGRIS STAIN
PALANGKA RAYA

ABSTRAK

Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah (a) untuk mengukur pengaruh koreksi teman pada kemampuan mahasiswa menulis paragraf, (b) untuk mengukur pengaruh umpan balik tertulis guru pada kemampuan mahasiswa menulis paragraf dan (c) untuk mengukur pengaruh koreksi teman dan umpan balik tertulis guru pada kemampuan mahasiswa menulis paragraf.


Hasil uji reliabilitas, ditemukan bahwa nilai $p_{hitung}$ (0,988) lebih tinggi dari $r_{table}$ (0,622), itu berarti bahwa instrumen ini dapat digunakan sebagai instrumen penelitian. Kemudian hasil pengujian normalitas nilai yang ditemukan $d_{value}$ lebih rendah dari $d_{table}$ (0,148 <0,327), dapat disimpulkan bahwa data dalam distribusi normal. Hasil pengujian homogenitas menunjukkan nilai yang signifikan (0,583) lebih tinggi dari tingkat signifikansi $\alpha = 0,05$, maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa data tersebut homogen. Hasil dua arah pengukuran-berulang ANOVA dengan SPSS 17,0 perhitungan hasil hipotesis pertama, ditemukan bahwa nilai ($F_{hitung}$) (20,058) lebih tinggi dari $F_{table}$ pada tingkat df = 0,1 adalah 4,54. Itu diartikan bahwa hipotesis alternatif ($h_a$) menyatakan bahwa koreksi teman memberi efek pada skor mahasiswa dalam menulis paragraf diterima dan hipotesis nol ($h_0$) ditolak. Hasil hipotesis kedua, ditemukan bahwa nilai ($F_{hitung}$) (11,396) lebih tinggi dari $F_{table}$ pada tingkat df = 0,1 adalah 4,54. Itu diartikan bahwa hipotesis alternatif ($h_a$) menyatakan bahwa umpan balik tertulis guru memberi efek pada skor mahasiswa dalam menulis paragraf diterima dan hipotesis nol ($h_0$) ditolak. Hasil hipotesis ketiga, ditemukan bahwa nilai ($F_{hitung}$) (22,781) lebih tinggi dari $F_{table}$ pada tingkat
df = 0,1 adalah 4,54. Itu diartikan bahwa hipotesis alternatif (hₐ) menyatakan bahwa umpan balik guru tertulis memberi efek pada skor mahasiswa dalam menulis paragraf diterima dan hipotesis nol (h₀) ditolak. Ini berarti bahwa antara kedua teknik koreksi teman dan umpan balik tertulis guru memberikan pengaruh pada kemampuan menulis paragraf pada mahasiswa semester tiga program studi bahasa Inggris STAIN Palangka Raya.

Istilah kunci: Koreksi Teman, Umpan Balik Tertulis Guru dan Menulis Paragraph.
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