



Assessing the impact of freewriting and peer editing techniques on writing skills: An experimental study on personal recount texts in the context of education

Irma Widyawati^{1,*}

¹ English Education Study Program, Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiya and Teacher Training, UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Central Java 53126, Indonesia.

*Correspondence: irmaw03862@gmail.com

Received Date: December 6, 2024

Revised Date: January 30, 2025

Accepted Date: January 30, 2025

ABSTRACT

Background: Writing plays a crucial role in helping students communicate their ideas in various situations. However, tenth-grade students at SMA N 1 Wanadadi face challenges in writing, such as a lack of vocabulary and difficulties understanding grammar and text structure. This study aimed to assess the effectiveness of Free Writing and Peer-Editing techniques in improving students' ability to write personal recount texts. **Methods:** This research utilized an experimental design with a quantitative approach. The population consisted of 360 tenth-grade students at SMA N 1 Wanadadi, with XA class as the experimental group and XB class as the control group. Data were collected using pretests and post-tests in written form. The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 23. **Findings:** The results of the t-test showed that t count (6.319) was greater than the t value (2.030), and the significance (Sig = 0.000) was less than 0.050. This indicates that the Null Hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the Alternative Hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, proving that Free Writing and Peer-Editing techniques effectively enhance students' ability to write personal recount texts. **Conclusion:** The use of Free Writing and Peer-Editing techniques is effective in improving the tenth-grade students' ability to write personal recount texts at SMA N 1 Wanadadi Banjarnegara. **Novelty/Originality of this Study:** This study contributes to the body of knowledge by demonstrating the effectiveness of Free Writing and Peer-Editing techniques in a high school setting, specifically for students struggling with writing personal recount texts. The combination of these two techniques offers a practical approach to enhancing writing skills in a classroom where students face language-related difficulties.

KEYWORDS: freewriting; peer editing; writing personal recount text.

1. Introduction

One of the four competence that has become crucial to the fundamental study of English is writing. Rao. (2019) state that "writing is considered the most difficult skill among the four skills and the ELLs (English language learners) need to spend more time to practice it. Whatever ideas the learners get into their mind, immediately they have to note them down and later organize these ideas whenever they wish to write something. As there is no correspondence between the spelling and pronunciation of the English, the ELLs get confused in writing the correct spelling of the words. Moreover, the learners need to organize all the points in a systematic way when they aim at writing a good text. As writing involves more practice and commitment, the English teachers should apply several

Cite This Article:

Widyawati, I. (2025). The effectiveness of freewriting and peer editing techniques on writing personal recount text of the tenth grade students in SMAN 1 Wanadadi Banjarnegara. *Asian Journal Collaboration of Social Environmental and Education*, 2(2), 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.61511/ajcsee.v2i2.2025.1456>

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. This article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



techniques such as group and pair works so that the learners can discuss their points with the others and develop their writing skills enormously in the ELL environment.” (Rao, 2019). Even though writing comes as the last skill, it can’t be neglected and needs a lot of attention from the teacher and the student because it is necessary in daily academic life. Students are expected to learn how to be good writers. If they can’t write correctly and logically using appropriate language and style, life will be difficult for them not only at school but in adult life (Rajesh, 2017).

Writing can help students to communicate in everyday situations. Through writing, the students can express their opinions or ideas into writing form (Soanti & Bunau, 2015). Writing skills are a way to express one's thoughts and feelings on paper. As a result, every text, whether it is academic and non-academic are written in English. In other words, writing skill is increasingly becoming a required subject for students to study (Rajesh, 2017). In summary, by mastering writing skills, students can communicate with others by sharing information, thoughts, experiences, or ideas in written form.

On the other hand, students find it difficult to express ideas in the written form. Most students are unable to distinguish the form of a paragraph in writing and correctly identify the main idea, topic sentence, supporting sentences, and concluding sentence. As a result, they received a low writing score. This is supported by Sabiq that usually, writing is complicated and challenging. In reality, students don't understand how to make a choice of words and bring words together (Sabiq, 2021). Students often have many basic mistakes in written works about spelling, grammar, punctuation and organization. Besides that, learning writing at high school have many problems at the present such as lack of experienced writing skill teacher and lack of time to study, the time for teaching writing skill is not enough for students to improve their ability and students do not know principles of writing. Furthermore, according to empirical research by Abdullah in (Sartika & Arriyani, 2020) argued that students are rarely given the opportunity to practice writing, so their exposure to writing skills is limited. It can be concluded that students who learn English still have writing problems, such as difficulty expressing their ideas, lack self-confidence, have inadequate linguistic competence (vocabulary, spelling, and grammar), and have limited time to practice writing in the classroom. It causes students unable to write. When students begin to write, they may suddenly become blank and have nothing to write. This is one of the reasons students find it difficult to begin writing. It is supported by Sari & Al-Hafizh in (Fairuza, 2020) who state that as the newbie, students are usually confused and face difficulties by doing their first paragraph of recount text. It is because the students cannot choose the idea about the text students are going to write (Husna & Multazim, 2019).

In order to reduce students' difficulties in writing, there are two techniques that can be applied for students. The technique called “Free Writing and Peer Editing Technique”. Freewriting, or quick writing, is often used in the classroom as a pre-writing activity (Park, 2022). Elbow found that an activity that can help students learn simply is free writing, where free writing is done without having to worry about using good or correct words. It is supported by Bello who stated that practice is one-way to improve writing skill. Here, the practice will be conducted in form of free writing activity. Whatever the students write about, it is easy to start although the students write about their experience or short story or telling story (Isnai, 2018). Freewriting, like brainstorming, is a useful way for students to simply start the “flow” of writing, unfettered by the potential of being judged for ungrammaticalities, incorrect spelling, or fuzzy thinking (Brown, 2015). The important ones they can start to write. In summary, Freewriting is a simple technique for assisting students in expressing themselves through writing, and it is hoped that it can give students a good start in writing.

After doing Free Writing, the next step is Peer editing. After free writing, students are guided not to care the writing mistakes they make, so it would be better if they knew their writing mistakes through peer-editing. This is supported by another research who claims that mind develops through one's interaction with the world around him/her. He emphasizes that learning is not an individual activity; but rather a cognitive activity that the nature of learning shifts the focus on learning from individual to the interaction within

a social context. Thereby, peer interaction is cardinal to the improvement of students' learning, because it allows students to construct knowledge through social sharing and interaction (Bijami et al., 2013). So, Peer-editing are designed to help the students become a better writer. In this Peer-Editing process, students will check and correct their classmate's writing. The aim is for them to know their mistakes in writing and then correct them. According to Hussain, peer editing is an interactive process of reading and commenting on a classmate's writing (Hussain, 2023). In addition, Bijami et al. (2013) stated that students' development in increasing their knowledge through providing opportunities for critical thinking, and increasing their independence in writing can be obtained through peer-editing. It is noteworthy that peer editing has come to take an important part in writing instruction because it provides a flexible platform to help students writing practice (Bijami et al., 2013).

Thus, the researcher is interested in applying the free writing and peer editing techniques to write recount text. This is because both of them has some benefits in teaching writing. According to Li (2007), Free writing served a useful thinking tool for exploration and understanding of what is required in academic writing and what is entailed for the writing process. Students recognised the value of exercise and taking time to go through the writing process. Also, freewriting can improve students' self-confidence while doing their writing. In relation to the preceding statement, freewriting can serve as training or warm-up for students when it comes to writing, which is especially useful for beginners who want to share their knowledge through writing (Li, 2007). In addition, feedback is a key element in language learning. It can promote minimal or deep learning (Bijami et al., 2013). The feedback here is peer editing that plays an important role in the writing process. Hyland writes that peer-editing helps the students and makes the students aware of their reader when they write and make revision. In addition, peer-editing also helps the students become more sensitive to problems in their writing and more confident in correcting them (Fajri et al., 2015).

Based on preliminary studies at SMAN 1 Wanadadi on March 29 2023, an English teacher said that the students' writing ability in learning English were various. Some students could understand quickly, some were slow, and some were very slow. The teacher said that it was because the students have lacks of vocabularies, did not understand the grammar and structure of the text. That is because of the heterogeneous backgrounds of students. Then, that situations made the students have lack on writing ability. In addition, based on students' writing results on the pre-test, it was found that the students were still not proficient in writing. That is, they have not paid attention to the structure of the text. Some of them even only one paragraph during writing activity. This indicates that they are still confused about developing ideas in writing, in other words their writing does not have any variations. This research aims to know the effectiveness of free writing and peer-editing technique of students' ability in write recount text at SMAN 1 Wanadadi. Based on the explanation above, the researcher intended in conducting the effectiveness of free writing and peer-editing techniques on writing recount text of the tenth grade students in SMAN 1 Wanadadi Banjarnegara.

1.1 Freewriting

According to Nunan (2003), writing is both a physical and a mental act. At the most basic level, writing is the physical act of committing words or ideas to some medium, whether it is hieroglyphics inked onto parchment or an e-mail message typed into a computer. On the other hand, writing is the mental work of inventing ideas, thinking about how to express them, and organizing them into statements and paragraphs that will be clear to a reader (Nunan, 2003). Hussain state that writing is a process not a product, which means that a piece of writing is never complete; it is always possible to review and revise, and review and revise again (Oshima & Hogue, 1999). In summary, writing is the act of physical and a mental in processing a piece of text. When we write, we do more than just put words

together to make sentences. Good writers go through several steps to produce a piece of writing (Zemach & Rumisek, 2006).

According to Titisari in (Ma'rufah et al., 2021), free writing is provided when teacher only gives the title and everything is done by the students. Freewriting is a technique to write quickly from ten to fifteen minutes that makes students write whatever comes into their head without stopping, worrying about grammar, spelling, organization or even making basic sense (Li, 2007). Hasim (2017) state that, free writing calls "Writing Without Form". Writing without form is writing from one's own mind. The results of the writing may not be in accordance with the form of writing in a particular genre, which is important to write itself, to write freely all thoughts that come to mind without fear.

Peer-editing is a technique to edit and evaluate a student's writing done by the other student or peer. In short, it can be called as editing peer's writing by the other peer (Hidayat & Faridah, 2015). There are some benefits of peer-editing, such as; When students learn together with their friends, it encouraged the students to learn from each other. It means that if one student as an editor can explain mistakes of their writing to their friends by using their own way with the simple language and their friend will understand. It helps the students to revise and improve their writing when peers were able to provide concrete suggestions for revision (Tufliha, 2021). Peer editing also required students to engage in a number of cognitive processes such as reflection, analysis, and reviewing. In peer editing, learning is seen as a dynamic process in which learners themselves are actively involved, in which implementing cooperative work promotes discussion and sharing of ideas among students (Galvis, 2010). Peer editing also frames a self-awareness in student's writing. Peer editing brings positive thing for students, in case they will be aware to their friends writing assignment although they will just criticize it and students will try their best to revise their own works to avoid "constructive criticism" from their peer (Fajri et al., 2015). In summary, the benefits of peer-editing are student can learn from each other, engaged students in a series of cognitive processes, and frames a self-awareness in student's writing.

Peer editing, on the other hand, has significant drawbacks. It needs practice, and it should introduce a new skill that requires practice in order to be effective. Students must be taught how to critique their peers' writing. Because the first-year program begins too soon, students argue that they do not know enough about legal writing to be good peer editors. Some students do not benefit from peer editing; outliers-those at the opposite ends of the normal distribution-often gain the least from teaching strategies like peer editing. The best students discover that revising the work of bad writers provides little benefit to them. In other words, the difficulties of peer editing can be seen that the students on the first year is difficult to practice because they do not know enough to review their peer's text, so that peer-editing requires training

2. Methods

This research used a quantitative approach and Experimental method. In this case the experimental research needs 2 classes, one class designated as the experimental class, and the other as the control class; both have the same ability and level. Both classes were given pre-test and post-test questions to investigate the effectiveness of free writing and peer-editing technique (X) and student's ability in writing recount text (Y). This research was taken at SMAN 1 Wanadadi which is located on Jalan Raya, Tapen Jurang, Tapen, Kec. Wanadadi, Kab. Banjarnegara, Jawa Tengah 53461. The reason of researcher to take place on this school is because some of the student at SMAN 1 Wanadadi have a difficultness in writing. Based on students work in writing activity, some students had less vocabulary, less mastery of grammar, and did not pay attention to text structure. Therefore, the researcher used Free writing and Peer-editing techniques to find out its effectiveness in students' ability to write personal recount texts. The population of this study were all 10th grade students at SMAN 1 Wanadadi. The 10th grade of SMAN 1 Wanadadi consist of ten classes (10A-10J) with a total of 360 students.

Independent variables are often referred to as *stimulus, predictor, antecedent variable*. The independent variable is a variable that influences or causes the change or the emergence of the dependent variable (Sugiyono, 2019). Usually, independent variable is denoted by the letter X. The independent variable (X) in this study is "Free Writing and Peer-editing Techniques". The dependent variable is often referred to as the output, criterion, consequence variable. The dependent variable is the variable that is affected or is the result, because of the independent variables (Sugiyono, 2019). Usually, dependent variable is denoted by the letter Y. The dependent variable (Y) in this study is "Students' ability in writing Personal Recount Text". Based on the description above, this research examines two variables: Free Writing and Peer-Editing Techniques (variable X) and students' ability in writing Personal Recount Text (variable Y).

This study uses two techniques in data collection, namely Pre- test, Post-test and also a Treatment. Instrument testing is used to obtain data from the experimental class and control class. In quantitative research, data analysis is an activity after data from all respondents or other data sources have been collected. Data analysis techniques in quantitative research use statistics (Sugiyono, 2019).

Expert validity used in this research, was judged a lecturer of UIN Prof. K. H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto. The validity of Free Writing and Peer-editing Techniques instrument (presented in appendix) showed that the questions were considered valid. The normality test is important requirements that may be followed while analysing the study data. It was done to determine whether or not the distribution of data was normal. In this study, the normality test was analysed using Kolmogorov- Smirnov and SPSS version 23 software. If the normality score is higher than 0,05, the data distribution is considered to be normal. On the other hand, if the normality test score is less than 0.05, it is possible that the data distribution is not normal.

The homogeneity test was used to determine whether or not the data from the two groups included the same variation. This type of test, like the normality test, made use of SPSS version 23 software. The Levene Statistic with $\alpha = 0.05$ is used in this study. If the homogeneity score was more than 0,05, the data was regarded to be homogeneous. T-test is used to know the effect of using freewriting and Peer-editing techniques on students' writing Personal Recount Text. The t-test was used by the researcher to determine whether the null hypothesis or alternative hypothesis should be accepted or rejected. The t-test used in this study is a Paired Sample T-test with a two-tailed significance test. The criteria for rejecting or not rejecting H_0 based on the p-value are as follows: If the p-value or sig (2-tailed) is higher than the significance level of sig = 0.05 (5%), the null hypothesis is accepted. On the other hand, if the p-value is less than sig = 0.05 (5%), the alternative hypothesis is accepted (Jainuri, 2019). T-test analysed by using SPSS version 23 software.

3. Results and Discussion

The following is analysis data from the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental class and control class. The data has been analysed using the normality test, homogeneity test, and t-test.

3.1 Normality test

The results of the pre-test and post-test experimental class, as well as the control class, were used to generate the normality test data. If the significance value of the normality result is higher than 0,05, it can be concluded that the data distribution is normal. Meanwhile, if the score of normality test shows less than 0,05, it can be concluded that the data distributions is not normal. The result of normality test as follows.

Table 1. The result of normality test

	Class	Kolmogorov- Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Students' ability in writing personal recount text	Pre-test Experimental Class	0.141	36	0.068	0.951	36	0.111
	Post-test Experimental Class	0.141	36	0.068	0.951	36	0.111
	Pre-test Control Class	0.117	36	0.200*	0.932	36	0.029
	Post-test Control Class	0.118	36	0.200*	0.951	36	0.115

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors significance correction

According to the normality table, it can be state that the data is normally distributed. The significance value of the pre-test in the experimental class is 0.68, and the pre-test in the control class is 0.200. Then, the significance value in the post test in the experimental class is 0.68 and in the control class is 0.200. All of the data indicates that the probability value is more than 0.05. As a result, the data is normally distributed.

3.2 Homogeneity test

The Homogeneity test was designed to determine whether or not the data from the experimental and control classes were homogenous (equal). In this study, the researcher used the Levene Statistic to scale the homogeneity test of both the experimental and control classes. The result of homogeneity test as follows.

Table 2. The result of homogeneity test

		Levene statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Student's ability in writing personal recount text	Based on mean	0.014	1	70	0.905
	Based on median	0.036	1	70	0.850
	Based on median and with adjusted df	0.036	1	69.86	0.850
	Based on trimmed mean	0.015	1	70	0.904

According to the Table 2 above, the significance level in the row based on mean column Sig is 0.905. Because Sig > 0.05, it can be said that the variance of the two groups of data is the same or homogeneous.

3.3 T-test

The t-test was performed by the researcher to assess whether the null hypothesis or alternative hypothesis should be accepted or rejected. If Sig > 0.05 then H₀ is accepted and H_a is rejected. If Sig < 0.05 then H₀ is rejected and H_a is accepted. The result of T-test as follows.

3.3.1 Paired sample T-test of experimental class

T-test of data Pre-test and Post-test of the experimental class is to know the differences in the ability of the students in writing personal recount text using Free writing and Peer-editing techniques. The t-test of the pre-test and post-test in the experimental class is shown in the following table.

Table 3. The result of paired sample statistics of experimental class

	Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pre-test experimental class	57.22	36	10.313	1.719
Post-test experimental class	72.22	36	10.313	1.719

The descriptive analysis of the processed data is described in the paired sample group statistics table. The mean score of the pre-test found in the table 57.22 in experimental class and the mean score of the post-test is 72.22. N indicates there are 36 data. The standard deviation was used to calculate the degree of risk, which is 10,313 in the experimental class's pre-test and 10.313 in the experimental class's post-test. The standard error mean was used to examine how well the average data from the sample data can estimate the population mean for each variable.

The experimental class's standard error mean in the pre-test and post-test is 1.719. Because the data was normally distributed, the std error mean may be ignored. Based on the pre-test and post-test mean, it is reasonable to believe that the post-test on the data is higher than the pre-test. Because the average (mean) post-test score is 72.22 from 36 data points, and the data distribution (standard deviation) obtained is 10,313 with a standard error mean of 1.719. It indicates that the post-test on the data is higher the pre-test.

Table 4. The result of paired sample statistics of control class

Paired differences							
Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
			Lower	upper			
-15.000	14.243	2.374	-19.819	-10.181	-6.319	35	0.000

The Table 4. above shows that the results of the paired sample test in the experimental class, $t = -6.319$ with $df = 35$ at a significance level of 0,05. Then $\text{Sig (2-tailed)} = 0.000 < 0.05$. From the result, it can be said that at a significance level of 0,05 H_0 is rejected and H_a is Accepted. The above table's output includes information on the mean paired differences, which is -15.000. This value represents the difference between the average pre-test and post-test outcomes for the experimental class. It can be written ($57.22 - 72.22 = -15.000$), and the difference is between -19.819 to -10.181 (95% Confidence Interval of the difference lower and upper).

Based on the table above, it is found that the t count is negative, which is -6.319. This negative t count occurs because the pre-test mean value is lower than the post-test mean value. In this case, a negative t count might be positive. So, the value of the t count becomes 6.319. Next, found of the t table, which searches the t-table based on the df value and the significance value ($\alpha/2$). The value of df is 35 and the value of $0.05/2$ is 0.025. This number serves as the starting point for locating the t table in the distribution of the t statistical table. Then, based on df 35 and the value of 0.025 found that the t-table value is 2.030. Thus, because $t \text{ count } 6.319 > t \text{ table } 2.030$, it can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. It can be concluded that there is an average difference between the pre-test and post-test results.

3.3.2 Paired sample T-test of control class

The aim of t-test of data Pre-test and Post-test of the control class is to know differences in the ability of the students in writing personal recount text using conventional learning. The t-test summary of the results of the pre-test and post-test in the control class is shown in the following table.

Table 5. The result of paired sample statistics of experimental class

		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Pre-test control class	60.42	36	9.664	1.611
	Post-test control class	67.22	36	10.382	1.730

According to the table, the mean of the pre-test in the control class is 60.42 and the mean score of the post-test is 67.22. N indicates there are 36 data. The standard deviation was used to measure the level of risk, which in the pre-test of the control class is 9.664 and

the standard deviation in the post-test of the control class is 10.382. The standard error mean in the pre-test is 1.611, while post-test is 1.730. Based on the pre-test and post-test mean, it can be assumed that the post-test on the data is higher than the pre-test. Because the average score(mean) of the post-test is 67.22 from 36 data, and the distribution of data(Std. Deviation) obtained is 10,382 with a standard error mean of 1.730. It means that the post-test on the data is higher than the pre-test.

Table 6. The result of paired sample statistics of control class

Paired differences							
Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean	95% confidence interval of the difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
			Lower	upper			
-6.806	13.264	2.211	-11.293	-2.318	-3.079	35	.0004

Based on the Table 6 above, the results of the paired sample test in the experimental class, $t = -3.079$ with $df = 35$. Then, $\text{Sig (2-tailed)} = 0.004 < 0.05$. From the result, it can be said that at a significance level of 0,05 H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted. In other words, there was a difference in the pre- test and post-test scores in the control class. The mean paired differences are -6,806. This value shows the difference between the control class's average pre- test and post-test results. It can be written ($60.42 - 67.22 = -6.806$), and the difference is between -11.293 to -2.318 (95% confidence interval of the difference lower and upper). Based on the output of the table above, it is known that the t count is negative, which is -3.079. This negative t count is caused because the mean value of the pre-test results is lower than the mean post-test results. In a case like this, a negative t count can be positive. So, the value of the t count becomes 3.079. Next, found of the t table, which searches the t-table based on the df value and the significance value ($\alpha/2$). The value of df is 35 and the value of $0.05/2$ is 0.025. We use this value as the basis of reference in finding the t table in the distribution of the t statistical table. Then look up the t-table value based on df 35 and the value of α 0.025, so the t-table is 2.030.

Thus, because $t \text{ count } 3.079 > t \text{ table } 2.030$ as a basis for the above decision. It can be concluded that there is an average difference between the pre-test and post-test results, which means that there is an effect towards student writing personal recount text at SMAN 1 Wanadadi using conventional approach.

This research was conducted at SMAN 1 Wanadadi. The objective of this research is to find out the effectiveness of Free Writing and Peer-Editing Techniques on students' ability in writing personal recount text of the tenth grades students in SMAN 1 Wanadadi. Researcher used a quantitative approach and quasi experimental method. The method chosen is to compare the differences in writing ability between students in class XA as experimental class and use free writing and peer-editing techniques during learning activities, with XB as control class, who did not use freewriting and peer-editing techniques during learning activity.

At the beginning, the students of experiment and control class was tested using pre-test to know their ability in writing personal recount text before treatment. The question from the pre-test given was to create a personal recount text by choosing one of two themes determined by the researcher. Previously, the questions from the pre-test given had been validated by expert judgement, who is one of the lectures of UIN Prof. K. H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto. After pre-test, the researcher applied free-writing and peer-editing techniques in experimental class 3 times, while in control class was use conventional learning. Then, after 3 times of treatment, researcher gave post-test to experiment and control class. The instruction of the question was same as pre-test, but the theme is different.

The researcher analysed normality and homogeneity test from the data of pre-test of experiment and control class using the IBM SPSS statistics 23 program. The results of this analysis show that the data is normally distributed and homogeneous. The significance value of the pre-test in the experimental class is 0.68, and the pre-test in the control class is 0.200. For the significance value in the post test, it can be seen that in the experimental class

is 0,68 and in the control class is 0.200. The data shows that the probability value is more than 0,05 and it can be concluded that the data was normally distributed. Then, the homogeneity test shows that the significance level in the row based on mean column Sig is 0.905. Because $\text{Sig} > 0.05$, it can be concluded that the variance of the two groups of data is the same or homogeneous.

After completing the normality and homogeneity test, the researcher used T-test to test the hypothesis using IBM SPSS 23 program. The researcher used paired-sample t-test. The result of paired sample t-test show that the mean of experimental class was 57.22 on the pre-test and the post-test 72.22 with the 36 data. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 10.313, and the post-test also 10.313. Std. Error mean on pre-test and post-test was 1.719. The mean of control class in the paired sample statistical table of pre-test was 60,42 and the post test was 67.22 with 36 data. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 9.664 and the post-test was. Std error mean of pre-test was 10.382 and the post test was 1.611 and 1.730. Therefore, the mean of the pre-test and post-test of experiment and control class can be assumed that it is different. It can be seen in mean difference on Table 4, that the increase in the experimental class is 15.000 while the increase in the control class is 6.806 (see Table 4.). In other words, there is an increase in scores in both classes which can be seen from Mean Difference. If the mean difference are compared, the increase in scores is more significant in the experimental class than in the control class. In conclusion, using free writing and peer-editing techniques in writing personal recount text is more effective than without free writing and peer editing techniques.

Moreover, in experimental class obtained $\text{Sig} (2\text{-tailed}) = 0.000 < 0.05$ which means that at a significance level of 0.05 H_0 is rejected and H_a is Accepted. The df of experimental class was 35, it means that the t- table is 2,030. The t-count was 6.319. From that, $t \text{ count } 6.319 > t \text{ table } 2.030$. It can be concluded that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Besides, in control class obtained $\text{Sig} (2\text{-tailed}) = 0.004 < 0.05$. The df of control class was 35, it means that t-table is 2,030. The t-count was 3.079. Because $t \text{ count } 3,079 > t \text{ table } 2.030$, it can be said that there is an average difference between the pre-test and post-test results of control class. Although the experiment and control classes H_a were accepted, it can be noticed the difference between the t-count and t-table in the experimental class and control class. There was differences or effect that in the experimental class, which was higher than the control class. It can be concluded that the class that received freewriting and peer-editing techniques was more influential than the class that did not receive it.

Thus, Free writing and peer-editing technique helps students to elaborate their writing ability. This is in accordance with several literature reviews in this research, like Nurfiryalianti and Jamaluddin (2014) who stated that Freewriting helps students to improve writing in a formal way. According to Brown (2004, Free writing makes students start the "flow" of writing, unfettered by the potential of being judged for ungrammaticalities, incorrect spelling, or fuzzy thinking. Elbow (1998) also state that Freewriting can help students learn simply to get on writing and not be held by worries about whether they use good words or right words. In addition, the researcher applied peer-editing that help the students become a better writer. As Binjami (2013) said that Peer editing on writing develops students to improve their knowledge through providing opportunities to think critically, and to improve their autonomy. Hyland (2004) also state that Peer-editing can helps the students and makes the students aware of their reader when they write and make revision. The statements above have been proven in this research, where the use of Freewriting and Peer-editing techniques in writing is effectively used.

Besides, during freewriting and peer-editing activity, researcher found that the students enjoyed the activity and said if free writing and peer-editing is easy to do, but sometimes students confused about what they will write and unable to edit their friend's writing. This is as stated by Hedge (2000) that as one of the type of writings, free writing seems easier to be practiced. Indeed, it consists of a number of steps to be concerned to produce ideas that is very beneficial for writing. One of the hardest tasks in writing is getting started. What make the writing skill, in general, becomes more difficult to be applied is that its components that should be seriously alert by the writer. In addition, the first-year

program is too soon, it means that the students complain that they do not know enough about legal writing to be capable peer editors. That is why Peer-editing is sometimes difficult to practice, especially in the first year of high school.

Previous study also supports the results of this research. Based on previous study in the second chapter, the first study was done by Isni about *Free Writing Technique in Teaching Writing Skill in EFL Classroom*, where the results of the research were significantly effective in teaching writing in EFL classroom. The second previous study was conducted by Tufliha (2021) on the effect of using peer editing to improve students' writing ability among eighth-grade students at Junior High School 8 Bukittinggi in the 2018/2019 academic year. The study found that incorporating peer editing in writing yielded better results compared to not using peer editing. The third previous study was written by Alharthi (2021), the result of this study according to the analysis, students in the freewriting program acquired better grammar acquisition than the control group, and the students can improve their writing skill. The fourth previous study was conducted by Galvis (2010), which examined the role of peer editing as a strategic tool in the EFL students' writing process. The findings indicate that during peer-editing sessions, students created zones of proximal development, where high-achieving students provided linguistic scaffolding and empowered lower-achieving peers. Additionally, the study revealed that students employed cognitive strategies, such as noticing and explaining, when identifying errors related to the formal aspects of the language. The last previous study, was written by Lestari et al. (2022). The results of this study prove that free-writing method can improve reading and writing skills in learning English in descriptive text learning material. In summary, all previous studies accommodate this research, where freewriting and peer-editing techniques are effective in writing.

4. Conclusions

This research examined the effectiveness of Freewriting and Peer-Editing Techniques on students' ability in writing Personal Recount Text of the tenth grades students in SMAN 1 Wanadadi Banjarnegara. The data was obtained using pre-test and post-test. Researcher also used two classes as research objects, namely the experimental class and the control class, where pre-test and post-test have been given to both classes. The data obtained was processed using IBM SPSS statistics 23. Researcher used normality test and the result was data normality distributed. Then, the researcher used homogeneity test, and the result was data is homogeneous. The last is t-test to assess whether the null hypothesis or alternative hypothesis should be accepted or rejected.

Based on the results of data processing, it was found that the pre-test and post-test results in the experimental class and control class both had increased scores. However, the increase in value shown by the mean differences in the experimental class was higher than in the control class. The mean difference of experimental class is 15.0, while in control class is 6.8. Moreover, the result of the t-test on experimental class shows that $t_{\text{count}} 6.319 > t_{\text{value}} 2.030$ and then $\text{Sig (2-tailed)} = 0.000 < 0.050$. Therefore, the statistical hypothesis implied that the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected and the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted. From the statement before, it can be concluded that using free writing and peer-editing techniques on students' ability in writing personal recount text of the tenth grades students in SMAN 1 Wanadadi is effective.

Acknowledgement

Appreciation and gratitude are extended to the reviewers for their constructive feedback and to the editorial team for their dedication in editing and publishing this article.

Author Contribution

I.W. has fully contributed to the writing of this article, from the thematic planning process to the final stage of publication.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Ethical Review Board Statement

Not available.

Informed Consent Statement

Not available.

Data Availability Statement

Not available.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declare no conflict of interest.

Open Access

©2025. The author. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

References

- Alharthi, S. (2021). From instructed writing to free-writing: A study of EFL learners. *SAGEOpen*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211007112>
- Bijami, M., Kashef, S. H., & Nejad, M. S. (2013). Peer feedback in learning english writing: Advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(4), 91. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v3i4.4314>
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/writing-without-teachers-9780195120165>
- Fairuza, A. (2020). *The effect of using freewriting technique on students' writing in recount text (A quasi-experimental study at the eight grade of MTs Al-Ikhlas Jakarta in academic year 2019/2020)* (Bachelor's thesis, Jakarta: FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta).
- Fajri, H. M., Inderawati, R., & Mirizon, S. (2015). The implementation of peer editing technique to improve students' writing achievement. *Journal of English Literacy Education*, 2(2), 48-57. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.4630310202>
- Galvis, N. M. D. (2010). Peer editing: A strategic source in EFL students' writing process. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 12(1), 85-98. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3057/305726658006.pdf>
- Hasim, H. (2017). *Free writing: Menulis Untuk mengejar Kebahagiaan*. B First.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Hidayat, Y., & Faridah, D. (2013). Peer-editing: A strategy to enhance EFL students' paragraph development. *(A Case Study Conducted at English Education Program of Galuh University)*.

- Husna, A., & Multazim, A. (2019). Students' difficulties in writing recount text at inclusion classes. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 9(1), 52-76. <https://doi.org/10.18592/let.v9i1.3077>
- Hussain, S. A. (2023). Introduction to academic writing course (MBBS). *Advances in Politics and Economics*, 6(1), 27-53. <https://doi.org/10.22158/ape.v6n1p27>
- Isni, P. (2018). Free writing technique in teaching writing skill in EFL classroom. *VELESVoices of English Language Education Society*, 2(1), 45– 53. <https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v2i1.608>
- Jainuri, M. (2019). *Pengantar aplikasi komputer (SPSS)*. Hira Institute.
- Lestari, R., Iskandar, I., & Fatmasari, E. (2022). Metode *free writing* untuk meningkatkan kemampuan reading dan writing teks deskriptif mata pelajaran bahasa inggris pada siswa kelas vii SMP Muhammadiyah Sewon Kab. Bantul Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran*, 4(2), 33-42. <https://ejournal-jp3.com/index.php/Pendidikan/article/view/154/135>
- Li, L. Y. (2007). Exploring the use of focused freewriting in developing academic writing. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 4(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.4.1.5>
- Ma'rufah, D. W., Mufliah, M., & Awaliyah, U. (2021). Need analysis on writing skill: What do the students really need for writing course?. *Tarling : Journal of Language Education*, 5(1), 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.24090/tarling.v5i1.4984>
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588214>
- Nurfiryalianti., & Jamiluddin, H. (2014). Improving writing skill by using free writing. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society (ELTS)*, 2(3), 1–15.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English*. Perason Education.
- Park, J. (2022). Preservice Teachers' L2 Writing Anxiety and Their Perceived Benefits of Freewriting: A Case Study. *English Teaching*, 77, 63-77. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.s1.202209.63>.
- Rajesh, D. (2017). Teaching writing: The problems encountered by the rural students. *Research journal of English (RJOE)*, 2(3), 134-137.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The significance of writing skills in ell environment. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 9(3), 5-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2019.00035.1>
- Sabiq, A. H. A. (2021). Scaffolding strategy in teaching writing and its challenges. *Jurnal Education And Development*, 9(1), 30-30. <https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v9i1.2275>
- Sartika, D., & Arriyani, N. (2020). Enhancing students writing skill to write descriptive text using Peer Review and Free Writing Techniques. *English Community Journal*, 4(2), 90-97. <https://doi.org/10.32502/ecj.v4i2.3039>
- Soanti, N., & Bunau, E. (2015). Improving students' ability in writing procedure text by using picture to the second year class f students of SMPN 13 Pontianak. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa (JPPK)*, 4(10). <https://doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v4i10.11667>
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (Sutopo (ed.); 2nd ed.). Alfabeta.
- Tufliha, A. (2021). The effect of using peer editing to improve students ability in writing at eight grade students of junior high school of 8 Bukittinggi academic year 2018/2019. *Elite Journal*, 3(1), 51-64. <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE/article/view/46>
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *Academic writing from paragraph to essay*. Macmillan.

Biographies of Author

Irma Widyawati, English Education Study Program, Education Department, Faculty of Tarbiya and Teacher Training, UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Central Java 53126, Indonesia.

- Email: irmaw03862@gmail.com
- ORCID: N/A
- Web of Science ResearcherID: N/A
- Scopus Author ID: N/A
- Homepage: N/A