



Application of Peer Correction Technique in Korean Descriptive Text Writing Learning

Asma Azizah*, Didin Samsudin, Vivi Yantri Halimatus Sa'diyah

Department of Korean Language Education, Faculty of Language and Literature, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: asma.azizah@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

This research aims to measure the increased ability to write Korean descriptive texts after the application of the peer correction technique and to understand teachers' and learners' view on the application of the peer correction technique in learning to write Korean descriptive texts. This research used a mixed method and data collection techniques used in this research are observations, tests, questionnaires, and interviews. The number of samples in this study was 28 Korean Language Education students from the basic level. The students' scores on writing were found by pre-test and post-test. The scores' average increase is 4.57. It can be concluded that there is an increase in students' writing ability after the application of peer correction technique but in its application, it is necessary to pay attention to several things such as the level of student ability. This research is practically useful for Korean teachers and learners in preparing and carrying out peer correction technique in class especially on writing skills.

Keywords: Correction techniques, descriptive text, Korean writing skills, peer correction technique.

1. INTRODUCTION

This research is motivated by the complexity of writing skills in the Korean language. There are many factors to consider when writing compared to speaking. There are at least nine components of writing in Korean language learning, namely grammar, function, sentence construction, content, compositional process, reader, purpose, and word choice. The presence of these components makes *sseugi* (writing) can be considered as a complex task. When speaking, one does not need to apply all the components of writing. According to Kim (2022), writing not only requires proficiency in spelling, grammar, vocabulary, grammar, and language expression, but also requires the ability to think about the language culture and social culture of a foreign language. That is why *sseugi* is said to be more complex compared to spoken language.

The complexity of writing in the Korean language extends to all types of texts, including descriptive texts. According to Semi (2007), a descriptive text is a text that portrays a particular object or thing in such a way that the reader can feel, see, hear, or experience it (perceived by the senses). Generally, the structure of a descriptive text consists of a title, general description, and specific description. The title serves as the identity of the object being described. The title is usually written specifically and should not merely state a generic object like "Orange Cat" or "School Bag." This is necessary because descriptive texts depict an object specifically or uniquely. For example, "*nau i saranghaneun goyangi*" means "My Beloved Cat." Below the title, there is a general description. In the general description section, the object is typically defined in a general sense. Lastly, the specific description provides detailed explanations about the object, including its appearance, actions, and feelings.

Song (2015) examined the effectiveness of peer correction techniques in their study. The research findings indicated that the technique was positively received by students and was considered successful in enhancing peer relationships as well as self-correction abilities. Kim (2016) also conducted research focusing on the implementation of peer correction in a writing academy classroom, where the results showed that peer correction techniques could be an alternative in writing instruction. Kim (2008) also conducted peer correction along with teacher correction in Korean language learning for foreigners, where both received positive responses. The learners argued that reading

other learners' writing and giving feedback had a positive effect on their writing ability. However, the participants preferred the simultaneous application of teacher correction and peer correction. On the other hand, Emelda (2019) conducted a study comparing two correction techniques, peer correction and self-correction, in the context of writing descriptive texts in English. The research showed that peer correction was deemed more influential in improving the ability to write descriptive texts. Furthermore, Sunahase et al. (2019) through their research demonstrated that evaluation using this technique was perceived as more effective as it greatly assisted learners in assessing their abilities, not only in writing but also in providing corrections. In contrast, Melinda's findings (2020) indicated that teacher correction was considered more effective in instruction compared to peer correction. This was attributed to the varying abilities of students in providing corrections and their tendency to be confused in determining the accuracy of their peers' answers.

Based on the phenomena described above and previous research studies, several urgencies can be identified as to why researchers conduct studies to explore the effectiveness of the peer correction technique in teaching descriptive writing in the Korean language. Firstly, there is a need to enhance writing skills in the field of the Korean language because writing in Korean is more complex compared to spoken language. Secondly, there is a need for the development of new teaching models in the Korean language because there has been no evaluation conducted specifically with peer correction. Thirdly, despite the existing research on peer correction techniques, there is a lack of studies focusing on peer correction in writing instruction, particularly for descriptive texts in the Korean language in Indonesia. Taken together, these urgencies highlight the importance of conducting research to investigate the effectiveness of peer correction techniques in teaching descriptive writing in the Korean language, addressing the complexities of the writing process, the need for innovative teaching approaches, and the lack of specific research in the Indonesian context.

2. METHOD

This research utilizes a mixed method that measures the improvement of basic-level descriptive writing skills in the Korean language through pre-test and post-test using the peer correction technique. Additionally, it aims to describe the perceptions of teachers and learners regarding the application of peer correction technique in teaching descriptive writing in the Korean language through observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The data sources for this study are 56 students from the Korean Language Education program in the Faculty of Language and Literature Education at the University of Education Indonesia, who are at the basic level (second semester). The participating students will undergo the pre-test and post-test, while the course instructor for "*malhagi sseugi*" (speaking and writing) in the second semester of the Korean Language Education program at the Faculty of Language and Literature Education, University of Education Indonesia, that facilitated the implementation of the peer correction technique. Besides the pre-test and post-test, researcher also collected data from the results of teacher observations of the implementation of peer correction in the classroom, questionnaires to find out the responses of students and lecturers regarding the implementation of peer correction, as well as in-depth interviews with lecturer. Then the collected test data analyzed in terms of maximum, minimum, and mean scores.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Application of Peer Correction Technique in Korean Descriptive Text Writing Learning

After collecting data through pre-test, post-test, questionnaires and interviews, the results of data analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive data analysis

Category test	Number	Min. score	Max. score	Average
Pre-Test	28	33	87	55.43
Post-Test	28	40	90	60.00

Based on Table 1, it can be observed that there are differences in both the minimum, maximum, and average scores between the pre-test and post-test. Out of the 28 students in the class, the minimum score obtained in the pre-test was 33, while the maximum score was 87. In the post-test, the minimum score was 40, and the maximum score was 90. This indicates a variation in the scores obtained in which the average score in the pre-test was 55.43 and that in the post-test was 60.00.

Table 2. Percentage improvement of evaluation component

Indicators of Assessment	Pre-Test	Post Test	Difference	Percentage
Content	317	344	27	8.5%
Composition	313	346	33	10.5%
Vocabulary	306	321	15	4.9%
Grammar	431	458	27	6.3%
Functional Aspects	185	211	26	14%

Table 2 shows that each assessed component in this test has experienced an improvement. There was an increase of 8.5% in content, 10.5% in composition, 4.9% in vocabulary, 6.3% in grammar, and 14% in functional aspects. Although the numbers may not appear significant at first glance, it is important to note the specific indicators for each component. Content requires well-handled topics, diverse arguments, relevance between content and topic, as well as specific and detailed content in good writing. Composition encompasses five indicators: natural expression of ideas, clear expression of thoughts, structured paragraphs, logical coherence and cohesion, and natural flow of writing. In vocabulary, students must meet two indicators to achieve the maximum score: wide-ranging use of vocabulary and accurate selection of words and idioms. Grammar also consists of two indicators: sentence structure without errors and proper use of compound and subordinate sentences. Lastly, in the functional aspect, students are expected to demonstrate accurate spelling, punctuation, and appropriate placement of these elements. By considering these specific indicators, the observed improvements in each component become more meaningful and highlight the progress made by the students in their descriptive writing skills.

In Table 3, the teacher provided corrections related to vocabulary and grammar that were deemed inaccurate. The teacher also marked parts that, according to them, should be removed as they did not align with the preceding and succeeding sentences. The notes given during the correction process also helped the students understand the areas that needed improvement. Some of these notes were related to the intended meaning of the student's writing and the vocabulary that needed to be revised. Additionally, the teacher not only marked errors but also provided recommendations or suggested answers. In contrast, the basic-level students, with their limited proficiency, were only able to provide minimal corrections in terms of grammar, and there were no recommendations or further discussions included in the correction results.

Table 3. Comparison of corrections by students and teachers

Correction by Teacher	Correction by Students
<p><i>Eoryeosseul ttae cheonsigeuro ibwohaesseoyo. Aju oraenmaneun chueogiraseo da gieokhaji eonheunde jega aneunhan gajineun byeongwoni jeongmal silheoyo. Je saenggageun jeil museoun jangsoneun yeoksi byeonwonieyo.</i></p> <p><i>Byeongwone gal ttaemada gibuni hangsang geokjeonghago musewoyo. Waenyahamyeon byeongwoneseo manhi saramdeuri doragasyeosseoyo. Geurigo byeongwoneseodo gongpo iyagiga manhayo. Byeongwone gal ttaemada kkok yonggamhaeya haeyo. Jega jeil silheohaneun charyangeun gugeupchayeyo.</i></p> <p>(.....)</p>	<p><i>Jinan 2 wol 14 ire cheot susureul badasseoyo. Neomu museopgo ginjanghaesseoyo. Geuraedo apeseoneun gwaencheonha boasseoyo. Sasil momi apeun geon anijiman mok dwie susureul haeya hal ge isseoyo. Geu ttae jeoneun cheoem ibwonhaesseoyo. Hyeolgwani gyesok teojyeoseo jusareul 8 beon majasseoyo. Soni neomu apasseoyo. Dahaenghi gyesok silpaehaesseo gyeolguk jeongmaekjusareul badeul su isseosseoyo.</i></p> <p>(.....)</p>
Notes:	
- The second sentence is less comprehensible.	
- <i>cheonsigeuro</i> -> <i>cheonsikdaemune</i>	
- <i>saenggageun</i> -> <i>saenggageneun</i>	
- <i>doragasyeosseoyo</i> -> <i>doragan sarami minhi isseoyo.</i>	

3.2. The Learners' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Application of Peer Correction Technique in Korean Descriptive Text Writing Learning

After the peer correction, the author distributed questionnaires to the students who participated in the class and conducted an interview with the teacher. The author proposed eight statement points to the students. The eight statements represent five indicators in this questionnaire: knowledge, comfort, critical attitude, interest, and usefulness. Table 4 showed the results of the questionnaire that has been submitted.

Table 4. Results of questionnaires asked to learners

No.	Indicators	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Moderately Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Knowledge	I understand the procedure for implementing the peer correction technique.	31%	26%	37%	3%	3%
2.	Comfort	I feel comfortable when my friends correct my work.	20%	34%	26%	20%	0%
3.	Critical attitude	I think critically when implementing the peer correction technique.	11%	40%	46%	3%	0%
4.	Interest	I feel confident in practicing the peer correction technique.	3%	20%	61%	14%	2%
		I agree if the peer correction technique is applied again in the future in other courses.	3%	37%	34%	23%	3%
5.	Usefulness	I feel helped by my friend's correction.	28%	40%	17%	9%	6%
		I gain knowledge from my friends' correction of my work.	26%	43%	20%	3%	8%
		I feel that my writing skills have improved because of the peer correction technique.	20%	37%	32%	11%	0%

The results shown in Table 4 align with the responses to the additional questions asked by the researcher regarding the benefits and advantages of peer correction. The students perceive peer correction as highly beneficial. They feel assisted by the written corrections provided on their written work. They also acknowledge that peer correction optimizes the correction time, which is typically time-consuming when conducted solely by the teacher. This is in line with Lee (2016) who stated that the results of feedback from peer learners responded quite well and improved the quality of writing. Furthermore, the students also become more aware of their individual writing abilities. This benefit is also found in Song's (2015) research on the effects of peer feedback in English writing classes.

However, despite having several benefits, the students also acknowledge some shortcomings in this peer correction technique. Among them is the fact that some students may not be sensitive enough in providing corrections. Some students may also struggle to give objective assessments and may appear to give biased evaluations as they want to maintain a friendly atmosphere. As a result, there are some students who feel that they have not experienced any improvement in their writing skills. This is consistent with the 11% of students in the questionnaire who disagreed with the notion of improvement in their abilities after the implementation of peer correction. This is due to the different Korean language skills of the learners, in which not all learners can provide appropriate feedback or not all feedback can be responded correctly.

The perceptions of the students, both the advantages and disadvantages, align with the perceptions of the teacher as a facilitator in implementing peer correction in the classroom. Through interviews, the teacher expressed that the peer correction technique has its own strengths and weaknesses. The teacher acknowledged that the teacher correction technique, initially, is effective in identifying errors in students' writing. However, considering the number of students, this process indeed takes a significant amount of time.

In any form of peer correction implementation, students are indirectly encouraged to be critical and attentive in identifying errors. If students approach this task diligently, there are numerous benefits to be gained from this process.

The benefits highlighted by the teacher include improving students' writing abilities, enhancing their focus in class, and boosting their self-confidence. The teacher also mentioned the main challenge faced, which is the varying writing abilities of students, particularly in writing descriptive essays. According to the teacher, at this level, writing a 2-3 paragraph essay poses a considerable difficulty. Therefore, not all students, especially at the basic level, are able to write descriptive essays proficiently or provide accurate corrections to their peers.

Considering the advantages and disadvantages of each correction technique, the teacher concludes that both peer correction and teacher correction can be alternately implemented in the classroom. Specifically, at the basic level, peer correction can be applied to shorter and less complex questions to match the students' abilities. At higher levels, correcting essays should become more routine and manageable. The teacher adds that implementing peer correction requires not only preparedness in terms of knowledge and insight for providing corrections but also the mental readiness of students and their critical attitude towards their peers' writing. Furthermore, the teacher agrees that peer correction can be used as an alternative in the correction process and can be alternated with teacher correction periodically or as needed. This aligns with the recommendation of Sapkota (2012) and Sumponogati's (2018) in their research comparing peer correction and teacher correction. Both techniques have their own benefits in the classroom and can be applied together in a single lesson. Additionally, in the conducted interviews, it was mentioned that peer correction can be used in other language skills learning such as reading and speaking. Indeed, based on the description of the perceptions of both learners and teachers, it can be interpreted that peer correction has its own shortcomings and advantages. However, despite the existing limitations, with proper procedures and implementation at the appropriate aspects and levels, peer correction can be considered as an alternative in writing instruction in the future. By recognizing and addressing the weaknesses, peer correction can be refined and utilized effectively to enhance the writing skills of students.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the pre-test and post-test scores, there was an average improvement of 4.57 in the students' writing. However, the increase was not significant because the aspects tested may not have been suitable for students at the basic level. The aspects in question include writing descriptive essays with components such as content, composition, vocabulary, grammar, and functional aspects. Additionally, the aspect with the smallest improvement was grammar and vocabulary.

Based on the questionnaire results and interviews, it can be concluded that peer correction, when implemented in teaching Korean at the basic level, has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of peer correction include developing students' critical thinking skills, building their mental resilience and self-confidence, understanding students' writing abilities, and reducing correction time. However, the disadvantages include not achieving maximum results after corrections due to students' basic-level proficiency and a tendency for less objective grading. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, when implemented with proper procedures and at the appropriate aspects and levels, and with the support of teacher correction, peer correction can be considered as an alternative in writing instruction at the basic level.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank the study program for the opportunity to be funded for this publication as well as the reviewer's comments on the earlier version of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Emelda, M. (2019). *The effect of different types of correction in writing descriptive text at students of iain palangka raya*. IAIN Palangkaraya (Unpublished)
- Kim, J. R. (2016). Analysis of the effectiveness of procedural writing education through peer correction. *The Society of Korean Language and Literature Education*, 0(62), 131-170.
- Kim, M. J. (2008). *Comparison of the effects of teacher and peer feedback on rewriting in Korean as Second Language*. Ewha Womens University (Unpublished).
- Kim, Y. J. (2022). Study of education strategy for writing in Korean: teaching strategy of fallacies of writing in Korean and awkward expressions based on case study. *Teaching Korean as a Foreign Language*, 64, 41-65.
- Lee, Y. B. (2016). Aspects and effects of peer feedback activities by the difference of peer group members writing levels. *The Education of Korean Language*, 0(154), 127-164.

- Melinda, S. (2020). *The impact of peer corrective feedback toward descriptive writing quality of junior high school students*. Universitas Islam Malang (Unpublished)
- Sapkota, A. (2012). Developing students' writing skill through peer and teacher correction: An action research. Nepal English Language Teachers Association. *Journal of NELTA*, 17(1-2), 70-82.
- Semi, M Atar, 2007. *Dasar-dasar keterampilan menulis*. Angkasa Bandung.
- Song, C. S. (2015). The effect of peer correction in english writing guidance class: focusing on graduate students of The Department of English Education. *Modern Studies in English Language and Literature*, 59(4), 217-240.
- Sumponogati, S. (2019). *The impact of peer and teacher corrections to the students' paragraph writing in discussion text: experimental research to the 1st semester students of technology faculty at UNISBANK Semarang 2017/2018*. Universitas Diponegoro (Unpublished).
- Sunahase, T., Baba, Y., & Kashima, H. (2019). Probabilistic Modeling of Peer Correction and Peer Assessment. *Proceedings of The 12th International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM 2019)*.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial 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 chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter'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.

