

ABS 223

by lcels_2 Abs 223

Submission date: 30-Sep-2020 04:28PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1401160728

File name: full_paper_abs-223_7773475362.docx (75.07K)

Word count: 5810

Character count: 33941

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING MODEL IN ACADEMIC WRITING

Ade Ismail¹, Ninuk Lustyantie², Emzir³
^{1,2,3}Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia
adeismail_7317167360@mhs.unj.ac.id (HP. 082187065663)
ninuk.lustyantie@unj.ac.id
emzir.unj@unj.ac.id

Abstract

Collaborative learning refers to the concept that learning is a social process (Vygotsky 1978), rewarding experience through teamwork (Fung 2010), sharing linguistic knowledge and references, negotiating, and making products together (Widodo 2013). Collaborative writing is the process of writing together either in pairs, in groups, or with peers (Storch 2018). The focus of this study is to determine the effectiveness of collaborative learning model in academic writing to increase students' skills in writing an argumentative essay. This research was conducted in the English Language Study Program, Khairun University, a tertiary institution in Eastern Indonesia from September 2018 to April 2020. The number of participants was 60 fourth semester students consisting of 30 students for the control class and 30 other students in the experimental class. The instrument used in this study is a writing assessment rubric. Based on the test results, Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.00 < 0.05, which means that the hypothesis H_0 is rejected or H_1 is accepted. This shows that there is a significant difference in learning outcomes between the use of the Collaborative Learning Model in Academic Writing and Conventional Models.

Keywords: Collaborative Learning, Collaborative Writing, Academic Writing

A. Introduction

Collaborative learning refers to the concept that learning is a social process (Vygotsky, 1978). In line with this, collaborative learning means the process of learning together to solve a problem or design a product (Laal & Laal, 2012). The learning process is carried out in pairs, groups, or with peers. Barkley, Cross, & Major (2012) formulated five phases of collaborative learning, namely orientation, group formation, preparation of learning assignments, facilitating student collaboration, and assessment.

In the context of learning, ⁷⁰ collaborative writing is defined as the process of writing one text together (Storch, 2011; Storch, 2018). sharing knowledge and experiences when having difficulty in writing (Fung, 2010), sharing linguistic references, negotiating, and designing joint products (Widodo, 2013). Collaborative writing is learned to improve students' skills in writing academic texts. As stated by Grabe & Kaplan (1996) ⁶⁹ that writing is a set of skills that must be trained and learned through experience. Williams (2005) states that writing skills take time to develop, bound by rules and agreements. Students need skills starting from collecting ideas, information, analyzing, organizing, and communicating these ideas to readers.

Academic writing is writing of a high standard and requires a special methodology (Carvajal, Emilce, Flórez & Edith, 2014). The stage is started from prewriting to select a topic and brainstorming (Oshima & Hogue, 1999), then grouping ideas to determine the types of ideas that can be developed (Blanchard & Root, 2004) to achieve writing goals (Tompkins, 2008), determining the topic and writing initial draft (Williams, 2005). The initial draft is not the final draft because it requires a revision and editing process. Galko (2001) describes three strategies for writing an initial draft, such as determining the topic sentence, coherence between paragraphs, and detailed information for each sentence to support the main idea being developed. Collaborative learning models in academic writing have been researched by some researchers before. Comparing collaborative pre-writing with individual pre-writing (McDonough, De Vleeschauwer & Crawford, 2018), collaborative writing with peers for academic purposes (Bhowmik, Hilman, & Roy, 2018). Besides, some studies analyze the effects of collaborative pre-writing and individual pre-writing learning models. ⁶⁸ This study describes the positive impact of pre-writing collaborative learning on text quality (McDonough and De Vleeschauwer, 2019).

Storch & Aldosari (2013) research on pair writing investigates the use of the second language (L2), the influence of pair writing proficiency, and interaction patterns. ⁴⁹ Guasch, Espasa, Alvarez & Kirschner (2013) looked to see the effects of feedback on collaborative writing in online learning. In a study entitled "The Use of Feedback System to Improve the Text Writing: A Proposal for Higher Education Context" ⁴¹ focuses on the use of feedback (Mauri, Ginesta & Rochera, 2016). This study was designed as an innovative educational psychology learning for elementary school teachers.

Li & Zhu (2017) ⁶⁷ investigated the use of Wiki learning media in collaborative writing in second language learning classes (L2). Meanwhile, Zhang (2018) examined collaborative writing by looking at the effects of the use of first (L1) and second (L2) languages when they collaborated. ³⁶ This study aims to find out whether the interaction of using L1 or L2 affects the ⁷³ complexity, accuracy, fluency, and quality of the text. The study focuses on the effectiveness of using the collaborative learning model of academic writing in English by strengthening the assignment process on students' ability to write essay texts.

⁶⁶ B. Literature Review

1. Collaborative Learning

Theoretically, collaborative learning is developed based on Vygotsky's concept of learning as a social process (Vygotsky, 1978). Therefore, the meaning of collaboration is defined as ³⁵ working together to solve a problem or design a product (Laal & Laal, 2012). Five collaborative phases are offered namely orientation, group formation, preparation of learning, and learning assignments, facilitating student collaboration and assessment (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2012). This is in line with research on online writing learning through weekly meetings as a reflection of teaching experiences, mentoring programs when instructors discover new experiences in

teaching, and teaching through journal model. These strategies are undertaken to facilitate natural collaboration efforts (Stewart, Cohn & Whithaus, 2016)

Collaborative learning is also a representation of joint tasks in setting goals, planning, and formulating strategies. Students are directed individually to plan, monitor, evaluate, and adapt motivation, cognition, and behavior during collaboration (Zheng, Li & Huang, 2017). When collaborating, students are given social boundaries called social-shared regulation in which all group members regulate and manage motivation, cognition, metacognition, emotions, and behavior to construct joint results. The results show that this collaborative learning model increases the ability to participate in learning, group performance, and frequency of self-regulation.

Collaborative learning is also a means of problem-based and experienced learning (Bower & Richards, 2006). A survey of 120 students at Macquarie University showed that 33% strongly agree and 53% agree that they learn more information/knowledge while ¹⁴ working in a group rather than working alone. 44% of respondents agreed and 27% strongly agreed that it is easier to do assignments in groups than to work alone (Bower & Richards, 2006). In line with that, Storch (2012) explains that sharing work in small groups or pairs is better than being done individually. The division of tasks provides opportunities for students to use the target language. Besides, collaborative learning can also improve students' critical thinking power (Gokhale, 1995).

Students try to understand, find a way out, or be able to produce a product. Teachers position themselves as expert intellectual experience designers. This is based on four basic assumptions that learning is an active and constructivist process, depending on the context, the differences in the intellectual characteristics of learners, and inherent in social processes (Smith & MacGregor, 1992). This is where the principle of mutual trust, mutual incentives, and division of labor is

needed (Brassard, 2010). Placing students as the center of learning has several benefits, both socially, psychologically, academically to the assessment mechanism (Laal & Ghodsi. 2012).

There is a joint intellectual effort between students and educators both face-to-face and online. The challenge is in cognitive complexity, students are not accustomed to new social interactions, such as the difficulty of obtaining a sustainable understanding of joint activities on specific discourses related to knowledge and language which are difficulties that are often faced including the use of technological devices (Dooly, 2018).

The application of collaborative learning models to children also has a positive impact, especially in finding new ideas even though they do not always produce the best work in the group. But it can foster an attitude of respect for individual abilities and bridge them to maintain friendship and independent learning (Tunnard & Sharp, 2009). The requirements are interactivity, synchronicity, and can be negotiated (Dillenbourg, 1999). This learning model is designed deliberately, equality in inter-group collaboration, and meaningful learning (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2012), the process of writing together to produce quality texts (Storch 2018). Collaborative learning will be implemented if students and teachers build collaboration with the same goal. The philosophy is that students work together to achieve predetermined goals (Rae, Taylor, & Roberts, 2006)

2. Collaborative Writing

Conceptually, collaborative writing is the process of writing a text that involves more than one person; in pairs, small groups, or peers (Storch. 2018). Students share knowledge and learning experiences (Fung, 2010). The process of writing one text jointly by two or more authors or its nature is the shared ownership of the written document (Storch, 2011), a feedback activity between students (Kim & Chiesa, 2018). The advantages of integrated collaboration in writing in

the classroom are finding common ideas and receiving direct feedback, sharing linguistic knowledge and references, coordinating writing activities, providing social support, increasing critical thinking skills (Widodo, 2013). Storch (2005) shows that the process of writing in pairs results in the shorter text though and takes longer but is better in terms of accuracy and complexity.

Other collaborative writing studies focus on comparisons of collaborative pre-writing and individual pre-writing. Participants in this study were 57 Thai students. The findings show that students who collaborate during the pre-writing phase are more accurate and get better ratings than those of individual pre-writing, although there is no significant difference at the level of complexity (McDonough, De Vleeschauwer & Crawford, 2018). This shows that collaborative writing has a positive influence on students' writing skills (Dobao & Blum, 2013). Even though there were obstacles in the process, students felt happy by gaining a lot of experience, the results of the writing were very good, and discussed together (Bhowmik, Hilman & Roy, 2018).

Another study also discusses the effects of collaborative and individual pre-writing on learners of English as a foreign language (McDonough & De Vleeschauwer, 2019). The conclusion is that writing practice activities through collaborative pre-writing planning can help students (EFL) produce more accurate texts. The collaborative process that focuses on the paired activity model carried out by Storch and Aldosari (2013) also indicates that collaborative pairs with low (LL) and high (HH) levels of knowledge are more optimal, but to improve interaction patterns, it is better to use a collaborative level pairing pattern. high and low (HL). Guasch, Espasa, Alvarez & Kirschner (2013) examined the effects of feedback on collaborative writing on online learning. The focus is on the influence of teacher and peer feedback in the learning environment. The results of this study then conclude that (a) the quality of writing performance is more influenced

by epistemic or epistemic + suggestive feedback. (b) the quality of writing not only after participants received epistemic + suggestive feedback but also after receiving only corrective feedback.

Besides, a study on the feedback model was also conducted by (Mauri, Ginesta & Rochera, 2016) who concluded that a feedback system increases motivation, and learners' understanding of content and tasks, optimizing cognitive and metacognitive management of the learning process. Li & Zhu (2017) emphasize that collaborative writing through Wiki in the second language learning class (L2) also shows that the collective patterns of writing quality are excellent, especially in the areas of rhetorical structure and coherence. Zhang (2018) who looked at the effects of using the first language (L1) and second language (L2) when students collaborated in writing support the sociocultural perspective from the use of the first language in L2 learning. Pedagogically this study provides empirical evidence from the written results to support the idea that the use of the first language is not debilitating in collaborative writing assignments and may facilitate the writing of syntactically more complex texts.

Therefore, it can be concluded that collaborative writing is adapting the concept of working together in generating contributions in pairs or study groups (Coffin, Curry et al., 2005), involving three focuses, such as meetings for reflection on teaching experiences, mentoring programs, and teaching through a journal model (Stewart, Cohn & Whithaus, 2016). The goal is to represent joint tasks in the aspects of determining goals, planning, and formulating strategies. However, according to Huang, Li, and Zheng, this model needs to be accompanied by social rules that bind together (Zheng, Li & Huang, 2017). The uniqueness of the collaborative learning model is the existence of joint intellectual efforts between students and educators, and a shift in the learning center to students (Dooly, 2018).

3. Academic Writing

An academic paper is considered effective if the writer shifts from writer-based to reader-based writing. Focus on audience and purpose, short and flowing, formal vocabulary, fulfilling written structure, nominalization, not ambiguous, following writing rules (abbreviations, acronyms, labels), having grammar, and placing punctuation correctly (Alameddine & Mirza, 2016). Meanwhile, the structural aspect consists of an introduction, discussion, and conclusion. The large (generic) structure of the academic text was further expanded (Mallia, 2017). These aspects include generic features, use of more formal and standard aspects of language, avoiding idiomatic or colloquial vocabulary. For an accurate word, ²⁵ a higher proportion of passive verbs are used in academic writing, although it is used wisely. Adjusted to the target audience, concise in simple and direct language. Use an inductive approach, starting with broader ideas and focusing on specifics and developing evidence-based conclusions. One paragraph only has one main idea, if there are different ideas it can be presented in different paragraphs. The paragraph structure consists of a topic, supporting, and a closing sentence. Strengthen the cohesive device that is a blend of text that flows ²⁵ through the use of transitional words including conjunctions and references. Transition words that help achieve text cohesion are time sequences, numerical sequences, cause/effect orders, and comparisons.

As a text of the high standard and a process that requires a specific and appropriate methodology, academic writing requires the support of peers, experts, and professionals to provide input on how ideas are structured and organized and how cohesion and coherence can occur. A study involving students at the University of Colombia aims to achieve the ability to produce research articles. They work collaboratively which allows them ⁶ to develop values such as empathy, respect, tolerance, and responsibility. ⁶ In the end, there is a product produced: a research article in

which the vision of each group member is presented (Carvajal, Emilce, Flórez & Edith, 2014). In the prewriting stage, the writer will carry out two processes, namely choosing and focusing on the topic (choosing and narrowing a topic) and the second is brainstorming (Oshima & Hogue, 1999).

In the process of freewriting, a writer tries to find ideas that will be developed. The more freewriting, the more ideas you get. Processing is writing down topics, content, marking ideas that will be developed (Blanchard & Root, 2004). Tompkins tries to formulate a language function adapted from Halliday's main thought which implicitly becomes the goal of the writing process itself (Tompkins, 2008). A slightly different opinion is expressed by Shields who sees the prewriting aspect as a whole or does not divide it step by step with their respective sequences (Shields, 2010).

Writing planning can also be carried out through the list of readers to ascertain who will be the readers (James, 2007). Meanwhile, the writing of the initial draft was carried out concerning the first text produced. Some writers have difficulty writing the initial draft. Whereas in writing this initial draft is not a final draft because it still requires revision and editing processes (Williams, 2005). Three strategies are topic sentences, coherence between paragraphs, and sentences that are explained in detail and support the main idea in the form of examples, facts, opinions, statistical data, and others (Galko, 2001). It is recommended that each writer prepare all material for writing needs and use a combined approach (Simon & Schuster, 1987).

C. Research methods

36

This research was conducted in the English Language Education Study Program at Khairun University, one of the universities in Eastern Indonesia from September 2018 to April 2020. The number of participants was 60 fourth semester students. They were then divided into two groups,

30 students in the control class and 30 other students in the experimental class. All of these students participated in essay writing courses. The control class students got the academic writing learning process through the conventional model while in the experimental class in a collaborative learning model for 12 meetings. The instrument was a writing assessment rubric. The stages of collaborative learning in academic writing consist of orientation (introduction/review of the material, delivery of learning objectives and competencies to be achieved, delivering material coverage), presenting material and discussion, Group Formation and Equation of Perceptions, Assignments, and Collaborative Writing (pre-task, during the task, post-task), and Reporting and Reflection. The items that are the focus of the assessment are generic structures, language features, grammar, spelling, and content (Anderson & Anderson 2003, Hughes 2003, Emilia, 2011). The data in the study were students' articles written after participating in the learning process. After collecting the data, it was analyzed using an assessment rubric. To see the difference between the control and the experimental class, the data from the rubric analysis were calculated with SPSS application.

D. Findings and Discussions

As stated, the purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the collaborative learning model of academic writing on students' ability to write argumentative English texts. Based on the results of the data analysis, it was found that there was a difference in the average score obtained between students who took the learning process through the collaborative academic writing model and the conventional learning model as in table 1.

Table 1 The Average Score of Students' Writing Ability

| | N | Generic Structure | Language Figure | Grammar | Mecanic | Content |
|------------------|----|----------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Control Class | 30 | 73 | 71 | 63 | 72 | 63 |
| Experiment Class | 30 | 93 | 78 | 82 | 91 | 76 |

Based on the data above, students' abilities have increased in items of genetic and mechanical structures compared to other aspects. They have been able to write an opening paragraph containing questions or statements related to the topic. Students can also write several paragraphs that provide evidence, arguments, either supporting the statement or contradicting (contra) the topic being discussed. As well as outlining conclusions that contain the final point of view that supports or contradicts the topic being developed. On the mechanical side, it also shows that students can write well by placing punctuation marks. The data above also indicates that students' grammar skills have increased compared to the control class with a score of 82. On the content side, neither the control class nor the experimental class have experienced a significant increase. This is also a sign that they still need a lot of practice to formulate their ideas well. The following will present two text samples from students in the experimental class.

Text #1

| How to Increase English Speaking Skills | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>English is an international language that is very important for you to master in this millennial era. If you want to be part of global community, learning, improving, mastering, and using English well can improve your personal and career life.</u></p> | <p>Thesis Statement</p> |
| <p>Speaking for most people is consider the most difficult skill because it covers many aspects of English language skills including pronunciation, listening, grammar, and vocabulary as well (Yanto, 2015). But really what is needed is just a little courage and great motivation to be able to speak English fluently.</p> | <p>Argument</p> |
| <p>There are several ways that we can do increase our English speaking skills. The first is look for native speaker. The best way to learn conversation is to meet native speakers of English. The main purpose of learning conversation is to be able to communicate using English, anyway so, the best way to increase our speaking skills is to meet native speaker. You can start by looking for friends through cyberspace, inviting them to chat about their daily lives. Indeed, not all native speakers, especially in cyberspace can accept well, but there is nothing wrong with trying to learn. You can also increase your speaking skills if you have native acquaintances, or you live in an area where many native speakers meet. Try just greeting them and chatting lightly, remember finding the goal of learning conversation, which is to communicate with each other. The second way is record your voice even though we usually hear our own voices, it never hurts to record our own voice while studying and we can learn a lot from it. We can practice by finding some articles in English (we can googling first), the record our voice. Next, listen to the recording. We can look for where our strengths are also weaknesses and mistakes when saying something. We can focus on correcting our mistakes. The third is enjoy your process when learning conversation. Sometimes we feel like we can immediately speak English, understand what native speakers say. But be patient, everything requires a process and in the conversation learning process, absorbs conversation in English first, train yourself to say them clearly, clarity in speaking is important, because it will be related to whether your interlocutor understand what you say. If we speak clearly, it will be easier for our interlocutor to understand what we are saying. That is the essence of the conversation, which is conveying what is meant clearly.</p> | <p>Connectivity of ideas</p> <p>Language feature</p> <p>Grammar</p> <p>Mechanic</p> <p>Content</p> |
| <p><u>Practicing English is one of the most enjoyable and useful parts to improve your English skills. Many people want to be able to speak English or can communicate a little with foreigners using English. The way we speak English and communicate determines our position as a winner or loser in current era of competition. However, speaking English is something that is both easy and difficult depending on how much we try to master it.</u></p> | <p>Conclusion</p> |

In text 1, students have written according to the character of the argumentative text, such as thesis statements, arguments, and conclusions. Even though there are still some minor errors in grammar and text content that still need revision from the aspect of textual content. However, the text has fulfilled the requirements of argumentative text.

Text#2

| How to Increase English Speaking Skills | |
|--|--|
| <p>English is an international language that used by people around the world. It because English is very easy to understand in the most other country in the world and that status makes it be the global lingua franca. This is why it is very important for us to learn English, so we can communicate and interact with people all over the world. To learn it, English has 4 general skills that must be mastered. That four skills are listening, reading, speaking and writing.</p> | Thesis Statement |
| <p>Reading and writing are considered to be the two receptive skills in language learning and writing and speaking are the other two productive skills necessary to be mastered in the development of effective communicative (Rahman, 2016). Of the four micro English skills, speaking seems to be the most important skill required for communication (Zaremba, 2006). It is producing utterances for communication messages (Rodriquer, 2000:32). Abdel Salam (2002) defined speaking as a collection of micro skills which include syntax, grammar, morphology, pragmatic or social language, semantics and phonology. Speaking has a meaning when it enables children and young people to explore their own selves and clarify their identity, they can manage to understand and respect their own selves (Ranson, 2000). Mastering speaking skills makes the speaker a well-rounded communicator who is a proficient in the four language skills such skillfulness provides the speaker with several distinct advantages which let them enjoy sharing idea with others and managing to understand their self (Ruddock, 2002).</p> | Argument Connectivity of ideas Language feature Grammar |
| <p>However, as the learners as foreigner languages, some of the learners are still feel difficult to master this speaking skills. For most foreign language learners, speaking in target language is not an easy thing to undertake because to speak a foreign requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules (Heriyansyah, 2012). To solve that problem, several ways can be done to improve the English speaking.</p> | Mechanic Content |
| <p>First of all, try to find the native speaker to practice with joining the community or an English organization can be a can a great way to practice the speaking skills. Another ways if you cannot get the native speaker to practice, recording is a great way for learners. When you recording and the listening again you can evaluate your own pronunciation.</p> | Conclusion |
| <p>Another way to improve your speaking is through the movie and music. Listening the English music and sing along automatically will help you remember the vocabulary that you can use when speaking. However, from movie you can learn how the native speaker speak and try to practicing it in your daily life.</p> | |
| <p>All of those ways can be easily done by practicing it every day. Then, as a foreign language learner we are able to improve our speaking skills which very important to be mastered.</p> | |

In text 2 above, the respondents' arguments have not been well structured, but conceptually, it has been written based on argumentative text character, such as thesis statements, arguments, and conclusions. In the sentence, "For most foreign language learners, speaking in target language is not an easy thing to undertake because to speak a foreign requires more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules" there is still an inappropriate diction such as in the phrase "more than knowing its grammatical and semantic rules". But in general, readers can understand the intent of the author. The two examples of text above are part of student writing. The overall results of the analysis are then calculated statistically to test the hypothesis:

H0: The collaborative learning model of academic writing cannot improve students' ability to write argumentative texts

Ha: The collaborative learning model of academic writing can improve students' ability to write argumentative texts

The data about difference test results with non-parametric statistics, namely the Mann-Whitney Test, can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 1 Uji Mann-Whitney Test

| Test Statistics ^a | |
|--|--------------|
| | Data_Postest |
| Mann-Whitney U | 36,500 |
| Wilcoxon W | 501,500 |
| Z | -6,212 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 |
| a. Grouping Variable: Kontrol_Eksperimen_Postest | |

Based on the test results, Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.00 < 0.05, which means that the hypothesis H₀ is rejected or H₁ is accepted. This shows that there is a significant difference in learning outcomes between the use of the Collaborative Academic Writing Model and

conventional models. Or it can be stated that the Collaborative Academic Writing Model that was developed could improve students' ability to write argumentative text.

The results of analysis indicate that collaborative learning model of academic writing in English improve students' abilities in writing argumentative essays. This shows that the collaboration process as an important part of collaborative learning is very helpful for students (Storch, 2018). As emphasized that learning is a social process (Vygotsky, 1978). Students share knowledge and experiences (Fung, 2010). The results also show that students who collaborate during the pre-writing phase are more accurate and get better ratings than those who pre-write individually are evidence that collaborative models have benefits in writing (McDonough, De Vleeschauer & Crawford, 2018, McDonough & De Vleeschauer, 2019, Doboia & Blum, 2013), although in the process there are often obstacles (Bhowmik, Hilman & Roy, 2018).

Besides, Storch & Aldosari (2013) also emphasized that knowledge level does not become a barrier when forming collaborative learning groups. Feedback, which is often a strategy in collaborative writing, is also effective for improving writing skills (Guasch, Espasa, Alvarez & Kirschner, 2013; Mauri, Ginesta & Rochera, 2016). Therefore, the results of this study reinforce the previous argument which states that collaborative writing works together in contributing in pairs or study groups. Prewriting strategy that includes brainstorming, very effective in groups and random feeds on writing work through individual peer reviews (Coffin, Curry et al. 2005), it is suitable for students who already have a level of knowledge and writing skills. The aim is as a representation of joint tasks in the aspects of determining goals, planning and formulating strategies. Even so, it needs to be accompanied by social rules that bind together (Zheng, Li & Huang, 2017).

These results indicate that the ability of students has increased through collaborative learning in academic writing (Bower & Richards, 2006). As stated by Widodo (2013) about the benefits of integrating collaborative models in the writing process. Doboia & Blum (2013) emphasize that collaborative learning has a positive influence on students' writing skills. The role of students in providing feedback at the discussion stage also has an impact on writing skills (Mauri, Ginesta & Rochera, 2016). In the aspect of writing skills, they have also been able to write appropriate to the generic structure of the academic text (Mallia, 2017), and go through all the stages in writing planning (Oshima & Hogue, 1999).

E. Conclusion

Collaborative writing model in academic writing is a learning model that emphasizes cooperation between students in learning to write. The process starts from planning, writing, revision to publication. This collaboration is carried out when students to overcome students' writing skills. Discussion in pairs or through small groups is an alternative way out in learning to write essays. The results of this study indicate that collaborative writing model in academic writing improve students' writing abilities in terms of generic structures, language features, grammar, mechanics, and content. It is one of the strongest evidence that the collaborative process can be applied to learning academic writing (Storch, 2018).

F. Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the students who participated in this research. I also thanks to my supervisors who has provided suggestions and corrections during the research process and writing this article, and to the reviewers for suggestions.

References

- 1 Alameddine, M. M. & H. S. Mirza (2016). "Teaching academic writing for advanced level grade 10 English." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 232: 209-216. Retrieved from: <https://www.academia.edu>
- 38 Barkley, E.E., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2012). *Techniques Learning Techniques*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- 21 Bhowmik, S.K., Hilman, B., & Roy, S. (2017) "Peer collaborative writing in the EAP classroom: Insights from a Canadian postsecondary context." *TESOL Journal*: e393. DOI: 10.1002/tesj.393
- 1 Blanchard, K. & C. Root (2004). *Ready to Write Moore. From Paragraph to Essay*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- 48 Bower, M. and D. Richards (2006). "Collaborative learning: Some possibilities and limitations for students and teachers."
- 33 Brassard, C. (2010). "The Collaborative Learning Model." *Centre for Development of Teaching and Learning* 13(1): 1-14.
- 6 Carvajal, M., Nancy, E., Flórez, R., & Edith, E. (2014). "Collaborative Work as an Alternative for Writing Research Articles." *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development* 16(1): 119-136. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1053828.pdf>
- 1 Coffin, C., et al. (2005). *Teaching Academic Writing. A Toolkit for Higher Education* London, Taylor and Francis e-Library.
- 47 Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *What do you mean by collaborative learning?*, Oxford: Elsevier.
- 17 Dobao, A. F. & Blum, A. (2013). "Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions." *System* 41(2): 365-378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.02.002>
- 37 Dooly, M. (2018). "Collaborative Learning." *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*: 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0394>
- 32 Fung, Y. M. (2010). "Collaborative writing features." *RELC Journal* 41(1): 18-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210362610>
- 23 Galko, F. D. (2001). *Better Writing Right Now. Using Words to Your Advantage*. New York: Learning Express, LLC.
- 18 Gokhale, A. A. (1995). "Collaborative Learning Enhances Critical Thinking." *Journal of Technology Education* 7. <https://doi.org/10.21061/jte.v7i1.a.2>
- 1 Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory dan Practice of Writing*. London: Pearson Education Limited.

- 11 Guasch, T., Espasa, A., Alvarez, I.M., & Kirschner, P. A. (2013). "Effects of feedback on collaborative writing in an online learning environment." *Distance education* 34(3): 324-338. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.835772>
- 42 James, N. (2007). *Writing at Work. How to Write Clearly, Effectively and Professionally*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- 30 Kim, Y. & Chiesa, D. L. (2018). "Task Development 75: Collaborative Writing." *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*: 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0812>
- 20 Laal, M. & Ghodsi, S. M. (2012). "Benefits of collaborative learning." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 31: 486-490. Retrieved from: <https://cyberleninka.org/article/n/1038401.pdf>
- 14 Laal, M. & Laal, M. (2012). "Collaborative learning: what is it?" *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 31: 491-495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.092>
- 13 Li, M. & Zhu, W. (2017). "Good or bad collaborative wiki writing: Exploring links between group interactions and writing products." *Journal of second language writing* 35: 38-53. DOI: [10.1016/j.jslw.2017.01.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.01.003)
- 27 Mallia, J. (2017). "Strategies for Developing English Academic Writing Skills." *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume 8*. DOI: [10.24093/awej/vol8no2.1](https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.1)
- 9 Mauri, T., Ginesta, A., & Rochera, M.J. (2016). "The use of feedback systems to improve collaborative text writing: a proposal for the higher education context." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 53(4): 411-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.961503>
- 12 McDonough, K. & De Vleeschauwer, J. (2019). "Comparing the effect of collaborative and individual prewriting on EFL learners' writing development." *Journal of second language writing* 44: 123-130. doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.04.003
- 8 McDonough, K., De Vleeschauwer, J., & Crawford, W. (2018). "Comparing the quality of collaborative writing, collaborative prewriting, and individual texts in a Thai EFL context." *System* 74: 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.02.010>
- 51 Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English*. New York: Longman.
- 19 Rae, J., Taylor, G., & Roberts, C. (2006). "Collaborative learning: A connected community for learning and knowledge management." *Interactive Technology and Smart Education* 3(3): 225-233. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17415650680000066>
- 1 Shields, M. (2010). *Essay Writing. A Student's Guide*. California: SAGE Publication.
- Simon & Schuster. (1987). *Handbook for Writers*. London: Lynn Quitman Troyka
- Smith, B. L. & MacGregor, J. T. (1992). *What is collaborative learning*. Washington.
- 10 Stewart, M.K., Cohn, J., & Whithaus, C. (2016). "Collaborative Course Design and Communities of Practice: Strategies for Adaptable Course Shells in Hybrid and Online Writing."

Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal 9(1).
<https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Transformative>

³ Storch, N. (2005). "Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections." *Journal of second language writing* 14(3): 153-173. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002

Storch, N. (2011). "Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 31: 275-288. doi:10.1017/S0267190511000079.

²⁴ Storch, N. (2012). "Collaborative language learning." *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0153.pub2>

Storch, N. (2018). "Collaborative writing." *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*: 1-6. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0153.pub2 ⁵⁹

³ Storch, N. & Aldosari, A. (2013). "Pairing learners in pair work activity." *Language Teaching Research* 17(1): 31-48. doi: 10.1177/1362168812457530

¹ Tompkins, G. E. (2008). *Teaching Writing. Balancing Process and Product*. Fifth Edition (Australia: Pearson Prentice Hall., 2008), hh. 9-10. Australia: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Tunnard, S. & Sh²¹, J. (2009). "Children's views of collaborative learning." *Education 3-13* 37(2): 159-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270802095421>

¹ Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Ed. by M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman). Cambridge: Harvard University Press,

Widodo, H. P. (2013). "Implementing collaborative process based writing in the EFL co⁵⁴ classroom." *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning* 4(1): 198. Retrieved from: <https://rpltd.eap.gr/images/2013/04-01-198-widodo.pdf>

¹ Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching Writing in Second and Foreign Language Teaching Classrooms*. United States of America: The McGraw-Hills Companies, Inc

Zhang, M. (2018). "Collaborative writing in the EFL classroom: The effects of L1 and L2 use." *System* 76: 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.04.009> ²⁴

¹⁵ Zheng, L., Li, X., & Huang, R. (2017). "The Effect of Socially Shared Regulation Approach on Learning Performance in Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning." *Journal of Educational Technology & Society* 20(4): 35-46. Retrieved from: <https://www.jstor.org>

ORIGINALITY REPORT

32%

SIMILARITY INDEX

26%

INTERNET SOURCES

20%

PUBLICATIONS

22%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Submitted to Universitas Negeri Jakarta Student Paper | 5% |
| 2 | library.iugaza.edu.ps Internet Source | 2% |
| 3 | biblio.ugent.be Internet Source | 1% |
| 4 | www.ring-tones-ringtones.net Internet Source | 1% |
| 5 | Submitted to National Economics University Student Paper | 1% |
| 6 | www.scribd.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 7 | s3.amazonaws.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 8 | www.tandfonline.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 9 | revistas.uned.es Internet Source | 1% |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 10 | Submitted to University of Westminster Student Paper | 1% |
| 11 | Submitted to Laureate Higher Education Group Student Paper | 1% |
| 12 | Submitted to University of Melbourne Student Paper | 1% |
| 13 | Submitted to University of Queensland Student Paper | 1% |
| 14 | files.eric.ed.gov Internet Source | 1% |
| 15 | Submitted to Higher Ed Holdings Student Paper | 1% |
| 16 | Irlidiya Irlidiya, Achmad Tolla, Nurdin Noni, Anshari Anshari. "The Development of Interactive Multimedia for First-grade Beginning Readers of Elementary School: An Innovative Learning Approach", Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2015 Publication | 1% |
| 17 | imanagerpublications.com Internet Source | 1% |
| 18 | jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id Internet Source | 1% |
| 19 | Submitted to Swinburne University of Technology | 1% |

20 Submitted to Southern Cross University <1%
Student Paper

21 Submitted to Bahcesehir University <1%
Student Paper

22 repository.radenintan.ac.id <1%
Internet Source

23 media.neliti.com <1%
Internet Source

24 m.benjamins.com <1%
Internet Source

25 propertibazar.com <1%
Internet Source

26 www.joomag.com <1%
Internet Source

27 Submitted to University of Warwick <1%
Student Paper

28 Submitted to Universitas Riau <1%
Student Paper

29 Meixiu Zhang. "Collaborative writing in the EFL
classroom: The effects of L1 and L2 use",
System, 2018 <1%
Publication

Submitted to Minnesota State University,

30

Mankato

Student Paper

<1%

31

**Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah
Surakarta**

Student Paper

<1%

32

ojs.academypublisher.com

Internet Source

<1%

33

vm36.upi.edu

Internet Source

<1%

34

repository.unpas.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

35

digitalcommons.acu.edu

Internet Source

<1%

36

worldwidescience.org

Internet Source

<1%

37

www.educationalrev.us.edu.pl

Internet Source

<1%

38

jurnal.fkip.uns.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

39

**Nada Abdulaziz Alkhalaf. "Saudi Female EFL
Learners and Collaborative Writing: Attitudes
and Challenges", Theory and Practice in
Language Studies, 2020**

Publication

<1%

40 Jeffery D. Nokes, Susan De La Paz. "Writing and Argumentation in History Education", Wiley, 2018
Publication <1%

41 María Verónica Leiva Guerrero, Tatiana López Jiménez. "Uso de plataforma virtual para retroalimentar la formación del profesorado", Pensamiento Educativo: Revista de Investigación Educativa Latinoamericana, 2019
Publication <1%

42 Submitted to Wawasan Open University
Student Paper <1%

43 Submitted to Fresno Pacific University
Student Paper <1%

44 Kim McDonough, Jindarat De Vleeschauwer, William J. Crawford. "Exploring the benefits of collaborative prewriting in a Thai EFL context", Language Teaching Research, 2018
Publication <1%

45 jultika.oulu.fi
Internet Source <1%

46 "Blended Learning. Education in a Smart Learning Environment", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020
Publication <1%

| | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 47 | digitalcommons.unl.edu Internet Source | <1% |
| 48 | Submitted to Universiti Teknologi MARA Student Paper | <1% |
| 49 | jode.ncu.edu Internet Source | <1% |
| 50 | Submitted to Universitas Brawijaya Student Paper | <1% |
| 51 | revistas.udistrital.edu.co Internet Source | <1% |
| 52 | Bao Trang Thi Nguyen, Jonathan Newton. "Learner proficiency and EFL learning through task rehearsal and performance", Language Teaching Research, 2019 Publication | <1% |
| 53 | eprints.unm.ac.id Internet Source | <1% |
| 54 | Submitted to Hellenic Open University Student Paper | <1% |
| 55 | unmas-library.ac.id Internet Source | <1% |
| 56 | Xuan Teng, Xinhui Zhou. "A Study of the Effects of Collaborative Writing on the Development of Chinese Senior High School Students' | <1% |

Discourse Competence", International Journal of Linguistics, 2020

Publication

57

eprints.iain-surakarta.ac.id

Internet Source

<1%

58

Mimi Li, Wei Zhu. "Good or bad collaborative wiki writing: Exploring links between group interactions and writing products", Journal of Second Language Writing, 2017

Publication

<1%

59

scholarworks.waldenu.edu

Internet Source

<1%

60

online-engineering.org

Internet Source

<1%

61

May Olaug Horverak. "An experimental study on the effect of systemic functional linguistics applied through a genre-pedagogy approach to teaching writing", Yearbook of the Poznan Linguistic Meeting, 2016

Publication

<1%

62

Daden Sopandi. "ANALYSIS OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENT SKILLS IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXTS", PrimaryEdu - Journal of Primary Education, 2020

Publication

<1%

63

docs.lib.purdue.edu

<1%

64

onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Internet Source

<1%

65

www.slideshare.net

Internet Source

<1%

66

Samah Zakareya Ahmad. "Cloud-Based Collaborative Writing to Develop EFL Students' Writing Quantity and Quality", *International Education Studies*, 2020

Publication

<1%

67

kclpure.kcl.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

68

Mimi Li, Wei Zhu. "Patterns of computer-mediated interaction in small writing groups using wikis", *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 2013

Publication

<1%

69

mafiadoc.com

Internet Source

<1%

70

Fangyuan Du. "Comparing Students' Perceptions and Their Writing Performance on Collaborative writing: A Case Study", *English Language Teaching*, 2018

Publication

<1%

- 71 Teresa Mauri, Anna Ginesta, Maria-José Rochera. "The use of feedback systems to improve collaborative text writing: a proposal for the higher education context", *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 2014
Publication <1%
-
- 72 Teresa Guasch, Anna Espasa, Ibis M. Alvarez, Paul A. Kirschner. "Effects of feedback on collaborative writing in an online learning environment", *Distance Education*, 2013
Publication <1%
-
- 73 Wenting Chen. "An Exploratory Study on the Role of L2 Collaborative Writing on Learners' Subsequent Individually Composed Texts", *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 2019
Publication <1%
-
- 74 Sandra Tunnard, John Sharp. "Children's views of collaborative learning", *Education 3-13*, 2009
Publication <1%
-
- 75 Daphnée Simard, Michael Zuniga. "Chapter 13. Exploring the mediating role of emotions expressed in L2 written languaging in ESL learner text revisions", John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2020
Publication <1%
-
- 76 "English Language Teaching Research in the Middle East and North Africa", Springer Science <1%

and Business Media LLC, 2019

Publication

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off