



**The Impact of Online Collaborative Writing Activities on English Language Learners' Writing Skills at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Lancang Kuning University**

*Dampak Kegiatan Menulis Kolaboratif Daring terhadap Keterampilan Menulis Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Lancang Kuning*

**Febri Yuni Br. Hutabarat<sup>1\*</sup>, Herlinawati<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>English Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Pasir Pangaraian, Indonesia.

[\\*febri.yuni02@gmail.com](mailto:febri.yuni02@gmail.com)

Diterima: 02 Januari 2025; Disetujui: 1 Februari 2025

**Abstract**

Online Collaborative Writing Activities strategy in the writing learning process provides more opportunities for students to be more active in the learning process. This is because collaborative activities offer significant benefits for students, especially in the learning process at the English Department Universitas Lancang Kuning. This thesis discusses the effects of online collaborative writing activities in the fifth semester of the English Department at Universitas Lancang Kuning. The purpose of the research is to find out the impact of using online collaborative writing activities on writing ability. The method of this research was experimental research with Quasi-Experimental design. This research was conducted from December 2021 to January 2022. The instruments used in this research were tests to write argumentative essays. The results of this research on the effects of using online collaborative activities in EFL writing students' are higher in using group rather than pair activities. This is evidenced by the mean difference between the group and pair activity classes, which is  $88.55 > 84.89$ . Based on the results of Ngain's mean value, it can be concluded that online collaborative writing activities are less effective (40-55%). In addition, there is a significant difference between the group activity class and the pair activity class.

**Keywords: Online Collaborative Writing, Writing Ability, Argumentative Essay.**

**Abstrak**

Strategi aktivitas kolaborasi menulis online dalam proses pembelajaran menulis lebih banyak memberikan kesempatan kepada mahasiswa untuk lebih aktif dalam proses pembelajaran. Hal ini karena kegiatan kolaboratif memberikan manfaat yang signifikan bagi mahasiswa khususnya dalam proses pembelajaran di Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Lancang Kuning. Skripsi ini membahas tentang pengaruh penggunaan aktivitas kolaboratif menulis

online pada semester V Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Lancang Kuning. Tujuan penelitian adalah untuk mengetahui pengaruh penggunaan aktivitas kolaboratif menulis online dalam kemampuan menulis. Metode penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimen dengan desain Quasi-Experimental. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan pada bulan Desember 2021 sampai Januari 2022. Instrumen yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah tes menulis esai argumentatif. Hasil penelitian tentang efek penggunaan aktivitas kolaboratif online pada siswa menulis EFL lebih tinggi dalam menggunakan aktivitas berkelompok daripada aktivitas berpasangan. Hal ini dibuktikan dengan perbedaan rata-rata antara kelas aktivitas berkelompok dan kelas aktivitas berpasangan yaitu  $88,55 > 84,89$ . Berdasarkan hasil nilai rata-rata Ngain, dapat disimpulkan bahwa kegiatan menulis kolaboratif online kurang efektif (40-50%). Selain itu, terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan antara kelas aktivitas kelompok dan kelas aktivitas berpasangan.

**Kata Kunci: Kolaborasi Online, Kemampuan Menulis, Argumentasi Essai**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is the activity of expressing ideas through language media. Writing is a productive and expressive activity, so writers must be able to use vocabulary, grammar, and language structure (Nurgiyantoro, 2001). Writing is one of the most challenging problems because "it remains unclear how students acquire the skills needed to produce an effective piece of writing in another language" (Khanalizadeh & Allami, 2012). Of the four language skills that students must master, writing as a productive skill has been believed to be the most challenging skill for students, including Indonesian students (Richards & Renandya, 2002; Mukminatien, 1997).

During this pandemic, face-to-face learning is still minimized. The world of education is changing. Everything is online, including learning. Donna J. Abernathy mentions that "online learning is not the next big thing. It is the now big thing." Online learning can be as good or even better than in-person classroom learning. Research has shown that students in online learning performed better than those receiving face-to-face instruction, but it has to be done right. The best online learning combines elements where students go at their own pace, on their own time, and are set up to think deeply and critically about

subject matter combined with elements where students go online at the same time and interact with other students, their teacher and content (Hertina et al., 2024).

Based on the aforementioned research, the researcher is interested in investigating the effects of collaborative activities in online writing classes as a potential gap drawn from the previous research above. The research expects to determine which collaborative activities will better affect students' writing performance. Therefore, the research will be titled "The Impact of Online Collaborative Writing Activities on English Language Learners' Writing Skills at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Lancang Kuning University."

## 2. METHODS

The research was experimental (Quasi-Experimental Design). The researcher conducted this research in the fifth semester at the Faculty of Teachers Training and Education Universitas Lancang Kuning. The sample of this research was 40 students. The researcher used a test as an instrument. The test was used to determine the students' writing ability. The test was constructed in writing an argumentative essay with the Indicators as follows: Content (30%), Organization

(20%), Grammar (20%), Vocabulary (15), Mechanics (15).

The writing process underwent several stages, such as pre-tests, treatments, and post-tests. In this pre-test, the researcher asked the lecturer who teaches the writing class who has the same ability to be used as a research sample. Then, the researcher asked the lecturer for student score data to be used as pre-test data. In this study, there were two treatments. The treatment in the first class is activity in groups, and the treatment in the second class is activity in pairs. The treatments were done for 8 days. Last, the post-test was done on the ninth day after treatments. The researcher's technique in analyzing the data was a test of normality, homogeneity, and a hypothesis test. All these tests were conducted using SPSS.

### 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Findings

The results of the pre-test scores can be seen in Table 1. The data's pre-test scores were calculated using statistical computation to draw descriptive statistics. As seen in the table above, the English writing skills of 5th-semester students are

still very poor. The results of the Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test Scores can be seen in Table 2

**Table 1. Pre-Test Scores**

No.	Classes	
	5.1	5.2
1	73	75
2	74	73
3	76	76
4	78	77
5	75	76
6	77	73
7	75	74
8	75	76
9	77	72
10	74	76
11	78	72
12	75	73
13	76	73
14	77	73
15	74	77
16	77	78
17	73	74
18	74	68
19	75	
20	73	
21	77	
22	74	

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-test Score**

Value	Class	N	Test of Mastery Concept			Mean
			Ideal Score	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	
Pre-Test	5.1 (Groups)	22	100	73	78	75.32
	5.2 (Pairs)	18	100	68	78	74.22

Concerning the pre-test data obtained from both classes, the next step was

calculating the normality and homogeneity tests, as seen in Tables 3 and 4.

**Tabel 3. Normality Test of Pre-Test**

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Pre-Test	Class 5.1	,169	22	,101	22	,062
	Class 5.2	,158	18	,200*	,926	18

The result showed Sig. >  $\alpha$  (0.062 > 0.05) and (0.167 > 0.05) mean that the pre-

test data in this study was normally distributed.

**Table 4. Homogeneity Test of Pre-Test**

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2,347	1	38	,134

Regarding the table above, the value of Sig. was 0.134, and the significance level was 0.05. It could be said that the pre-test data on both classes had homogeneous variance because Sig.  $0.134 > 0.05$ . After knowing that the pre-test scores in both classes were normal and homogeneous, the calculation proceeded to the treatment values in both classes.

### B. Post-Test

Based on the data collected for both classes, the students' post-test results were assessed by three assessors. From the three assessors, the students' average post-test scores can be seen in Table 5.

From the table, the post-test score is calculated using statistical calculations to draw descriptive statistics, as seen in Table 6.

**Table 5. Post-Test**

No	Class	
	5.1 (Group Activity)	5.2 (Pair Activity)
1	89	85
2	89	86
3	93	85
4	85	84
5	85	88
6	85	82
7	88	84
8	91	84
9	93	88
10	85	84
11	93	85
12	88	86
13	91	84
14	89	85
15	88	84
16	91	86
17	87	82
18	87	86
19	87	
20	88	
21	89	
22	87	

**Table 6. Descriptive Statistic of Post-Test Score**

Value	Class	N	Test of Mastery Concept			Mean
			Ideal Score	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	
Post-Test	5.1 (Groups)	22	100	85	93	88.55
	5.2 (Pairs)	18	100	82	88	84.89

The post-test data was gained from both classes. The following calculations were done: the normality test and the homogeneity test. Those tests qualified for

the continuing test. The normality test in this research used a Shapiro-Wilk formula. The result of the normality test of the post-test can be seen in Table 7.

**Table 7. Normality Test of Post-Test**

Class		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Writing Result	Class 5.1	,157	22	,167	,918	22	,069
	Class 5.2	,183	18	,114	,920	18	,132

The study's results showed that Sig.  $> \alpha$  ( $0.069 > 0.05$ ) and ( $0.132 > 0.05$ ). In other words, the post-test data obtained from this study were considered normal. Based on the post-test results obtained by both classes,

the homogeneity test results can be seen in Table 8.

**Table 8. Homogeneity Test of Post-Test**

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3,822	1	38	,058

Based on the data, the value of Sig. was 0.058, higher than the significance level of 0.05. It could be said that post-test data on both classes had homogeneous variance because Sig.  $0.066 > 0.05$ .

### C. Hypothesis Test

For the hypothesis test, some of the steps were explained: Based on the Table 9, the t-test of the post-test on the group and pair activity classes is different because Sig. (2-tailed)  $0.000 < 0.05$ . It could be concluded that both classes were different.

**Table 9. Independent Sample T-test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means				
	F	Sig. T	Df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Writing Result	3,822	,058	21138	,000	3,657	,702	2,236	5,077
Equal variances assumed								
Equal variances are not assumed.		5,442	36,039	,000	3,657	,672	2,294	5,019

### N-Gain Score Test

To see the N-Gain Score Test data, see Table 10.

**Table 10. N-Gain Score Test**

No	Group Activity N-Gain Score (%)	No	Pair Activity N-Gain Score (%)
S1	59,26	S1	40
S2	57,69	S2	48,15
S3	70,83	S3	37,5
S4	31,82	S4	30,43
S5	40	S5	50
S6	34,78	S6	33,33
S7	52	S7	38,46
S8	64	S8	33,33
S9	69,57	S9	57,14
S10	42,31	S10	33,33
S11	68,18	S11	46,43
S12	52	S12	48,15
S13	62,5	S13	40,74
S14	52,17	S14	44,44
S15	53,85	S15	30,43
S16	60,87	S16	36,36
S17	51,85	S17	30,77
S18	50	S18	56,25
S19	48	Mean	40,8482
S20	55,56	Minimum	30,43
S21	52,17	Maximal	57,14
S22	50		
Mean	53,6096		
Minimum	31,82		
Maximal	70,83		

The results of the N-gain score test calculation above show that the mean of the

N-gain score for the group activity class was 53,6095 or 53.6%, with a minimum N-gain

score of 31.82% and a maximum of 70.83%. Meanwhile, the mean N-gain score for the pair activity class was 40.8482 or 40.8%, with a minimum N-gain score of 30.43% and a maximum of 57.14%.

### Interpretation of Independent Sample T-test for N-gain Score

The interpretation categories of the effectiveness of the N-gain value (%) can be

seen in Table 11. Next, for the first output, Table 12.

**Table 11. Category of N-Gain Effectiveness Interpretation**

percentage	Tafsiran
<40	Not Effective
40-55	Less Effective
56-75	Quite Effective
>76	Effektive

**Table 12. Group Statistics NGain\_Persen**

	Experiments	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
NGain_Persen	Group Activity	22	53,6096	10,39212	2,21561
	Pair Activity	18	40,8482	8,61862	2,03143

The mean value of NGain\_Persen for the Pair Activity Class was 40.8482, which rounded up to 40.9%. So, the pair activity method is less effective in improving writing outcomes in the fifth

semester English Department Universitas Lancang Kuning. The results of the independent sample t-test for the N-Gain score can be seen in Table 1.

**Table 13. Independent Sample T-test for N-Gain Score**

Value	Df	Sig.(2-Tailed)	Sig. Level ( $\alpha$ )	Hypothesis
NGain_Persen (Equal variances assumed)	38	.000	.05	Accepted Ha

Based on the "Independent Samples Test" output table above, it is known that the value of Sig. (2 tailed) is  $0.000 < 0.05$ ; thus, it can be concluded that there is a difference ( $H_0$  rejected and  $H_a$  Received) between group activity class and pair activity class to improve argumentative writing outcomes in the fifth semester English Department Universitas Lancang Kuning.

The results of this study indicate that collaborative writing combined with online learning is less effective for developing foreign language learning. The value of Ngain evidences this mean results, which show a difference in students' writing skills at 40-55% (less effective). This is supported by the results of research by Muthmainnah & Azmina (2020) about students' perceptions of using WhatsApp groups for writing activities. However, on the other hand, the use of online collaborative

activities affects students' writing ability. This can be seen by comparing students' pre-test and post-test scores.

The uniqueness of collaborative writing activities is that students are encouraged to cooperate (Murtiningsih, 2016) and provide opportunities for students to give and receive immediate feedback (Susanti & Rukiati, 2017). Group activities and pair activities influence students' writing activities. Therefore, pair and group activities in collaborative writing discussions should be in the EFL classroom (Winarti, 2019). This aligns with the benefits of collaborative writing (Sukirman, 2016).

However, when comparing group activities and paired activities, group activities had a more significant influence than paired activities in this study. It can be seen from the comparison of the mean of the two. This study also supports previous

research that found online cooperative learning methods, such as group activities, helpful and practical for teaching argumentative essay writing.

In their research, Cakra et al. (2021) said that when comparing the two types of collaborative work, pair and group work, it was found that both low and high-proficiency students seem to participate the most when being in pair work, followed by group work. This might be because collaborative writing allows students to discuss, pool ideas, and provide each other with immediate feedback (Karina et al., 2024). In addition, online collaborative activities can also be carried out in all subject departments, depending on the level and needs of students.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

This research was a quasi-experimental design intended to investigate empiric evidence of the effects of online collaborative writing activities on students' writing ability in argumentative essays, the semester students of the English Department Universitas Lancang Kuning. From the explanation of the findings above, we can conclude that online collaborative writing activities affect students' writing skills in the fifth semester of the English department at Universitas Lancang Kuning. Based on the Tobtained and Ttable test ( $5.211 > 1.686$ ), the mean NGain\_Persen value of the Group activity class and pair activity class (53.6% and 40.9%) and the value of Sig. (2-Tailed) Independent Sample T-test for N-Gain Score ( $.000 < 0.05$ ) indicates that there is a difference between the use of group activity and pair activity ( $H_0$  rejected and  $H_a$  Received).

#### REFERENCES

Cakra, C., Sunra, L., & Neni, N. (2021). Efektivitas Metode Demonstrasi dalam Peningkatan Pemahaman Membaca Teks Prosedur pada Masa

COVID-19 di Kelas IX SMPN 2 Selemadeg Timur Kab. Tabanan Bali. *Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran*, 3(3): 103-112.

Hertina, D., Nurhidaya, M., Gaspersz, V., Nainggolan, E.T.A., Rosmiati, R., Sanulita, H., ... & Ferdinan, F. (2024). *Metode Pembelajaran Inovatif Era Digital: Teori dan Penerapan*. PT. Green Pustaka Indonesia. 170 hlm.

Karina, M., Judijanto, L., Rukmini, A., Fauzi, M. S., & Arsyad, M. (2024). Pengaruh Interaksi Sosial terhadap Prestasi Akademik: Tinjauan Literatur pada Pembelajaran Kolaboratif. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(5): 6334-6343.

Khanalizadeh, B. & Allami, H. (2012). The Impact of Teachers' Beliefs on EFL Writing Instruction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(2): 334-342.

Mukminatien, N. (1997). *The Differences of Students' Writing Achievements Across Different Course Levels*. University of Malang. Malang.

Murtiningsih, R.S. (2016). Collaborative Writing in an EFL Context. *Journal of Foreign Language, Teaching & Learning*, 1(1): 82-90.

Muthmainnah, N., & Azmina, B. (2020). EFL-Writing Activities Using Whatsapp Group: Students' Perceptions during Study from Home. *LET: Linguistics, Literature and English Teaching Journal*, 2(10): 1-23.

Nurgiyantoro, B. (2001). *Penilaian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. BPFE Yogyakarta. Yogyakarta.

Richards, J.C & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Sukirman, S. (2016). *Using Collaborative Writing In Teaching Writing*. Faculty of

- Tarbiyah and Teaching Science, IAIN Palopo.
- Susanti, N., & Rukiati, E. (2017). Collaborative Writing in Small Groups: Learners' Perceptions. Politeknik Negeri Jember, Jawa Timur, Indonesia.
- Winarti, W. (2019). The Effect of Pair and Group Work in Collaborative Prewriting Discussion on Students' Writing Quality. *Journal of English for Academic and Specific Purposes*, 2(2): 12-24.