LAPORAN PENELITIAN

PROGRAM BANTUAN DANA PENELITIAN DOSEN

FAKULTAS HUMANIORA

STUDENTS VOICES ABOUT COLLABORATIVE EFL WRITING

OLEH:

GALUH NUR ROHMAH, M.PD, M.ED

NIP 197402111998032002

JURUSAN SASTRA INGGRIS

FAKULTAS HUMANIORA

UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG

2017

HALAMAN PENGESAHAN

1. Judul Penelitian : STUDENTS' VOICES ABOUT COLLABORATIVE EFL WRITING
2. Identitas Pelaksana
   a. Nama Lengkap : Galuh Nur Rohmah, M.Pd, M.Ed
   b. Jenis Kelamin : Wanita
   c. NIP : 197202111998032002
   d. NIDN : 2011027401
   e. Disiplin Ilmu : Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
   f. Pangkat/Golongan : Lektor Kepala/Pembina IV/A
   g. Email : galuhnurrohmah@yahoo.com
   h. Telepon/HP : 081252001900

Malang, 15 November 2017

Mengetahui,

Ketua Lab. Penelitian dan   Peneliti,

Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat,

Dr. Susilo Mansurudin, M.Pd   Galuh Nur Rohmah, M.Pd, M.Ed

NIP. 19700728 200801 1 007   NIP. 19740211 199803 2 002

Mengesahkan

Dekan,

Dr. Hj. Syafiyah, M.A

NIP. 19660910 1991032 002

TABLE OF CONTENT

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji pengalaman mahasiswa tentang menulis kolaboratif. Pada beberapa kelas menulis, menulis kolaboratif menjadi aktifitas tambahan untuk memfasilitasi mahasiswa menulis sebuah esei secara berkelompok. Kolaborasi dilakukan mulai awal proses menulis sampai penulisan akhir. Tentunya, hal ini menimbulkan situasi yang tidak mudah bagi mahasiswa. Mereka memiliki berbagai pengalaman yang tentunya sangat penting untuk diteliti. Penelitian menggunakan metode narrative inquiry karena data yang diperoleh berupa pengalaman mahasiswa ketika menulis secara berkolaborasi. Mahasiswa yang menjadi partisipan adalah mereka yang menempuh mata kuliah Writing selama 3 semester berturut-turut dan kelas yang mereka ikuti menggunakan collaborative writing. Temuannya adalah awal mula mengalami collaborative writing mahasiswa merasa berada pada situasi kompetisi dan situasi yang tidak menyenangkan. Setelah mengikuti proses, mereka mendapati collaborative writing memberikan banyak manfaat, manfaat pembelajaran dan manfaat iringan. Collaborative writing berdampak pada grammar, isi, kualitas tulisan mahasiswa, dan berdampak pada social skill mereka. Untuk penelitian lanjutan, perlu diteliti pengalaman mahasiswa dari berbagai level kemampuan untuk memperoleh gambaran yang lebih rinci tentang collaborative writing pada konteks Indonesia.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The research is about collaborative writing in EFL context focusing on students' voices when they learn through collaborative activities in writing class. This chapter presents background of the study, research questions, scope of the study, significance of the study, theoretical framework, and definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Collaborative writing has been considered as a promising second language learning activity. It also has been a topic of interest among ELT researchers. Collaborative writing may be defined as the joint production or the coauthoring of a text by two or more writers (Storch, 2011:275) that can potentially develop students' writing performance (Mulligan & Garafalo, 2011:9). They confirmed that collaborative writing is a non-stressful approach leading to purposeful usage of the target language and concrete writing improvements. The richness of collaborative writing, then, invites ELT practitioners to investigate it.

At higher level of education, working in group is common practice for finishing the project, and also at the workplace context. Higher education students are expected to work collaboratively because it will give more benefits than working individually. In the teaching of writing, the emergence of process writing approach has made collaborative writing gains its popularity to apply. In EFL context, especially at EFL university writing class, students are facilitated to work collaboratively during writing process. This phenomenon also happens at the teaching of writing in English Department at UIN Malang, teachers of writing commonly use pair work or small group in the classroom. Collaborative brainstorming and outlining are regularly done before students develop their composition as well as peer editing when students finished the draft. The emergence of collaborative writing results a number of studies documenting the advantages and the effects of collaborative writing. The studies, so far, have primarily been concerned with the effects of collaborative writing to contribute to students' writing development by investigating different patterns of collaborative writing, such as face-to-face collaboration, computer-mediated

collaboration/online collaboration, ZPD-activated collaboration, collaborative revision, students' interaction, collaborative prewriting, and collaborative editing (Storch, 2005; Fung, 2010; Mulligan & Garofalo, 2011; Shehadeh, 2011; Mirzaeia & Eslamib, 2013; Trajtemberg & Yiakoumetti, 2011; Chaoa & Lob, 2011; Houat, 2012; Lee & Wang, 2013; Cullen, Kullman, & Wild, 2013).

The effect of collaborative writing on linguistic competence has still become the targeted area of research. A study by Dobao (2012) gave strong evidence about the advancement of collaborative writing for students' linguistic competence. Comparing collaborative writing, pair work and individual work reveal that texts written collaboratively were overall more accurate than those written individually. On the other hand, it was found that the texts written in small groups contained significantly fewer errors not only than those written individually but also than those written in pair. These results suggest that the effect of collaboration on accuracy may be related to the number of participants in the activity.

The use of collaborative writing can significantly improve students' writing performance on grammar, vocabulary, content and organization, and, fluency and complexity. The effect of collaborative writing on students' grammatical and discourse competence is releaved in Shehadeh's study (2011) which investigated the effectiveness and the students' perception of collaborative writing in L2 in the UAE (Uni Arab Emirates). The experimental research confirms that collaborative writing had an overall significant effect on students' L2 writing; the effect was significant for vocabulary and organization. Mirzaei and Eslami (2013) reveal that ZPD-activated collaborative writing facilitates the learner to use meta-discourse appropriately and to improve writing, grammar and vocabulary. This study also clearly elaborates sociocultural theory in collaborative writing resulted students' sociocultural competence that is producing a reader-friendly discourse.

Instead of investigation on instructional effects of collaborative writing, some researchers also revealed its nurturing effects on language learning. Several studies inform the investigation on the merits of collaborative writing. In ESL tertiary classes pair work provided the opportunity for using and reflecting language use and engaging with the moves (Stroch, 2007). The face-to-face group

work in an ESL academic writing in Malaysia featured as mutual interaction, negotiations, conflict, and shared expertise, backtracking and humor facilitates students to be capable of constructing knowledge and developing writing and social skills through interactions with their peers Fung (2010).

The nurturing advantages of collaborative writing in L2 learning is explicitly described by Mulligan and Garafalo (2011). The students' positive comments reflect that collaborative writing serves 3 benefits those are social skill development, stress reduction and time-saving benefits, and motivational effects. The students experienced collaborative writing as the way to sharpen sense of responsibility for helping each other to be better. In term of the second point, students felt secure because they share the job that saves the time as well. The point was elaborated from the students' effort to write harder since the single grade will apply.

Another exploration on the merits of collaborative strengthens the benefits of collaborative writing. Lee and Wang (2013) conducted a research on online collaborative writing with online picture book as the project to Taiwanese students from 2 universities. The research is to identify factors contributing to students' involvement in collaborative writing project. It is found that the nature of the learning tasks, students' constant communication and appreciation of different opinions, the difficulties they encountered when communicating asynchronously, and students' expectations toward English learning affected to what extent they were involved in the online collaboration. Cullen, et al (2013) examined the benefits of a wiki-based collaborative writing project done by Malaysian student teachers pursuing Bachelor Degree in UK. It shows high level of collaborative behavior indicating by interactivity, mutual respect, and interdependence as a means to improve a strong sense of community practice.

Therefore, having open and deep look on collaborative writing is the way to gain better and deeper understanding about collaborative writing. Instead of having well-documented statistical findings on the effect of collaborative writing, investigating collaborative writing from other dimensions is also worth doing as what have been conducted by other researchers. They explored collaborative writing more intensively on students' side to advance research on collaborative

writing. Students experienced collaborative writing as the way to develop writing and social skills such as helping each other (Mulligan & Garafalo, 2011; Fung, 2010). Students' views on learning through collaborative writing were positive and supportive. They experienced that collaborative writing not only influence task performance and L2 development but also self-confidence and creativity (Shehadeh, 2011; Lin and Maarof, 2013: Dobao & Blum, 2013).

Meanwhile, a case study was done to understand EFL students' participation in group peer feedback revealed that students' motives could influence students' participation in group peer feedback activities, engagement with the peer feedback and their subsequent revisions (Yu & Lee, 2014). Specific studies on collaborative writers' stories confirmed that they experienced the tensions during a decade of writing collaboratively that gives useful insights for other writers and collaborators and those who seek caring, responsive, nurturing writing relationship, autonomy, and sense of classroom community (Douglas & Carless, 2014; Houat 2012).

When students are involved in collaborative writing and given space to share their experiences, it can provide pointers with regard to the design features of a "good collaborative task" and the reflection on their experience changes their approach to collaborative writing become more interactive and resourceful on linguistic aspects (Bremmer, et al, 2014:165). For many L2 leaners, the experience of writing with other learners in a group can be terrible one. In these situation, they may be faced with more competent language users, and they may be concerned about their ability to contribute, and about the attitude they may encounter from others in the group (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012). For sure, these situation become important to share. A study on how do learners experience joint writing focusing on university students' conceptions of online collaborative writing and task environment found that students commonly consider that online collaborative writing as document production or co-construction of personal understanding which was effectively done if it was supported with various procedural, functional and behavioral scaffolds (Limbu & Markauskaite, 2015).

This present study explores collaborative writing focusing on students' experiences. The contribution of the research is to add knowledge about

collaborative in L2 context, specifically, in essay writing. Moreover, some issues related to collaborative writing such as which types of collaboration, and which part of writing process, and which aspects to develop depending on the L2 classroom context. All aspects of collaborative writing will serve its own benefits for writing improvement. In this sense, collaborative writing should be prepared and handled properly to achieve the optimal benefits. By exploring students' voices, collaborative writing can be better understood and thoroughly describe the potency and the complexities, the challenges, and the success and unsuccess of collaborative writing.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the above description and explanation, the present research is going to probe the following research questions:

1. What learning experiences using collaborative writing

    have been important to teachers and students of EFL writing?

2. How do students perceive collaborative writing?

Referring to the research questions, the present study is expected to reveal these findings. First, it reveals how students experience, engage with, and make meaning of collaborative writing. From important experiences, the research have rich description about kinds of collaborative writing activities employed by EFL writing teachers in their classroom as there are lots of activities representing collaborative writing. In terms group composition, collaborative writing can be pair work or small group. When it comes to the stages, collaborative writing may have different way, collaborative pre-writing, collaborative writing, and collaborative revision. Also, this research gains deep understanding on the strengths and weaknesses of collaborative writing experienced by teachers and students.

Second, it is expected to give clear and deep description about the ups and downs of students' experiences in doing collaborative writing in EFL writing class. Therefore, there will be a clear description about how they feel and think of collaborative writing activity with its success and unsuccess stories.

1.3 Scope of the Study

The present study focuses on the collaborative writing activities conducted in EFL writing class of English Department. It is believed that collaborative writing is employed differently in every writing class, therefore, this study sees any kind of collaborative writing activities from pre-writing, writing, and revision. EFL writing students who enroll collaborative writing class for three semesters as the participants. The main concern of this research is students' experiences.

1.4 Significance of the Study

By exploring students' collaborative writing experiences, it is expected to gain balance perspective. Collaborative writing is considered as common but not all writing classes apply this teaching technique because a belief that writing is seen as solitary activity still dominates teaching writing pedagogy, therefore, when it is used in writing class, of course, this phenomenon emerges curiosity to explore. It is the time to capture students' experiences when they have it. The exploration will contribute to gain better understanding and to add theoretical bases about collaborative writing in EFL context.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding on some key words and the content of the study, it is necessary to define the following terms:

- Collaborative writing is student and student activity where two or more students in L2 writing class work together to produce a document of academic writing. Students write collaboratively during the process of writing, which includes idea generating, researching, planning, drafting, editing, and revising, and writing final draft.
- Students' voices are selected experiences when the students engage themselves in collaborative writing activities to produce an essay. The experiences are divided into three themes ('Entering New Nuance', Engaging with CW', and 'Expecting How'). The experiences will also tell about the students' negative and positive feelings and effect of working collaboratively.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 *Collaborative Writing Functions for Second Language Acquisition (SLA)*

L2 acquisiton happens in both formal and informal learning situation. Classroom is one of rich formal situation for exposing the success of L2 acqusition. Important theoretical framework that influence SLA is mapped by Troike (2006:26) shows that beyond linguistic factor, other two factors are also needed for being acquired in SLA. In line with pair and small group activites, those are constituated as one of the most common practices in communicative second language (L2) clssroom which is theoretically also supported by both psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic perspectives on L2 acquisition (Dobao, 2012:40).

The classroom setting represents the scope of SLA that includes the linguistics of SLA, the psychology of SLA, and social contexts of SLA (Troike, 2006). The linguistics aspects become the most frequent topic in ELT discussion. Syntax, morphology, vocabulary, and discourse are strongly involved component in language learning. When figuring out the information and producing language to convey meaning, a learner combining all linguistics aspects that leads to students' linguistic competence as revealed by some studies on the following sections. Collaborative writing contributes to students' writing performance in terms of grammar, vocubulary, content and organization.

2.2 *Collaborative Writing in L2 Writing Context*

To facilitate the students in meaningful writing process, collaborative writing could be the answer. It is relevant to the pedagogical view of writing that is it a process of discovering and making meaning. At the technical level, collaborative or joint writing is not very different from individual writing. They both serve similar sub-tasks such as planning, drafting, editing, and revising. But, in collaborative writing, students must share their thoughts early with other friends by discussing, negotiating, and building knowledge (Limbu & Markauskaite, 2015) and it is performed collectively by more than one person to produce a single text and writing is any activity that leads to a completed document (Lin & Maarof, 2013:601). Successful collaborative writing is

influenced by the nature of collaborative sub-writing tasks such as collaborative pre-writing and editing (Stroch, 2007; Nuemann & Mc Donough, 2015) or at the prolonged writing activity (Shehadeh, 2011). The nature of collaborative task can be manifested in face-to-face collaboration (Storch, 2005; Reynolds & Anderson, 2015) or online or computer-mediated communication collaboration using wiki or blog as media of instruction (Chaoa and Lob, 2011; Houat, 2012)

The second point to be great influence to the success of collaborative writing is the language proficiency of team members as confirmed that L2 proficiency in peer review significantly predicted the number of suggestions made, moreover, equality and mutuality also another point that contribute to the success (Allen & Mills, 2014). The interaction patterns also become contributing factor leading to meaningful collaborative writing. The interaction will show the language-related episodes (LREs) to construct the text. The episodes include discussion about (a) where specific ideas should be placed in outlines, charts, or tables, (b) what order ideas should be presented in writing, and (c) how links between ideas or between reasons and examples could be mare or improved (Nuemann & Mc Donough, 2015:89). Instead of knowing the LREs, interaction also indicates the students' talk during the collaboration which is classified into social talk, planning talk, and language talk (Cullen, et al, 2013:428).

2.3 *Collaborative Writing for Writing Competence*

The main goal of language classroom is to promote the students' communicative competence as it also applies for writing classroom that is to promote students' writing competence. Hyland (2003:51) referring to Canale and Swain's framework states that "to write successfully in English, a writer needs at least grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. To reach the ultimate goal, writing activity should be designed as the way to fill students' need on the improvement of communicative, in this context, writing competence. To see how collaborative writing activity is strongly relevant to communicative competence, the updated communicative competence and explicit description of communicative competence proposed by Celce-Murcia, et al (1995) becomes the basis of the discussion. The updated

model is the continuation of Canale and Swain's framework which makes the dimension of communicative competence more comprehensive.

The effects of collaborative writing on students' grammatical/linguistic competence (the knowledge of language code: grammatical rules, vocabulary, syntax, spelling) were shown from the findings revealed by Storch (2005). The study compared between composing a full text collaboratively or individually. Most of them chose collaborative writing when composing a short paragraph based on a given graphic prompt. Both quantitative and qualitative data analyses are applied. Quantitative procedure measured the students' writing fluency indicating by number of words, accuracy and complexities (clause analysis), meanwhile, qualitative procedure measured the content and structure of the text and task fulfillment. The classroom-based study reveals that advanced ESL learners' collaborative essay grades were higher than those done independently and tended to have greater grammatical accuracy.

Aspect of grammatical/linguistic competence, grammar and vocabulary, again, is clearly described by Mulligan and Garofalo (2011) who evaluated collaborative methodology designed for EFL university students in Kyoto in which students work in pairs to produce co-authored paragraphs and essays. The step-by-step procedures from planning, negotiating, drafting , and revising their writing assignments lead to produce meaningful tasks. At the end of the program, the students gave the written feedback on the collaborative approach employed during the program. The study found that clear gains from collaborative writing are in structural and grammatical proficiency as well as learning new words and phrases while revising each other's draft. This study also reveal the improvement on student's discourse competence that is the students' essays are more carefully organized as well as Nuemann and Mc Donough's study (2015) confirm that collaborative pre-writing stimulates student discusses content and organization.

Findings on the effect collaborative writing on students' grammatical and discourse competence is also reflected in Shehadeh's study (2011) which investigated the effectiveness and the students' perception of collaborative writing in L2 in the UAE (Uni Arab Emirates). The experimental research confirms that collaborative writing had an overall significant effect on students'

L2 writing; the effect was significant for vocabulary and organization. Mirzaei and Eslami (2013) reveal that ZPD-activated collaborative writing facilitates the leaners to use meta-discourse appropriately and to improve writing, grammar and vocabulary. This study also clearly elaborates sociocultural theory in collaborative writing resulted students' sociocultural competence that is producing a reader-friendly discourse.

A comparative study from Dobao (2012) gives strong evidence about the advancement of collaborative writing for students' linguistic competence. Comparing collaborative writing, pair work and individual work reveal texts written collaboratively were overall more accurate than those written individually. On the other hand, it was found that the texts written in small groups contained significantly fewer errors not only than those written individually but also than those written in pair. These results suggest that the effect of collaboration on accuracy may be related to the number of participants in the activity, and in this way contribute to our understanding of collaborative writing tasks.

The study from Trajtemberg and Yiakoumetti (2011) is relevant to sociocultural competence, the students' knowledge to convey message which is suitable for social and cultural context, that is clarified into applying the skill to real-life communication. The study was conducted to investigate EFL interaction by using collaborative writing with web-blog project. EFL students from undergraduate class at University of Chile were involved. The findings reveal that blogs assist in motivating learners to use language for real communicative purposes and to write in English in ways that they have not previously experienced. Self-expression, self-evaluation, and a sense of language progress are promoted when students interact in a collaborative space.

By referring to the findings of the previous studies, it can be stated that collaborative writing has strong contribution to students' writing competence. The grammatical/linguistic competence is indicated by high level of accuracy and grammatical structure found in the text. Various range of vocabulary is also the indicator for linguistic competence. The discourse competence is well-reflected in students' writing through better organization of the essay that is commonly referred to coherence. Collaborative writing helps improve students' sociocultural

competence through the writing for real-communication and reader-oriented point of view.

2.4 *The Merits of Collaborative Writing*

Instead of instructional effects which is discussed in the following section, nurturing effects of using collaborative writing in L2 writing context is also significant to explain. Several studies inform the investigation on the merits of collaborative writing. Storch (2007) compared pair and individual work on an editing task and analyzed the nature of pair interaction of ESL tertiary classes. There was statistically significant different in the accuracy of text edited in pair and individually or there were no advantages for students to work in pairs on grammar-focused tasks. However, the pair work becomes the opportunity for using and reflecting language use, for engaging with the moves. Fung (2010) investigated the features of face-to-face collaborative writing group in an ESL academic writing in Malaysia. The defining features are mutual interaction, negotiations, conflict, and shared expertise while facilitating features include affective factors, use of L1, backtracking and humor. The features occur during collaborative writing reveal that students are capable of constructing knowledge and developing writing and social skills through interactions with their peers. However, affective conflict may sometimes hinder successful collaboration if not handled appropriately.

Writing collaboratively builds sense of collaboration, autonomy, classroom commmunity as revealed by Houat (2012). He explored a blended course implemented using a wiki for collaborative writing project for Master's students from English and French Department in Morroco in which the students are assigned to construct writing about the history of distance learning. The data and statistic also reveal that there is positive perception and satisfaction from students.

The students' comments proved that collaborative writing serves 3 benefits on social skill development, stress reduction and time-saving, and motivational effects (Mulligan and Garafalo, 2011) . The students experienced collaborative writing as the way to sharpen sense of responsibility for helping each other to be better. In term of the second point, students felt secure because they share the job

that saves the time as well. The point was elaborated from the students' effort to write harder since the single grade will apply.

Furthermore, the involvement of sociocultural theory in L2 learning context adds different perspective in applying collaborative writing. Sociocultural theory views that writing classroom it is more than just a place to facilitate students to language learning, but writing classroom is a place for an engagement in collaboration and social interaction. This situation results the involvement of socio-cultural theory in writing classroom. As a place of social interaction, students are encouraged to work collaboratively to solve linguistic problems and to mediate L2 learning. Study about collaborative writing viewing from socio-cultural theory of mind and learning was conducted by Mirzaeia and Eslami (2013) who investigated the effect among four instructional designs, namely ZPD-activated collaborative, ZPD-free collaborative, fine-tuned L2-input provision and prevalent teacher fronted approach.

The above discussion shows that collaborative writing is very dynamic topic and activity for writing classroom. The benefits of collaborative writing will become the main reason for applying collaborative writing. However, possible challenges will also become important points to concern. When writing is seen as solitary activity, how can the writing classroom accommodate this, and how to build sense of participation among members of the collaborative group. The issue of fairness in gaining the score should be another consideration to think since collaborative text is the production of all members which sometimes not all are involved or participated in producing the text. In this sense, collaborative writing should be prepared and handled properly to achieve the optimal benefits.

More importantly, the previous studies reveal that collaborative writing has strong instructional effects that are the improvement of writing skills and language use or the effects that is directly to the improvement of writing competence. The dimension of writing competence involves linguistic competence, discourse competence, sociocultural competence. Having open and deep look and exploration to the benefits of collaborative writing is expected to gain better and deeper understanding about collaborative writing.

CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This research is aimed at revealing how teachers and students experience, engage with, and make meaning on collaborative writing, which includes the ups and downs experiences of having collaborative writing in writing class, and the way how teachers and students perceive collaborative writing. This chapter explains research design, research procedures, the quality of research outcomes.

3.1 Research Design

Narrative inquiry will be used in this study as 'interpretative device' to understand teachers' and students' experiences (Lawler, 2002). Meanwhile, Creswell (2012) proposes 'narrative research' as the term representing a design which focuses "on studying a single person, gathering data through the collection of stories, reporting individual experiences, and discussing the meaning of those experiences for the individual" (p. 502). Using narrative inquiry into teaching and learning has significant implications for classoom pedagogy as it invites teachers and students to see their classroom experiences from diverse point of view (Latta and Kim, 2010:139).

The present research explores collaborative writing experienced by EFL writing teachers and students. Students' voices will be built in past (introduction to collaborative writing), present (current experiences with collaborative writing), and future (future goals and aspirations on collaborative writing). Students, on the other side, also have experiences to share because writing collaboratively challenge them to have different writing situation compared to their mainstream writing class where they write the essay individually. The first time writing in pair or group raised conflicting situations. During the collaboration, of course, has made students to be able to cope with differences and others' contributions to joint meaning-making activity (writing itself). Also, students need space to share their future goals and aspirations toward better collaborative writing.

The capacity of narrative inquiry has shown its ability to holistically understand those day-to-day experiences. Narrative inquiry will tell how students' experiences shape and inform their teaching and learning practices. Bringing students' personal knowledge into professional knowledge can be achieved

through systematic procedures, hence, to have deeper understanding about lived experiences.

3.2 Research Procedures

Step 1: Identify a Phenomenon to Explore

At English Language and Literature Department of UIN MALIKI Malang, writing courses have been taught as a series of compulsory and prerequisite subjects focusing on academic writing. Writing I (4 credits) aims at enabling students to express ideas through written text in the form of narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative paragraphs. Writing II (4 credits) aims at enabling students to express ideas through written text in the form of narrative, descriptive, expository, and argumentative essays. Writing III (4 credits) aims at enabling students to express ideas through written text in the form of argumentative essay for academic paper.

Step 2: Purposefully Select Students

To select students as the research participants, purposeful sampling will be also applied. The number of students in each collaborative writing class (T1,T2, and T3 classes) is ranged from 25-30, and 4 of them are intentionally selected to understand the central phenomenon with the basis of selection is whether they are 'information rich' (Patton, 1990 in Creswell, 2012:206). From each class, four students will be selected based on the criteria of L2 proficiency and gender representation. Students' L2 proficiency is known based on academic transcript and information about writing performance during the teaching and learning process from the teachers. The main purpose of using proficiency level is not for finding causal relationship between proficiency level and collaborative writing. It is merely for getting rich data about how students with different proficiency experience and perceive collabrative writing. Gender representation will be accomodated for having balance and rich perspective about how female and male students experience and mean collaborative writing.

Step 3: Collect the Stories from Students

Gathering the stories is to ask the students tell about their collaborative writing experiences, therefore, a narrative frame and interview will be used as the research instruments. Soon after collaborative writing activities were conducted, semi-structured interview will be done after the participants finished with the narrative frame with all teachers and several students from each class.

Narrative Frames

Narrative frame is defined by Barkhuizen et al (2014:45) as a written story template consisting of a series of incomplete sentences and blank spaces of varying lengths. The frame should reflect the chronology of the experiences, therefore, Creswell (2012:511) suggests that the frame must have the three-dimensional space narrative structure consisting interaction (information how they feel, hope, react, and think), continuity (now and then), and situation (context, time and space). Narrative frame can help the researcher catches the expected experiences to be written since it provides insightful and fuller picture of the teachers and students experiences (Hiratsuka, 2014: 170) and provide teachers and students with guidance and support in both the structure and content of narrative (Xu, 2014:245).

The participants will be given an explanation about the purpose of the study and the inclusion of narrative frames. I will ask students to complete narrative frames with statement starters (see Appendix 1 and 3) intended to guide student in recollect their experiences. To anticipate the limitation of narrative frame such as restricting students' stories (who wants to write more) and researcher's accessible data, the researcher will include an empty box (see Appendix 2 and 4) with appropriate prompts at the beginning and end of the actual sentence-starter frame for participants to write freely any additional information they wanted to share (Barkhuizen, et al, 2014:49).

Interview

Combining narrative frame with other data collection instruments will make it more advantageous. Therefore, this research will also use follow-up narrative interview. The interview with the students outlines a set of issues related to their first engagement with collaborative writing activities employed by their EFL

writing teachers, their current moment of having collaborative writing, and their reflections and future aspiration about collaborative writing (see Appendix 6) that finally influence their view approaching collaborative writing and their perceived learning outcomes (Yang, 2014). The framework will not dictate the direction of interview; it will be important to give sufficient freedom to talk about aspects of their experiences without feeling any burden of a rigid set of questions. The interview will be tape-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Step 4: Restory or Retell the Students' Story

At this step, I will examine the raw data from the narrative frame, empty box and interview transcription. Then, I will identify elements of a story, and organize the elements into logical order based on literary elements of setting, characters, actions, problem, and resolution. This step will also allow me to build past, present, and future experiences. This is the way to keep the continuity of the experience. To make it visible in my restorying process, I will use those three dimensions to determine the themes. Determining themes will be next important step. In this research, themes are directed into three themes (see Appendix 7). The themes for students will involve theme1 'Entering New Nuance'(Past), theme 2 'Engaging with Collaborative Writing' (Present), and theme 3 'Expecting How' (Future). Then, retelling the story that represents each teacher's and student's experiences will be done on the basis of the themes.

Soon after the retold story finished, data analysis will be employed. Because narrative inquiry is one of forms of qualitative research, it often employs qualitative data analysis. I will read back and forth before reconstructing a complete narrative. Moroever, I am expected to have open mind in reading the stories by addressing and answering the questions for coding and categorizing based on the themes.

Then, I will be in interpetive proces when I will read the students' narrative subjectively to relate to the themes. A thematic analysis will be the major way to analyze the data (Bremner, et al, 2014). Thematic analysis is a largely a matter of categorization and classification. The collected narrative frames and interview transcriptions will be coded focusing on the meaning of the participants' comments, in order to identify recurring categories. After the restorying process

finished, I will give the restold version to teachers and students to verify whether my version really represents their stories. They will be invited to provide further information or make alternations of their stories. Then, I will rewrite into final version of narratives to have further analysis.

Step 5: Collaborate with the participant-storyteller

Collaboration with teachers and students during the research process will be essential part that I have to do. It aims to validate the data source. I will closely work with students in collecting the narratives. Before asking them to write the narrative, they must have good understanding about what story to tell. I will ensure them that both plesant or unpleasant stories are welcome as far as the stories are relevant to guidelines. When restorying occurs, it refers to the time when I write the narratives in my words which potentially can destroy the real meaning conveyed by students in their oroginal narratives. Therefore, I will share with them whether my retold narratives still represent their narratives.

Step 6: Write a story about the participants' experiences

This step refers to time for reporting the findings. In narrative inquiry, theme is prioritized to be placed at the first part of the findings. There is no single arragement to present the report, however, this research will arrange the report using thematic analysis through single case meaning that narratives of each participant will be analyzed individually. Later, the discussion section will wrap up all narratives into comprehensive point of view about collaborative writing in EFL context.

Step 7: Validate the accuracy of the report

To maintain the accuracy and crediblity of narrative account, I will keep collaborating with the participants throughout the process from the time of collecting, restorying, and reporting their narratives . The report on finding will be finished after validating process such as member checking, triangulating the data source, and searching for discomfirming evidences.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are addressed to answer the research question "What learning experiences using collaborative EFL writing have been important to students?". Therefore, the students' experiences are arranged into three themes. First theme '*Feeling the Wind of Changes*' which tells about students' feelings/impressions in firstly engaging with collaborative EFL writing, and students' changing feelings during three semesters following collaborative EFL writing classes. The theme is to answer RQ2a. "What did students experience in firstly engaging with collaborative writing?". Second theme is *'Gaining the Benefits'* representing students' stories about instructional and nurturing effects/benefits gained during collaborative EFL writing classes. It is to answer RQ2b. "What did students find about the benefits of collaborative writing?". Third theme is *'Viewing Now and Then'* signifies students' stories which tell about their evaluation and reflection about collaborative EFL writing experiences followed by students' aspirations on future direction of development of collaborative EFL writing. It is to answer RQ2c. "What did students hope about future direction of collaborative writing?"

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 Theme 1: *Feelings the Wind of Changes*

The narrative frames and the interview which were combined into restory version present narrative of experiences that continously change. Illustrating themselves on the first time they were taught by using collaborative EFL writing actvity, each of the students felt confused, difficult and tired. Entering new nuance from the mainstream writing class raised students' diverse feelings about collaborative writing. The mainstream class of writing is valuing writing as an individual or solitary activity which totally relies on students' individual performance in producing outline, draft, revision, and final draft. When the students write collaboratively, they have double burdens at the same time. Both students expressed the same feeling when firstly following Writing I course. The course was emphasized for paragraph writing. In the classroom, students worked in small group of 3 students during the first half of the semester.

The confusion was from a situation when in a collaboration, students seemed like making scream one with another. Students were busy to state the ideas without any ending. Another confusion was from the situation when students did not know much about the partner but they were asked to collaborate for writing. So many ideas came different students caused a situation that challenged students to decide which idea is better to choose. Feeling uneasy to express idea and to reject or receive other's idea resulted confusing condition, therefore, they cannot start to write anything quickly.

> 'Feeling distracted and confused with this method, at first, something strange, it was like making yell with another' NF 1.1 (S1SE.1). 'I wanted to compose case A, and my partner intended case B. Sometimes, it seems like a competition to decide which idea is good to write' NF 1.4 (S1SE.2).

> 'It's difficult not knowing anyone but we have to various ideas into difficult task' NF 1.2 (S2SE.1). 'If the idea was rejected by the other member, we had to redo it from a scratch' NF 1.4 (S2SE.2).

Working together to produce one piece of writing collaboratively was kind of place that was full of competition to win the most acceptable idea. Competition is valued as negative thing for S1 who experienced that settling down idea to write as the initial stage of writing process was uncomfortable phase. With more ideas came up to the group discussion more conflicting situation happened. Writing one topic with other, sometime, took long time to have fixed idea that is really tiring. Fixing idea in writing, for sure, was not only one aspect of writing to discuss. It covered the content, the language, the organization, and the mechanic which mostly, the group cannot cover all. Working in group was hard to start and to end.

Writing in pair or small group had been experienced by both S1 and S2. Various ways of forming the group made them aware of how to manage the team. In their collaborative writing class, teacher decided the partner and once, students chose the partner which personally S1 and S2 preferred to choose the partner with condition that the partner must be equal and balance. But, whatever the group formation was, feeling uncomfortable and uneasy with the partners easily raised in collaboration. The students met different kind of students' characteristics. In the classroom consisting 20-25 students, there was absolute situation that every individual student had her/his own value, identity, and characteristic. It raised some typology of group member such as passive-dominant, high-low and

independent-demanding. Being too demanding or too dominant was commonly done by everyone. S1' experience emerged the term 'parasite' which was commonly found in a collaboration. The issue of paratism appeared when students were not active to contribute any ideas as stated by S1. Ironically, S1 cannot do anything facing this situation which was unfair. S2 shared similar story about having problematic partner.

> 'If one of them do not speak up, cannot be called as collaborative then,...that person will be referred to as parasite' NF 9.6 (S1SE.3).

> 'Having a partner who didn't contribute to give ideas was unavoidable point that make us cannot go further' NF 9.6 (S2SE.3).

It was found that when students were asked about their attitude toward individual writing, they had different attitude. S1 and S2 had different sides on the way they see individual writing. It was hard for them to enter an activity which was totally different from their previous writing activity. Memorizing high school class, S1 shared that individual writing was major activity, therefore, S1 preferred individual writing as stated in S1's narrative:

> 'Honestly, I preferred to work alone than collaboratively NF 2.1 (S1Pref.1).

On the other side, for S2, valued individual writing is much more difficult to do especially when the topic was not familiar. Even, they have different views on collaborative writing, they shared similar feeling when the first time they involved in it.

> 'normally, when I write on my own, I will be stuck in brainstorming ideas' NF 2.1 (S2Pref.1).

Despite sharing their early time in collaborative writing class with difficulty, each of them presented the shifting of the feelings in experiencing collaborative writing activity at the following semesters. In contrary to the irritable faces expressed early on, next stories students shared show them enjoying collaborative writing. Both S1 and S2 reflected the beauty of collaborative writing as the place to gain much ideas and to learn for the betterment. The interaction existing during the writing process, resulted stimulating dialogue among members. As stated that:

> 'I like it because it gave me space to select the most suitable idea, ... Both ideas and critics from collaborative partner sometimes are more brilliant than I have ever thought' NF 3.1 (S1HE.1).

'I like it because in many ways, I can learn 'things' from other people'. No matter who your pair is, how smart or awful he is' NF 3.1 (S2HE. 1).

Time by time, the joy of collaborative writing was felt by students simultanously. Feeling comfortable and shifting S1's view about 'competition'. The negative sense of competition, later, shifted into positive one. S1 found that every member compete to offer a criticism and feedback which finally member should be supportive to the selected idea to write. The member support was also indicated by a moment when students gave all member put themselves in a group meaning that total involvement for producing a piece of writing. The same changing feeling expressed in S2's narrative S1 stated that

'the class was comfortable. Every member of the class create competitive atmosphere which force everyone to compete one another by offering criticism and the other will immediately give a feedback' NF 4.1 (S1HE.2).

'the class was amazing, the teacher was great in giving direction and the partner changing randomly' NF 4.1 (S2HE.2).

Students can identify which activities they liked most from the collaboration after having closer look on face-to-face interaction. Brainstorming was the most favourite activity for S1. Finding topic, outlining, drafting, and revising the draft invited students to any strengths and weaknesses of the draft. Viewing from different angels resulted good quality of writing. As the starting point of the collaboration, outlining was also the one S1 liked. It was time to put all best ideas together which invited very rich idea generation exposure for all members. Meanwhile, the discussion session was also the comfort zone for S2 where member share ideas and gave comments to one another as stated in:

'I enjoy brainstorming as it is a key process in collaboration, and I like most when giving argument in which everybody has to speak about the topic' NF 3.10 (S1HE.3).

'I like discussion session, because we have another people to talk, those who are different will see our weaknesses' NF 3.10 (S2HE.3). 'What I like the most was outlining session. It was the place to decide which idea will be applied/used' NF. 3.11(S2HE.4).

4.1.2 Gaining the Benefits

The continous engagement with collaborative writing activity resulted some effects on both students' writing skills (instructional effects) and other skills (nurturing effects). As the starting point of writing process, that is finding idea, it was important stage for students. By discussing any possible ideas to write, students gained very rich information from members. As a result, it trained

students how to find better ideas after passing through dynamic discussion. S1 shared that the discussion gave him chance to select which ideas would be appropriate to develop. Having various perspectives sharpened his own point of view. Similar to S1, S2 also shared the same benefit in the process of finding idea

'The development of myself is in finding appropriate idea' NF 9.1 (S1IE.1). 'When I think this is correct, based on my knowledge, it is correct, but when it was showed to my friends, my ideas are actually not in line with the main idea' (S1IE.2).

'Writing collaboratively helped me choosing better ideas' (S2IE.1).

The second similar benefit gained from collaborative writing was improvement on language style. Different students brought different language style in writing. Writing a group essay sharpened students' language style and sense on academic vocabulary as stated by S1. It was just the same with what S2 got from the members

'Moreover, I got advantage about how to have good language style' NF 9.2 (S1IE.2).

'It helped me learning... about language style and form' NF 9.1 (S2IE. 2).

One interesting point found from the narrative was about the benefits of collaborative writing on students' grammar and content. S1 and S2 shared different stories. S1 realized that his grammar was better than content. S1's role in the group was mostly to check the grammar of the essay. Therefore, S1 did not find that collaborative writing helped him to improve the grammar. However, during the collaboration, S1 got significant benefit on the content of writing

'I did not get improvement in grammar', my role was mostly on grammar as I realized that my grammar knowledge was better than content'. 'Gaining improvement in the content of the essay was my seen effect as I am not a good reader, my content knowledge was low, collaborating helped me to strengthen the content of the composition' NF 9.3 (S1IE.3).

Sharing different story, S2 did not gain much benefit on content. S2 considered that the content was basically based on how students think perspective differently and how far students read any relevant resources about the topic. In term of organization, S2 also did not learn much from the group members because the teacher taught explicitly about the organization of essay. Based on the narrative, S2 realized that improvement in grammar as the benefit from writing collaboratively.

'I am careless about grammar in complex sentence, but my friend can write complex one' NF 9.4 (S2IE.1).

Despite of sharing the benefits of collaborative writing for writing skill, students also shared about other good things of collaboration. In the narrative, it was found that both students were able to develop their negotiation and defending skill

'Negotiation and persuasion became my new skill when I defended my idea to write and persuade others to follow my idea' (S1NE1)

'Therefore, we learned how to make and defend our opinion in the class discussion. Moreover, I became know how to negotiate with others' NF 9.5 (S2NE.1).

Being exposed by intensive social interaction in the classroom, S1 and S2 can sharpen their social skill. For S1, collaborative writing taught him to put group decision as the priority. S1 and S2 did not only share some commonalities in gaining other good things of collaborative writing, but also share different aspects they got. While for S2, collaborative writing raised an idea about time management. During the collaboration, S2 found that it was hard to meet each other, and many reasons made by the partners. Since then, S2 learned much that member of the group brought their own behavior. Sense of acceptance was needed in a collaboration.

'I should not be selfish, and we should not think that we are the most correct human among others' NF 9.6 (S1NE.2). 'It helped me not only creating interesting work but also building a friendship from the interaction' NF 6.1 (S1NE3).

'Then, I became more open to other, and know each other NF 9.5 (S2NE.2). 'Although I was uncomfortable in one pair with him, I learned about time management' NF 3.3 (S2NE.3).

4.1.3 Viewing Now and Then

From time to time following writing class with collaborative activity, students were able to closely see their collaborative writing class. As a result, some evaluations have been made, as well as some aspirations for future development of collaborative writing have been expressed by S1 and S2. Based on the story, S1 evaluated that the issue of paratism cannot be solved. It was indicated by S1's behavior for doing nothing when having a parasite partner and keep saying. In line with S1 who struggled with parasitism, S2 referred to the same idea, that was passiveness. They narrated that:

'Again, parasite is crucial aspect in collaboration that should be solved by both teacher and students' NF 9.6 (S1Ev.1).

'Moreover, having a partner who didn't contribute to give ideas or passive partner was unvoidable' NF 9.5 (S2Ev.1).

Not only see what other friends did in collaborative writing, S1 and S2 also shared their own roles. Realizing that S1 had better grammar knowledge, S1 contributed much on grammar to the draft. Once in a situation when S2 became the owner of selected idea, S2 contributed to the idea development

'My contribution was mostly on grammar as I realized that my grammar knowledge was better than content' NF 9.3 (S1Ev.2).

'My role/position/contribution, after having little chat we choose one. We let the owner of the idea to make outline' NF 9.4 (S2Ev.2).

In term of matching system, S1 shared his unsatisfied evaluation. S1 evaluated that the group formation with low and low formation did not work for collaboration

'When students are low and low, so they did not support one another' NF 7.3 (S1Ev.3).

S2 differently evaluated about high-low, low-low, and high-high formation. S2 pointed that formation of high and low basically was not contributing factors to the success of collaboration

'It doesn't matter about high and low students, it depends on their will to learn from other or not' NF 8.5 (S2Ev.3).

What became essential for students in writing collaboratively was supportive behaviors which automatically lead every member of group gained the benefits. Moroever, based on S2's evaluation, both high and low students were benefited from the collaboration even in different degrees. Working in group facilitated high students in realizing small mistakes and content as stated

'For high students, they mainly learn about small mistake and deeper explanation about content'. 'Low students learn much about grammar and ideas arrangement' NF 8.3 and 8.5 (S2Ev.4).

Due to the key idea of effective collaborative writing, S1 and S2 mentioned different conception. S1 evaluated that a collaboration invited all members spirit to fill each another as contributing factor to the success. S1 storied that

'The key of collaboration is 'complementary' meaning that other can see my strength and weakness vise versa' NF 9.8 (S1Ev.5).

Effective collaboration did not directly connect to the idea of complementary. But, when it was due to the ability of each member to finish the task, it can be connected to equality. After evaluating the classroom practice, S2 formulated about effective collaboration, even, he still hesitated whether his definition was correct or not . It was indicated by the time to finish the project. S2 said

> 'Effective collaboration, I don't know, when we divide the part, I think it was fastest one' NF 7.3 (S2Ev.5).

By reflecting their own ups and downs stories in experiencing collaborative writing, S1 and S2 expressed some hopes to teachers and other students and aspiratios for the betterment of collaborative writing. Dealing with teachers' role, S1 hoped that teacher should monitor the collaboration. the direction for doing collaboration was not sufficiently given by teacher. It was expected that the collaboration was arranged through teacher's fixed direction. S2 narrated that the teacher encouraged students to read more to be succesfully discuss about the topic in group

> 'At the same time, I would like teacher to always being available in monitoring the students' work. To teachers, it was very needed as 'final destination' to correct the essay' NF 8.1 (S1Ho.1).

> 'Teacher asked to read and report the reading, and made everyone gave opinion about the topic' (S2Ho.1).

Instead of having expectation to what the teachers should do in managing collaborative writing class, both students expressed their hopes to the partners. It raised from students' reflection of their experiences. S1 concerned much on students' total availability to monitor the process of writing. Active involvement of each member was a must in a collaboration. S2's hope concerned with students' active participation in giving information to the content of the writing. Reading before discussing was seen by S2 as one of essential starting points to have dynamic collaboration.

> 'Students should be available to monitor the process of essay writing. Monitoring means correctiong the flow of the writing, the content, the grammar, and word choice as well editing and reviewing the content' NF 8.1 (S1Ho.2).

> 'At the same time, I would like students to, at least, read about the materials before coming to the class since the class activity will be discussion. Reading the needed

materials is essential in making opinion in the discussion and later will affect their arguments in their essays' NF 8.2 (S2Ho.2).

Struggling with different kinds of partner, contributed to S1's idea about matching system. Group with carefully formed influenced the quality of the collaboration and the writing. It was impossible to have perfect partner for the whole collaboration, but, it can be possible as far as the formation was done based on reasonable consideration. The chance to know more about who the partner to be should be open at the beginning of the process of collaboration. S1 shared his aspiration by writing:

> 'Knowing the characteristics of the individual student is a must. It is not like whether one is competent or not, firstly, it should be about her/his personality such as potentially being selfish or not' NF 9.13 (S1Ho.3). 'Students are allowed to make points like 'I want to work with her/him because s/he is in line with me' NF 9.13 (S1Ho.4).

After experiencing three-semester collaborative EFL writing activity, some views were emerged. The experiences, of course, was not sufficient yet to come up with final ideal collaborative writing, however, both students had some rich stories with its changing over time that can be used as resources to the next better practice of collaborative EFL writing. S1 raised a term 'true collaborative environment' to indicate what a collaboration should be. It should be equal. Their hope about equality confirmed that successfull collaboration was affected by the way each member equally take and give.

Both students agreed that collaborative writing will be useful for their future academic life. They proposed how collaborative writing should be done in the next writing class. As stated above, S1 came up with the idea of *'true collaborative writing environment'* while S2 gave more practical suggestion for applying next collaboration. S2 did not explicitly said the term equal, but it was represented by a situation where S2 had a space to compare the idea with other members. Comparing each other idea can be done equally if the owners of ideas at the same position to fill any hole in the idea development or draft writing. As stated by S2 that

> '...in true collaborative environment, each contributor has an almost equal ability to add, edit, and remove text. Equal also refers to the knowledge on the topic, if not, we cannot give any comments so there was no act of underestimating one another. They have the same right to voice their opinions' NF 7.1 (S1Ho.4).

'Most acceptable is the one we chose. I can have another person to compare idea' NF 3.5 (S2Ho.4).

S2 believed that combining both individual and collaborative writing simultanously was potential idea to the success of collaboration. With this zig-zag pattern, students can directly took the advantage of collaboration when they did individual writing.

'In collaborative-individual pattern. It means that after one task is done collaboratively, the next one will be individual task and so on' NF 9.5 (S2Ho.5).

Some points could be highlighted from students' experiences. Initially, students experienced collaborative writing as a place of competition. Discussing the topic, the outline, and many other aspects of writing brought them into uncomfortable situation. They needed time to adjust with the different taste applied by the teachers. Students faced some challenges to collaborate. However, they could find the joy of collaborative writing after three semesters engagement. The following table shows the summary of the findings on students' experiences.

4.2 DISCUSSION

This section discusses students' important experiences. The important experiences were selected based on the nature of narrative inquiry in which the experiences should be able to represent students' any ups and downs moments, students' reflection, students' perception, and students' hopes for next collaborative writing activity.

4.2.1   Feeling the Wind of Change

The nature of writing as an individual or solitary activity was commonly still in students' mind. When the students were firstly engaged with collaborative writing, it was hard situation. Working in group, actually, was not something strange and new for students. In the learning process, they were exposed to work in group for some years. However, totally working in group to produce a writing was still uneasy for them. Being Situated in collaborative writing, students narrated their stories and show the dynamic of experiencing it. They faced double burden to write.

Firstly, students thought that passing the writing process was like as a place of competition. Each student had idea to choose as group topic. Students faced complex experience about being win and loose in defeating the topic. However, once students passed the combination of collaboration and competition, they produced the best result. As stated by Browning (2012:154) "Our students will certainly face competition in the workplace, competition that will lead to both victories and defeats, thus it is productive and constructive for them to be able to process and debrief that experience together in an educational setting and to gain insight and appreciation for the lessons learned".

Secondly, writing with different types of group members made the collaboration, sometimes, did not run smoothly. The issue of dominant-passive pattern was always in collaboration. Students' motives played important role in positioning to be dominant or passive (Yu & Lee, 2015). Their study proves that when a student had negative belief about working with others reflected by feeling not interested, having no expectation from group activity, and only for following teacher's instruction, s/he will act passively (p.584). It raised the issue of

'paratism' as said S1 in which representing a situation when one student just follow what group decided without giving any contribution.

In term of group formation, both S1 and S2 preferred to choose the partner by themselves. It was in line with Russell (2010) who explored students' reflection on collaborative writing found that 'students saw the ease of communication they experienced with friends as highly significant' (p. 217). The friendship lessens difference among members and weakens inconvinience. It serves joy to finish the task.

There was slightly different feelings between S1 and S2 when firstly experienced collaborative writing. S1 preferred to write alone, it was caused by the freedom to write. In individual writing, S1 did not need to share anything with others, once, he came up with an idea, it can be developed without waiting decision from others. It was not so easy to collaborate towards one agreement with others like in a tyranny (Pierre, 2014:375). On the other hand, S2 started from the beginning enjoyed writing collaboratively. He was easily stuck when the time write alone. Writing with others helped him to produce more accurate and better writing quality (Sveum, 2013; Hanjani & Li, 2014).

Later, S1 and S2 experienced collaborative writing in similar way. Changing attitude from negative to positive was another result of better knowing on collaborative writing. During class interaction, they found a place to get better idea and meaningful feedback from other members. It was caused by many channels to communicate and more interactive discussion which shifted their behavior from group work to collaboration (Bremner et al, 2014:165).

Experiencing total collaborative writing made both students were able to identify which activity contributed more to them. For S1, brainstorming and outlining were key points where everybody had to speak up the possible and best ideas to write. While S2, found that all discussion sessions became strong evidence for him to see the power of collaborative writing. The stimulating discussion provided rich linguistic resources to develop writing quality and opportunities to compare ideas (Storch, 2005). Dobao (2012) investigated oral interaction in pair and group work to identify Language-Related Episodes (LREs).

The episodes consisted of Form-focused LRE, Lexis-focused LRE, Mechanics-focused LRE (p. 45).

4.2.2 Gaining the Benefits

Students' narratives shared commonalities in the way they gained the pedagogical benefits. Finding appropriate and better idea were similarly experienced by both students. Having discussion among members resulted the best topic to write. Each member with his/her own idea tried to strongly convince others that the topic was better, others did the same thing. Once, members were in agreement which best idea to choose meaning that they already carefully chose.

Experiencing writing in group facilitated students to see others' language style. The exposure of Language Related Episodes (LREs) from group interaction opened students' horizon on how to select and use appropriate style. Both S1 and S2 shared the same narrative on it. Group interaction also affectd students' language style because during the discussion, opportunities to discuss on language was open. Another instructional effect of collaborative writing was improvement on content was significatly happened to S1. Good content of the writing was mostly caused by students' content knowledge sharing gaining from their active reading. Improvement on grammar was experienced by S2. Problem on constructing complex sentence was frequently faced in writing the composition. Interacting with group members who were more capable on grammar was really helpful (Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012; Stroch, 2013; Mirzaei & Eslami, 2013) .

Instead of having pedagogical benefits for students, collaborative writing also served students with some merits. As mentioned earlier, collaboration allowed students to share and negotiate their ideas to others. Starting from finding topic, students negotiated to convince the best topic. At the following stages of oulining, drafting, editing, and revising, students were still invited to negotiate their ideas. This stimulated students to sharpen their negotiation skill. Dobao (2012) highlights that the interaction "offers different opportunities for negotiation of meaning, feedback, and modified output" (p.232).

Writing together with others also stimulates students' awareness how to appreciate others' ideas. Being respectful and open in a group was one of

requirements to the success of a collaboration. The bounding among members during group interaction produced sense of friendship. In Sveum's research (2013) was confirmed that " one of the main benefits of collaborative writing is creating network, cultural interaction, and friendship" (p. 220).

Collaborative writing challenged students' capacity to manage the time for finishing the writing because it required up to twice the amount of time to complete the same writing task compare to individual writing (Sveum, 2013; Neumann & McDonough, 2014). Recursive process of writing did not allow them to instantly write the composition. Therefore, students were conditioned to manage the time efficiently for finishing the writing not placing the speed as the priority but the speed and the quality of the writing

4.2.3   Viewing Now and Then

Reflecting the three semesters experience, S1 and S2 notified that the existance of paratism or passiveness cannot be avoided in group work. Positioning as safe player raised because there will be group responsibility, therefore, when the project was done by others, it was for all. For students, level of writing proficiency was not the only one important role to the success of groupwork. What matter for students was the relationship and the role they took.

Two types of relationship in pair or group work, dominant-passive and high-low relationship, were mostly occured. High-high composition resulted the largest LREs, followed by high-low composition. Meanwhile, low-low composition resulted the smallest LREs (Lesser, 2004 in Storch, 2013). Proficiency pairing in another research conducted by Mirzaei and Eslami (2013) shows different result. With ZPD-activated collaboration in which students were grouped based on high-medium-low level. The composition provides rich exposure of metadiscourse to the content, organization, and audience issues in writing.

In collaboration, both formations of relationship served its consequencies. Students' narratives indicated that they did not have much problem with high-low relationship. This could be happened as the idea of collaboration has extended from more-less capable collaboration into symmetrical (equal ability) one regardless of their proficiency that allows students to discuss (Hanjani & Li,

2014). When the students face dominant-passive relationship, it was not from the influence of proficiency level (Storch, 2013). In the previous part, it was mentioned that students' motives became influential factor to be dominant or passive. Dominant-passive relationship refers to how far the contribution of each member. Dominant students took control of the task while passive students had very little contribution to both quantity and quality of the task which raised low equality and low mutuality. To have high equality and high mutuality, collaborative relationship must be emerged. Any member contribute to all aspects of the task, and share the responsibility (p. 61-62).

When it came to students' contribution in the group, S1 and S2 shared different experiences. S1 realized that he was good at grammar, hence, he gave grammar touch into the writing. And, S2 contibuted much on the content of the writing as his ideas was chosen to develop and he had background knowledge. In a collaboration, each member is hoped to have significant contribution to the area that s/he becomes the expert. Fung (2010) used technical term 'shared expertise' to describe this phenomenon in which S1 and S2 brought direct impact of their stance by offering assistance, checking mutual progess, and providing help (Yu & Lee, 2015).

After engaging with collaborative writing, students evaluated that it was meaningful activity in EFL writing class. To ensure the betterment of the practice, some hopes were written in students' narratives. Students stated their hopes to the teachers. There should be fixed guideline from teachers to do collaborative writing. The guideline helped students effectively collaborate. Having collaborative writing was still unfamiliar activity. As discussed before, it easily raised conflicting situation when to write a composition with others. Ideally, before all done collaboratively, every single step must be clear for students. Also, it was strongly suggested that teachers needed to be aware of different patterns of relationship, group behavior and dynamics (Dobao & Blum, 2013:375).

Instead of addressing the hopes to teachers, S1 and S2 also made hopes to their friends. They wanted group member was available to intensively monitor the writing process, actively involved during collaboration. Hoping such kind of

collaborative behaviors was reasonable as the quaity of the writing relied much on the mutual relationship. However, students need to realize that for some students, collaborative writing was still uneasy. Lin and Maarof (2013) describe some students' problems of doing collaborative writing consisting lack of English proficiency, reluctance to give opinion, and spending longer time to finish the task (p. 604). Making realitic hopes could be started from student her/himself to positively value collaborative writing.

Moreover, knowing members personally was also key success for collaboration. It can be inferred that students preferred choosing their own partner compare to teacher-assigned partner. By choosing the partner by themselves, students knew their friends behavior and background because it was also key feature of group selection (Braine, Kerry, and Pilling 1990 in Russel, 2010). It was impossible to have perfect partner for the whole collaboration, but, it can be possible as far as the formation was done based on reasonable consideration.

Engaging three-semester in collaborative writing class made students positively perceived it. Students perceived collaborative writing as a tool to improve writing skill and non-writing skill. Related to writing skills, students thought LREs produced in the writing process helped them to improve grammatical and lexical accuracy, content and organization, coherence and language style, idea generation, (Shehadeh, 2011; Lin & Maarof, 2013; Dobao & Blum, 2013). The improvements were caused by mutual discussion among members. The positive change among students was the result from the collaborative activities they engaged with, and those affected students' non-writing skill. Collaborative writing provided greater variety of ideas and creativity, fun atmosphere to feel comfortable, space for self-confidence (Storch, 2007; Shehadeh, 2011; Dobao & Blum, 2013).

Students viewed that collaborative writing was advantegous for both high and low students. At the beginning they engaged with collaborative writing, the difficulty to adapt with different types of students, sometimes, hindered the interaction. Soon after students contibuted more to group discussion, it resulted resources for grammar, content, organization, and idea generation. Students from

both levels gained the advantages differently. S1 storied that high students learnt to be aware of small mistakes and to deepen the content. While low students learnt about grammatical and lexical accuracy (Dobao & Blum, 2013; Mirzaei & Eslami, 2013).

After experiencing collaborative writing, students can closely see what a collobarative writing should be. Both students viewed that collaborative writing will usefull for students' future in academic life and workplace. S1 had a perception that a collaboration should have a true collaborative environtment. The strong indicator for having true collaborative environtment is equality. S1 constructed the idea of equality was a situation when all members were able to contribute to the group writing. The contribution could be to add, edit, and revise the draft. The students' perception about true collaborative was in line with how collaborative writing defined in this study. It was a situation when students work together throughout the entire writing process, sharing authorship, and responsibility for the final product (Dobao & Blum, 2013).

Students also viewed that effective collaboration referred to the nature of interaction and the speed to finish the writing. During planning and writing the draft, students wrote the best selected topic and added the most relevant support for the good quality of writing. They knew each other from everybody strengths and weaknesses, therefore, there was mutual interaction to create complementary situation for broader view points (Fung, 2010:20). Moreover, interdependent relationship occured since everybody sees peers and self as additional and important source of knowledge of writing (Barkley et al, 2005).

On the other side, S2 took different stand about effective collaboration. For him, effective collaborative writing was if the draft can be finished ealier. To finish earlier, students divided the part of the essay separately. Based on model of collaboration, this was categorized as 'divided or horizontal' model (Bremner et al 2015). The good quality of the text cannot be guaranteed because it was based on fairness in allocating workload, students' preference or willingness to do a task (p. 158).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The study reveals that students felt confused at the first time assigned to write together. They shared that they were like in a competition to win whose idea was the best to choose. Before successfully coping with competitive situation, the same time, they also faced conflicting situation on dominant-passive relationship. However, those down side of their experiences shaped their better understanding on how to harmoniously, equally, and mutually collaborate.

For students, dominat-passive and high-low relationship should be solved to create collaborative relationship. They had aspiration that teachers must have clear guidelines of collaborative writing. They wanted every single step must be clear for them, hence, students' motive to reach high equality and mutuality in writing the task will be high. Realizing the power of collaborative writing, students viewed that collaborative writing should be built based on complementary situation and interdependent relationship in finishing the writing task. It offers great opportunities to have 'share expertise' and to appreciate strengths and weaknesses.

This narrative study is not free from limitations. First, relocating students' experiences challenged me to take balance position in representing them. It was easily for me to be trapped to place them as a superhero who can solve the problems in collaborative writing. Second, students might enable to give more detailed and potentially interesting narratives and expressions if they had written and spoken in their first language, Indonesian. This narrative study is still far from perfection as it cannot catch all important experiences that reflect day-to-day experiences of students.

A number of theoretical and pedagogical implications are derived from the findings of the study. The main theoretical implication is to incorporate previous efforts to confirm the sociocultural theory as strong support for applying collaborative writing. It also strengthens how process approach pedagogy closely related to collaborative writing. Another theoretical implication of the study is the

findings collaborative writing goes beyond microskill of writing. The findings shows that both teachers and students share narrative about how collaborative writing helps to improve macroskills.

From a pedagogical point of view, the findings of the study provide supplementary empirical evidences of the advantages of collaborative writing in EFL writing classroom. The social context in collaborative writing facilitated the students to learn from others. The interaction during collaboration provided rich Language-Related Episodes for better grammatical and lexical accuracy. Moreover, equal and mutual relationships gave the students stimulating space to sharpen their other writing skills.

It is suggested that teachers of EFL writing equip themselves to have good understanding on collaborative writing before applying in the classroom. It will help them to manage better collaborative writing. For students, they should value collaborative writing as a great place to interact with others for better writing performance. For future studies, exploring students' experience from all levels of proficiency will be essential area to do. Patterns of relationship existing during collaborative writing will be also important issue to investigate.

Rerefences

Bremner, S. Smith, A.P. Jones, R. & Bhatia, V. (2014). Task Design and Interaction in Collaborative Writ ing: The Students' Story. *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly*, 77(2):150-168 doi: 10.1177/2329490613514598

Browning, R. (2012). Blending Collaboration and Competition: A Model for Small Group Learning in Business Writing Classes. In K.M. Hunzer (Ed), *Collaborative learning and writing: Essays on using small groups in teaching English composition* (p. 143-165). North Carolina: McFarland & Company. Inc.

Dobao, A. F. (2012). Collaborative tasks in the L2 classroom: comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21: 40-58

Dobao, A.F. (2012). Collaborative Dialogue in Learner–Learner and Learner–Native Speaker Interaction. *Applied Linguistics*, 33(3): 229–256 Oxford University Press doi:10.1093/applin/ams002

Douglas, K and Carless, D. (2014). Sharing a different voice: Attending to Stories in collaborative writing. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 14(4):303-311

Fung, Y.M. (2010). Collaborative Writing Features. *RELC Journal*, 41(1): 18-30. DOI: 10.1177/0033688210362610

Hanjani, A.M and Li, L. (2014). Exploring L2 writers' collaborative revision interactions and their writing performance. *System*, 44:101-114

Lawler, S. (2002). Narrative in Social Research. In T. May (Ed), *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: Thousand Oaks Sage

Limbu, L and Markauskaite, L. (2015). How do learners experience joint writing: University students' conceptions of online collaborative writing tasks and environments. *Computers & Education* (82):393-408

Lin, O.P, & Maarof, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in Summary writing: Student perceptions and problem. *Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 90: 599-606

Mulligan, C. & Garofalo, R. (2011). A collaborative writing approach: Methodology and student assessment. *THE LANGUAGE TEACHER:* 35(3): 5-10

Nuemann, H. & McDonough, K. (2015). Exploring student interaction during collaborative prewriting discussions and its relationship to L2 writing *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27:84-104,

Pierre, E.A St. (2014). An Always Already Absent Collaboration. *Cultural Studies, 14(4)*: 374-379, doi:10.1177/1532708614530309

Russell, M. (2010). The formation of effective work groups within an FE classroom. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(2): 205–221 DOI: 10.1080/13596741003790765.

Shehadeh. A. (2011). Effects and students perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20:286–305

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

Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11*(2)*:143–159 doi: 10.117/13621688070746000

Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.

Sveum, T. (2013). Collaborative writing at Bobcatsss. Two heads are better than one?, *New Library World*, Vol. 114(5/6): 214 – 227 http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03074801311326849

Wigglesworth, G and Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and   writing feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (21)4:364–374

Yu, S and Lee, I. (2014). Understanding EFL students' participation in group peer feedback of L2 writing: A case study from an activity theory practice. *Language Teaching Research,* (19)5:572-593

Appendix 1: Narrative Frame for Students

I have just finished writing my essay collaboratively. While finishing the essay, once, I had to work writing collaboratively with my friends in pair or small group made me feel

(1)_____

_____

_____

____. Wrote my draf individually, I found that (2)_____

_____

_____. I liked/disliked my class which

incorporated collaborative writing activities because (3)_____

_____.

In addition, the class was (4)_____.

Furthermore, what I noticed was that (students/teachers) (5)_____

_____probably

because (6)_____Another

point I noticed was that (students/teachers) (7)_____

_____.

At the same time, I would like (students/teachers) to (8)_____

_____. Overall, I think

collaborative writing activities are (9)_____

_____

_____. This is the end

of my story.

Adapted from Hiratsuka (2014)

Appendix 2: Narrative Empty Box for Students

My past experience about collaborative writing is when for the first time I engaged in collaborative writing in my class. I found that colloaborative writing was(1)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

My present experience about collaborative writing includes the time when I am regularly asked to work together with my friends to write a composition. It challenged bacause

(2)_____

_____

_____

_____, and helped me because

(3)_____

_____

_____.

My future expectation incorporates my aspirations (hope) on collaborative writing class. I hope/expect that next collaborative writing in EFL writing will be done

(4)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Appendix 3: Interview with Students

1. The post-narrative frame writing will be semi-structured interviews, and held after you finished the narrative frame.
2. The interview will be individual in-depth interviews, lasting up to an hour.
3. You are free to share successfull and unsuccesfull stories.
4. To make you feel comfortable, interviews will be done casually.
5. The interview will be audio-recorded.
6. You are free to ask for clarification, in case there are unclear questions.
7. The interview covers three stages: a) contemporary experience, and b) reflection on meaning

Interview with Students

   A. Interview about life history. This part is about the phase when you experienced collaborative writing for the first time in your EFL writing class.
   1. How did you find collaborative writing activity for the first time?
   2. What were your views and perceptions of collaborative writing before the experience, if any?, had these changed after the experience?

   B. Interview about contemporary experience. This is the stage to explore stories of your collaborative writing class.

   1. What do you think of your present collaborative writing activity?
   2. What aspect of the activity do you like most?
   3. What is the most difficult part of the activity?
   4. What do you think about changing partners? Do you prefer to change partner continously or work with one or two partners only throughout the semester?
   5. How do you think collaborative writing affect your writing performance?
   6. What roles do you have in pairs or in small group work?
   7. How do you contribute to collaborative writing activity?

C. Interview about your reflection and aspiration on meaning. It is the session to gain information about your upcoming hope, feeling, and plan in the future in experiencing collaborative writing.
   1. Could you describe the ways in which collaborative writing impacted your writing performance?
   2. Would you like to do more similar collaborative writing in the future?
   3. What improvements (if any) do you expect to have better collaborative writing activities in an EFL writing class?