
The effect of collaborative group discussion method on students' writing achievement at SMAN 1 Sampara

Muhammad Alif Budiman¹, Kamaluddin², Alimin³

98budialif@gmail.com

^{1,2,3}Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to find out the significant effect of collaborative group discussion method on student's writing achievement at SMA Negeri 1 Sampara. The research method used quantitative method in the form of true-experimental posttest only control design which consisted of experimental class and control class. The population of this research was the eleventh-grade science program (XI IA) students of SMA Negeri 1 Sampara, and the samples were students at XI IA 1 class and XI IA 3 class. The research data were collected by giving treatment and posttest to students in the form of writing test through analytical exposition text. The data were analyzed by SPSS 23 for Windows. The result showed that there was significant effect of collaborative group discussion method on student's writing achievement at SMA Negeri 1 Sampara because the students' mean score from experimental class was higher than the control class. Then, researcher concluded by comparing the Sig (2-tailed) value with the significance value α . This showed that the Sig (2-tailed) value was 0,012 indicating that there was significant effect of group discussion method on students' writing achievement at SMA Negeri 1 Sampara. The result also showed that most of the students from experimental class had good to average criteria in writing achievement while the highest achievement on aspects of writing was the language use aspect.

Keywords:

Collaborative, Group Discussion, Writing Achievement.

1. Introduction

It is commonly known that learning process during the usage of conventional method affects a little for students to improve their writing, because they just want to finish their task and submit the task already. Unfortunately, the writing achievement that they obtain will be low because most of their drafts have bad quality such as structures and vocabularies usage. The draft itself only considers a little increase or none from each of the aspect, so that their writing result could have a bad affect to the meaning and the structure organization of their draft. So, as the consequence of having the learning process which only a few students can follow, it affects their result too, especially on students' writing achievement on English learning.

To overcome the problem, teacher should have an effective way of learning that persuades the students first to discuss and to work about the subject matter, which they do not just accept the learning material passively. Then, the teacher should give

the opportunity for the students to participate together in understanding the problem through group discussion method, also make the students to be collaborative with their teamwork, not depend too much on their friends. Panitz (1987) states that the learning is about taking responsibility and respecting to the other, so each of the students inside their group should have role to work, not depending on the smarter one. This way, the collaborative group discussion method makes students become more active in understanding their learning, especially in creating a report.

Collaborative according to Gokhale (1995) as a process that puts students from different ability to work together in obtaining the purpose, while Djajadisastra (1983: 12) also clarifies that the discussion method or group discussion is an educating and learning design that centers around the communication between different individuals in gathering so as to finish learning assignments together. From the two explanations above, it can be seen that to realize the learning objectives, the teacher must make a cooperative learning design. In this case, a group discussion to be able to collaborate between students in groups, namely discussing each other and working on each other's main ideas similar to the assigned task. Cooperative learning is almost similar to collaborative learning, but what distinguishes between the two is the occurrence of follow-up activities in the group discussion learning process which is expected to encourage all students in a group to be active and not dependent on their friends.

The students writing achievement becomes the goal for the teacher. Sometimes, what they get will affect their future learning process. So that students should be guided in collaborative group discussion method in order to meet the expectations of teachers in increasing their achievement, especially at the students' writing achievement on the three aspects of writing as the focus of the study. After the learning process with this method has been completed, it is expected to have significant effect on students' achievement.

Beare (2008) suggests that students should be engaged clearly and continuously in the teaching and learning process so that they can be persuaded to write for reasons that will closely relate to the demand to make learning experiences of lasting value the most significant factor recorded as hard copy working. EFL students would need assortment English composing aptitude relied on upon student's levels, scholarly subject, and institutional trouble (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996). In addition, not every single english student can compose the good writing, so the solution of this issue is making the teacher more involved in the process especially to assist students with the lack of this skill on certain level.

Writing itself cannot be done immediately, there are thoughts and there are decisions, which then the writer must re-correct whether the message conveyed can be implemented by the reader. First, the writing stage is explained by Ron (1987: 325) which states that there are three parts of the writing process, namely planning, composing, and revising, meaning that the planning section makes the writer look for and produce information first to bring the results of all information, then the drafting section regulates all of the information and revision sections re-evaluate the set of information that has been organized to make the paper.

At the beginning, Collaborative is a work done by two or many more people to achieve their main goal. Panitz (1996) states collaborative learning as a form of cooperation between two or more individuals in order to successfully achieve their

work goals. Therefore, great work requires the thinking of not only one person but, of everyone involved. Panitz's opinion is supported by the thoughts of Wiersema (2002) which explains that the cooperative learning process is assisted by other group members in order to learn the problems presented.

In the writing process, Lowry et al. (2004) states about the collaborative process which shares the efforts to write parts of a draft which could create a single draft as the the result of working together. The opinion supports to the other thought of Storch(2013) which explains about the important of communication through each process of writing. Therefore, the collaborative can create their result of learning in the English skill, such as the form of writing and students who work by collaborative way could distribute the objective of each students in writing a draft, such as the first member of a group work on an introduction part, then it follows by the other members to work on specific task(finding the sources for the explanation part and making the conclusion part).

Group Discussion Method itself is a teaching method that involves groups of students consisting of three to nine people to obtain and complete joint decisions (Hamdayama, 2017). According to Subroto (2002: 179), group discussion is an empirical discussion by a few people who are individuals from a group to trade suppositions on an issue or together looking for the answers to find solutions or certainties to an issue. The similarity of the opinion above is that the method asked students to solve the issues together by making a group and then having a discussion. So, the group discussion method is the best way to make every students to join the learning process itself.

Then, Based on Wahab's (1998) view, he also explains the advantages of group discussion method that consist of: a) provide the possibility to express opinions, b) causing a democratic approach, c) encourage a sense of oneness, d) broaden the view, e) live leadership together, f) help develop leadership, and g) increase understanding of yourself and of others

2. Methods

The design of study used true-experimental posttest only control design which consisted of experimental class and control class. In the beginning, both of the class was not given pretest. After that, the experimental class used group discussion method as their treatment for their learning while the control class studied through conventional learning method.

The population of this study were all students of class XI SMA Negeri 1 Sampara who were registered in the academic year 2020/2021 while the samples were students of class XI IA 1 as the experimental class and students of class XI IA 3 as the control class chosen using purposive sampling. The researcher conducted treatment to experimental class. This activity was carried out by providing learning to students through the application of the group discussion method. Beside the experimental class, the researcher conducted conventional learning to control class. The control class would take the learning process on the control class without using the same method like the experiment class had. The researcher performed posttest to both of the class. This activity was carried out after the researcher had treated the experiment and control class.

After the researcher and the English teacher had obtained the posttest of students' writing achievement, there were two ways to analyze the data namely using descriptive statistics to describe the posttest data and taking inferential statistics to test the hypothesis as the conclusion of the study by using SPSS 23 Windows Program.

Table 1. Categorization the Level of Writing Composition

Score Interval	Writing Category
100-83	Excellent to very good writing quality
82-69	Good to average writing quality
68-52	Fair to poor writing quality
51-34	Very poor writing quality

(Jacobs et al., 1981)

3. Result

Table 2. Comparison of Mean, Maximum Scores, Minimum Scores, and Standard Deviation of Student's score From Experimental Class And Control Class

Descriptive Statistic	Experimental Class	Control Class
Mean	72,64	68,04
Minimum	61	51
Maximum	84	80
Standard deviation	5,983	7,249

At the beginning, the mean score of student's posttest score of experimental class is higher than control class' mean score has with the score of 72,64 while control class only gained 68,04. The minimum score of experimental class is 61 and control class is 51. The maximum score of experimental class is 84 and control class is only 80. The standard deviation of experimental is higher than control class with the score of 5,983 while control class gain 7,249.

Table 3. Comparison of Student's Score on Experimental Class and Control Class

Category and Score	Experimental Class		Control Class	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent to very good(100-83)	2	7.14%	0	0%
Good to average(82-69)	20	71.42%	15	53.57%
Fair to poor(68-52)	6	21.43%	12	42.86%
Very poor(51-34)	0	0%	1	3.57%
N	28	100.00%	28	100.00%

The students from the experimental class with 20 students (71.42%) dominated the category of good to average writing quality and the amount of the students of experimental class was more than the students from the control class with 15 students (53.57%).

Table 4. The Comparison Between Student's Mean Score in each aspect of Writing

No.	Aspect of Writing	Experimental	Control	Different mean score
1.	Vocabulary	14.4	13.7	0.7

2.	Language Use	18.3	17.4	0.9
3.	Mechanics	3.4	2.8	0.6

On each aspect of writing, aspect of vocabulary was 0.7, the language use aspect was 0.9, and the mechanics aspect was 0.6. Based on this, it can be showed that the highest mean score which both of the class had achieved from the aspect of writing was the aspect of language use with the different mean score of 0.9 because the mean score from experimental class was 18.3 while the control class gained score of 17.4 The lowest was the aspect of mechanics with the different mean score of 0.6 because the mean score from experimental class was only 3.4 and the control class gained score of 2.8.

4. Discussion

Collaborative group discussion method makes the students become more care with the others. At the first meeting, the students did the writing process with feedbacks but had little effort to fix their final draft which as the consequences, most of their final topic had little improvement. The researcher found mistakes using of punctuation, verb agreement and also unobscured word.

Then it came at the next until the last treatment, where the researcher had told to all the groups that they should increase more of their attention and help their friends in writing their draft by maximizing their focus on fixing the using of punctuation, verb agreement, articulation and also the word choice on their draft through the collaborative group discussion which finally made them try to give their own input of each other's draft and fix them. They also receive the researcher advice to pay attention at the mistakes from each aspect of writing, so they also put his feedbacks and put it into their draft. Finally, all of their results were found with little errors of aspect of writing.

The effect of using collaborative group discussion method made the students to work on their part or roles also supporting the other's work by giving the suggestion or correction to their raw writing before creating the final draft. it also increase their will to deliver their own thought, by orally or their own draft in composing the main topic. After that, collaborative group discussion method directed the all the students of each group to being active in their process of discussion, thus making them to deliver their own idea into their own raw draft which it would be discussed together, by giving feedback on each raw draft that would build the final report of analytical exposition text.

The findings of the research showed that the collaborative group discussion method has effect on student's writing achievement at SMA Negeri 1 Sampara because several reasons:

- 1) This method stimulated the courage and creativity of students to exchange ideas with friends because according to Afidah, et al (2012), the opinions of students to build a final conclusion could be accepted through this method, so the process of discussion activities would train students to practice responsibility.
- 2) the advantage of this method was inviting students to participate in the problem-solving process because Asmani's view (2014) stated that the provision of study

groups by creating group discussions could lead to participatory efforts to students so that in the process they were not bored with the situation.

- 3) The method gave students the opportunity to develop decisions that were considered in groups. Based on Juniati's opinion (2017: 286), this required the ability of students who were weak in solving problems.
- 4) In addition, the application of the discussion method could make students became active because according to Kurniawan (2017: 54), the teacher provided the issues that the students should solve that by working together and they must be in charge during the discussion process.

The result of this study could be compared to a research conducted by Kurniawan (2017) entitled " Pengaruh Metode Diskusi Kelompok Terhadap Kemampuan Soft Skills Siswa Pada Mata Pelajaran Ekonomi Di Kelas XI IPS SMAN 3 Jember " which the result showed that the soft skills were better (cooperation and responsibility) of taught by the group discussion method than the conventional methods. According to the study above, the similarities were the using of group discussion method as the focus of research and the objective itself was to find out whether this method could teach the soft skill better than conventional method. Then, the difference between the researcher and the related study was the using methodology of their study, which the previous study using pretest-posttest control group while this study only used posttest only control group. Even though, the study above approved that the similarity between the related studies is the using of group discussion method which could be effective and also improve the students achievement or outcomes, even with the different method of the study.

On the other hand, the benefits from this method was that the collaborative group discussion method could give significant effect on student's writing achievement because on the process, the students had the ability to do the work together and also make them to have responsibility in their own writing their idea into a raw draft, preventing them from being too depend on the smarter student inside their group to work the raw draft alone.

5. Conclusion

The student's writing achievement from the class taught by using collaborative group discussion method was higher than the control class who only used conventional method. The findings showed that the mean score from the experimental class was higher than the mean score of the control class. After that, most of students from the experimental was on the good to average criteria, while the control class had gained at good to average criteria with lower gain and also much gain on fair to poor criteria. At the aspect of writing, the aspect of language use became the highest score that students had achieved on their posttest.

References

- Arikunto, Suharsimin. 2005, *Prosedur Penelitian Pendekatan Suatu Praktek*, Rhineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Beare, Eve. 2002, *Making Progress in Writing*, Routledge Farmer, London.

- Djajadisastra. 1983, *Teknik Belajar Mengajar*, Rosdakarya, Bandung.
- Gokhale, Anuradha A. 1995, *Collaborative Learning Enhances Critical Thinking*. Retrieved on July 25th, 2021, <<http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/>>.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R.B., 1996, *Theory and Practice of Writing*, Addison Wesley Longman Limited, United Kingdom.
- Hamdayama, J. 2017, *Metodologi Pengajaran*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Jacobs, H.L, Zinkgraf, S.A, Wormuth, D.R, Hartfiel, V.F and Hughey, J.B. 1981, *Testing ESL Composition Profile: a Practical Approach English Composition Program*. New Bury House, USA: Rowley MA.
- Karo-karo, I. S. Ulih Bukit Dkk. 1998, *Pengantar Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*.
- Kurniawan, M. U. 2017, 'Pengaruh Metode Diskusi Kelompok Terhadap Kemampuan Soft Skills Siswa Pada Mata Pelajaran Ekonomi Di Kelas XI Ips Sman 3 Jember', *Eco-Socio: Jurnal ilmu dan Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 1(1), 45-57.
- Lowry, P.B., Curtis, A., Lowry, M.R. 2004, 'Building a taxonomy and nomenclature of collaborative writing to improve interdisciplinary research and practice', *Journal of Business Communication*, 41 (1):66-99.
- Panitz, T. 1996, 'Collaborative Versus Cooperative Learning: Comparing the Two Definitions Helps Understand the Nature of Interactive Learning', *Cooperative Learning and College Teaching*, 8(2).
- Ron, White. 1987, *Writing Advance*, University Press, Oxford.
- Storch, Neomy. 2013. *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Multilingual Matters.
- Subroto, Surya. 2002, *Proses Belajar Mengajar Di Sekolah*, PT. Ardi Mahatya, Jakarta.
- Wahab, A. A. 2007, *Metode Dan Model-Model Mengajar Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (IPS)*. Alfabeta Bandung.
- Wiersema, Nico. 2000, *How Does Collaborative Learning Actually Work in a Classroom and How Do Students React to it?*, retrieved on July 26th, 2021 <<http://www.city.londonmet.ac.uk/>>.