

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE WORK IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS' L2 WRITING ACHIEVEMENT ACROSS SOCIAL ORIENTATION

Moh. Hasbullah Isnaini

MA in TEFL, (Doctorate Candidate in TEFL), State University of Malang, Indonesia

Abstract: *The present study investigated the effect collaborative work on students' L2 writing achievement across the social orientation, introvert and extrovert. There were 84 university students who were later divided into three different groups, one non-experimental group and two experimental group. At the end of the research, the participants were asked to write an argumentative essay to see the effect of the collaborative work seen from different social orientation, introvert and extrovert. To answer the research question, the Independent Samples T test and one way ANOVA were employed. The result of the study suggests that collaborative work is better than the individual work, the extroverts outperforms its counterpart, introverts, in terms L2 writing achievement, and no significant difference found in the subsets of writing to the students' L2 achievement. Thus, the result of the study implies that the use of collaborative work in the teaching of writing is suggested to help students write better.*

Key Words: *Collaborative Work, L2 Writing, Achievement, Social Orientation, Extroversion, , Introversion*

Introduction

The position of English as the foreign language makes the learners have difficulties to write well. Some researcher have investigated the teaching and learning English which mostly focused on the individual work. In general, they found that students still had problems in EFL writing. Academic writing is still the main problem in EFL writing (Kasman, 2004). It is in line with Irawati who found that many college students and university graduates in Indonesia had low competence.

In line with those findings, other researcher (Sabarun, 2006; Attanum, 2007; Ulfiati, 2010; & Isnawati, 2010) also state similar findings related to the writing performance of students working individually. In general, they found that most students had problem with writing. In detail, the students were low in three aspects namely motivation, writing ability, and confidence. Most of the students had low motivation since they did not do their exercise seriously. Having difficulties in organizing, exploring ideas are the reflection of their poor writing ability. It is also reflected when they don't know what to write and make some mistakes on grammar and dictions. Although they could complete their task but the result indicated that they were still low in writing. Many of them only rewrite what they had written. They last aspect is their confidence which critically low. They still have high anxiety once it comes to writing and expressing their ideas. The fear of making mistakes triggers the low confidence of the students.

Some other reserchers also found that students had writing problems in the aspects of grammar, vocabulary, cohesion and coherent, content, and organization (Barret & Cohen: 2011;Zakaria & magaddam: 2013; and Javid & Umer; 2014). Paying attention to what was found by previous researchers above, it seems that the findings meet Cahyono and Widiati's statement (2011) saying that writing is often believed to be the most complex one compared to the other three skills (listening, speaking, and reading). In addition, the findings also support the ideas by Richards and Renandya (2002) saying that the skills involved in writing are highly complex. It consists of the higher level skills of planning and organizing ideas as well as the lower level skill of spelling, punctuation, and word choice.

In relation to the students problems in writing, it is necessary to conduct a research focusing on the strategies which might help students to improve their writing ability. One of the ways to improve their writing is by providing them activities which trigger their involvement and work together. Collaborative work is one of the ways which gives students opportunity to work together with their peers. This study also focuses on the collaborative work across social orientation, introvert and extrovert. There is no adequate investigation on the personality types of students related to their writing ability, especially collaborative writing.

Thus, the present study will focus on collaborative work in which the social orientation will be the factor in students' L2 achievement.

The research questions are formulated as follows:

1. Do students who work collaboratively write better than students who work non-collaboratively?
2. Is there any significant difference in L2 writing performance between extrovert and introvert students when writing collaboratively?
3. Is there any significant difference between extrovert and introvert students in terms of different subsets of writing, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics when writing collaboratively?

The research hypothesis are as follows

1. Students who write collaboratively write better than the students who write non-collaboratively.
2. There is significant difference in L2 writing performance between extrovert and introvert students when writing collaboratively
3. There is significant difference between extrovert and introvert students in terms of different subsets of writing; content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics when writing collaboratively

Review of Literature

There are many reasons for using collaborative writing in the classroom. First, collaborative writing prepares students for it parallels the way writing is carried out in the

professional world (Woolever, 1991). Collaborative writing is common in the workplace because it generates quality ideas and enables the pooling of resources to produce a well-written document. It allows students to improve their idea by learning from others since there will be a pool of ideas during the writing activity. Second, collaborative writing fosters reflective thinking especially when learners are involved in presenting their opinions to their peers (Higgins, Flower & Petralgia, 1992). It occurs when students are engaged in the act of explaining and defending their ideas to their peers (DiCamilla & Anton, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Storch, 2002). When students are engaged in learning, they tend to perform their best to get the message across to the peers. They would try their very best effort to finish the gaps they want to solve, their language problems. Once the students talk about the language, they unconsciously internalize the knowledge they are working on. In this case, the students have to use their cognitive skills actively in order to follow an argument.

The third reason of using collaborative writing is dealing with the stages of writing. Collaboration is useful for all stages of writing since it promotes planning in writing (Dale, 1997). Collaborative writing results in good idea generation, pooling knowledge, and better organization which results in grammatically accurate texts that fulfil task requirements (Donato, 1988; Storch, 2002; Storch 2005). Donato (1988, 1997) describes the knowledge-sharing process as collective-scaffolding in which learners help each other in their learning. Collaborative writing also helps novice writers with revision (Dale, 1997). The composing process can be regarded as revision itself by experienced writers because the process is recursive (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Sommers, 1980).

Fourth, the process of collaborative writing builds self-awareness and self-confidence in the writer because one is affirmed of the ability to produce before the product is completed (Duin, 1991). This occurs especially when the writer has to perform a difficult writing task. It is in line with Kuiken and Vedder (2002) who state that collaborative writing will increase the writers' awareness upon the existing gaps in their language repertoire since interaction triggers their consciousness mechanism. Thus, the writer is assured of the possibility to perform it successfully due to the guidance provided by the group members.

The collaborative work has shown its power to help students learning in many ways. It gives the students the chance to produce ideas which in turn will give opportunity for learning since it will make them want to contribute when they come to the language source problem. In this case output is really essential for the students as the device of learning because it triggers them to discuss on the language problem which is actually the source of the problem. They will talk about the language they do not really know or understand. Output is one of the learning sources that learners can use to help them learn better. Swain (1985) states that comprehensible output is the output that extends the linguistics repertoire of the learner as he or she attempts to create precisely and appropriately the meaning desired. She also argued that producing the target language may serve as "the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning. It is no doubt that the output will give benefit for SL learners to acquire the target language better.

Swain (1995, 2005) has identified three for output: noticing function, a hypothesis-testing function, and a metalinguistic function. The noticing function holds that when learners produce output, they may notice gaps in their knowledge because through output they may realize they cannot say what they want to say. The second function is hypothesis testing that is, when talking to others, learners may try out different ways of saying the same thing and may also come to realize whether their utterances are comprehensible and well formed. When learners cannot express their intended meanings, they may search their existing knowledge to find solution to the problem. If they cannot find a solution, they might seek help from others or pay closer attention to the subsequent input. The last is metalinguistic function which is very useful for reflection. That is, output may encourage learners to consciously reflect upon language and consciously think about what to say and what not to say. Swain (1998) has stated that the learners' own language indicates and awareness of something about their own, or their interlocutor's, use of language.

The strength of the collaborative and output may become a powerful pedagogical activities which can help learners acquire the target language better. Ellis (2003) urges that there is a need to conduct a research on the use of classroom activities that promote both communicative interaction and attention to form. One way of promoting such opportunities is through pedagogical task that encourage negotiation of meaning, while at the same time providing opportunities for feedback and attention to form (Samuda and Bygate, 2008).

The collaborative work will benefit learners for their learning since it involves interaction among them. The sociocultural framework provides a strong basis for using pedagogical activities that encourage learners to work together and produce language collaboratively. Swain and her colleagues argued that such activities are effective because when learners collaborate to produce output, they use language not only to convey meaning, but also to develop meaning (Swain, 2005). These activities are beneficial because when learners attempt to produce language through collaboration, they will not only produce output, but they may get help from their peers while they try to make their meaning precise (Kowal & Swain, 1994; Swain, 2005). It is in line with the Vygotskian sociocultural theory of ZPD which refers to the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978).

Based on those theoretical arguments, several studies have empirically examined the role of collaborative work which involve output as the result of the students' learning. In a study, Storch (1999) stated that collaboration effect on overall grammatical accuracy. Then, Storch (2005) conducted another research on how effective a collaborative work was. She examined the effectiveness of collaborative work when students produced a written text either in pair or individually. The result showed that the collaborative pair work led to many opportunities for exchanging ideas and peer feedback. The result also showed that students who produced the text collaboratively wrote shorter but grammatically more accurate and more complex in comparison to those who produced them individually. But the difference between individual and pair work

was not statistically significant. She suggested that a larger scale of sample should be used to see the effects of the collaboration on the product. The type of the text also effects the insignificant result of the collaboration.

In 2007, Storch conducted another research which focused on the same topic. She examined the effectiveness of pair work by comparing learners' performance on completing an editing task. The result showed that when the students completed the tasks in pairs they were actively engaged in interaction and reflection about language form. Again, no significant different was found between the accuracy of the task when completed collaboratively and individually. She argued that it has to do with the scope of the topic. There is no much to discuss about the topic when the students worked on it.

Another researcher who reveals the effective of collaborative work (pair work) is Shehadeh (2011). She found that collaborative writing had an overall significant effect on students' L2 writing performance. However, this effect varied from on writing skill area to another. Specifically, the effect was significant for content, organization, and vocabulary but not for grammar and mechanics.

Collaborative work also can outperform the individual work in term of accuracy. Jafari and Ansari (2012) state that students who worked in pair have better writing accuracy than those who work individually. In their study, it was revealed that working collaboratively (pair work) contributes to the improvement of students writing performance.

The next researcher who investigated the effect collaborative (pair) work toward students writing performance is Biria and Jafari (2013) they found that practicing in pairs really improved the overall quality of the learners' writing production even though the fluency of the written texts did not change significantly.

The last researcher investigated the effect of collaborative writing in writing summary which revealed that collaborative gives ample opportunities for feedback and idea sharing that can lead to the meaning negotiation (Sajedi, 2014). He found that students who wrote the summary collaboratively (pair or group) outperformed the students who wrote the summary individually. In his research, he also reported that the pair work outperformed the group work (consisted of three students) in the summary writing. So the result of the study suggested that the type of the collaboration might not play a significant role on students L2 writing performance.

The results of previous studies on how effective the collaborative work is and how beneficial output for the improvement of writing skill may somehow confusing because those results do not tell us who contribute more or less when the students are writing. There must be some other factors which essentially contribute to the quality of the students' language performance. Kayaoglu (2011) states that there personality types are significant factors in education, especially language learning because they are believed to contribute to language behavior. The personality type which influence students' learning are extroversion and introversion. Extraversion (E) and introversion (I) dichotomy deals with the way people prefer to attain energy and focus their attention. Extroverts prefer to get energy from outside sources or outer world, but introverts prefer solitary activities and the inner world of ideas as the source of

their energy (Eysenck & Chan, 1982). According to Jensen and Ditiberio (1984), it is the first dimension of Jung's system identified a person's general orientation toward life. Extroverts mainly focus their energy outward and tend to interact with people and things. Outer experience (i.e., talking and acting) is so highly important for them that they often begin performing tasks with little planning, then rely on trial and error to complete the task. Since they spend more time dealing with outer experience rather than inner experience (i.e., reflecting and observing), they think most clearly and develop more ideas in action or in conversation.

Different from the extroverts, the introverts mostly focus their energy inward; they tend to consider and contemplate. More cautious about the outer world; they anticipate and reflect before becoming involved in action to avoid errors. When they are alone and uninterrupted by people and incidents, they think best and develop more ideas. Thus, the personality type should be into account to decide the best learning strategy which might work. Some researcher have investigated that the personality types contribute to the mastery of the language skills and component; listening, speaking, reading, writing, and vocabulary (Gan, 2011; sadhigi, 2013s; Roudgarsaffari, 2015; arem& Hazrati, 2015).

Chen, Jiang,& Mu (2015) investigated the correlation between personality types and oral English outcome which showed that the extroverted students outperformed the introverted ones in terms of oral proficiency. The result of the research suggests that introversion becomes the barrier to their oral English learning. On the other hand, Gan (2011) found that there was no significant correlation between the social orientation and the students' oral achievement.

The social orientation, introversion and extroversion, also gives contribution to the students' achievement in learning reading. Some researcher have investigated how the extroversion and introversion benefit the students in reading comprehension. The research conducted by Sarem and Hazrati (2015) showed that the the introvert learners with mean score(46.60) outperformed the introvert learners with the mean score(43.15). however, the difference between their performances was not statistically significant. One of the justifications that they make is that the introverts have been known as studious and hard-working students compared to more extroverted and out- going ones. Contrast with Sarem and Hazrati's research result, Roohani, Hasanimanesh, and Boroujeni (2015) revealed that introverts significantly outperformed extroverts in all subsets except organization. The justifications are that introverts carefulness, more concentration, and the ability to generate much more ideas alone.

Methodology

A. Participants

The participants of the study were 84 undergraduate students of Brawijaya university in Indonesia. The students were at the sixth semester who were taking Essay Writing subject.

B. Instruments

In order to see the proficiency level of the students, the TOEFL test scores were used to make sure that all the participants had the same proficiency. To see the social orientation/personality type, the researcher used the “The Big Five” personality questionnaire which was modified to fit the purpose of the study. There were 30 questions as the total in which 15 items were designated for introverts students and another 15 items for the extrovert students. The writing test was used to measure students’ achievement from which the data was gained to see the effect of the collaborative work across the social orientation. The students were required to write an argumentative essay individually about a topic which was provided by the researcher. The topics were chosen in such a way to fit the students’ level and familiarity so that they could write as good as possible.

C. Procedure

At first, the researcher administered the TOEFL test to participants to homogenize them in terms of proficiency. Only students who scored more than 450 points of the total possible score were selected as the samples for the study. Then, “The Big Five” personality questionnaire was distributed to decide the students’ social orientation, extroverted or introverted.

D. Data collections and Analysis

To deal with the data collection procedure, firstly, the researcher administered the TOEFL test to the students to determine the level of students’ proficiency. Secondly, the personality questionnaire was administered to decide what social orientation the students belong to. After the administration of the questionnaire, the students were asked to write an argumentative essay within 120 minutes to check the achievement after the manipulation. To answer the research questions, the researcher employs Independent sample t test which is used to see the difference between collaborative and individual work and the difference between the extroverts and introverts. To see what subsets of writing contribute more on the students’ achievement, one way ANOVA was employed.

Findings

This chapter covers the research findings and verification of the hypothesis of the research. All the gained data answer the research problems formulated and verify related all the hypotheses related to the problems. The data in this chapter are provided to decide whether there is significant difference between the collaborative work and the individual work on students’ L2 achievement seen from the different social orientation, which are calculated by means of statistical procedure in hypothesis testing. In other words, the data are analyzed to give detailed

explanation of the effect of collaborative work on students' L2 achievement across social orientation.

Table 1
The Summary of Students L2 Achievement between Experimental and Non-experimental Group

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	individual work	42	65,7143	16,16875	2,49489
	collaborative work	42	81,7143	12,11587	1,86952

Based on the table 3.1, it is clearly seen that the mean score of the students in the experimental group is greater than the students' score in the control group. The mean difference of the two groups is significant, 16 points, which tells that the experimental group outperforms the control group in the L2 writing.

Table 2
The Result of Independent Samples Test between Experimental and Control Group
Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	4,456	,038	5,132	82	,000	-16,00000	3,11763	22,20195	-9,79805
	Equal variances not assumed			5,132	76,006	,000	-16,00000	3,11763	22,20928	-9,79072

Table 2 shows that there is significant difference between the experimental and non-experimental groups. The gained p value is smaller than the set p value .05 which indicates that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. The researcher takes the alternatives hypothesis which says that there is significant different between students who write collaboratively and students who write individually.

The difference of students' L2 writing achievement of different social orientation

The difference between the experimental and the no-experimental group leads the researcher to answer the next research question in which involves the students' social

orientation. There are two types of social orientation involve in the present study, introvert and extrovert, which are believed to contribute to the students' L2 writing achievement. To know the difference the L2 writing achievements between these two types of personality, the researcher employs independent sample t test. The result of the statistical computation is shown in the table 3

Table 3
Summary of L2 Writing Achievement between Introvert and Extrovert Students Working Collaboratively

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	collaborative work of introverts	21	76,8095	12,88650	2,81207
	collaborative work of extroverts	21	86,6190	9,18410	2,00413

Table 3 shows the mean difference between the introvert and extrovert students working collaboratively. The mean score of the extrovert students is greater than the mean score of the introvert students, 86,6190 and 76,8095 respectively.

Table 4
The result of Independent Samples Test between the Introvert and Extrovert Students when Writing Collaboratively

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	1,465	,233	2,841	40	,007	-9,80952	3,45315	16,78861	-2,83044
	Equal variances not assumed			2,841	36,150	,007	-9,80952	3,45315	16,81183	-2,80722

Table 4 indicates that there is significant difference between the two groups because the p value is less than .05 in the level of 95% confidence. The result also summarizes that the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and take the alternatives hypothesis which later leads him to see which subsets contribute more on the students' L2 writing achievement. There are five subsets of the writing which contribute to the writing of the students namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic.

The difference of writing subsets which contribute to the students' L2 writing achievement

Table 5
The Result of the Descriptive Statistics of Writing Subsets Score

subsets_score	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
content	21	86,9048	15,55042	3,39338	79,8263	93,9832	50,00	100,00
organization	21	89,2857	14,94036	3,26025	82,4849	96,0865	50,00	100,00
vocabulary	21	83,3333	9,94778	2,17078	78,8052	87,8615	75,00	100,00
language use	21	77,9762	11,11359	2,42518	72,9173	83,0350	50,00	100,00
mechanic	21	84,5238	11,79563	2,57402	79,1545	89,8931	75,00	100,00
Total	105	84,4048	13,17652	1,28590	81,8548	86,9547	50,00	100,00

Table 5 shows the descriptive result of the students' for each subsets which describes the means of the students score gained for each subsets. The highest score of the writing subsets is on the organization which is 89,2857. The second highest score is on the content, 86.9048, which is not really different from the organization score. The difference between the two highest subsets is 2,3809 which considered not significantly different. the mean score of mechanic is 84,5238 which is not significantly different from language use which is 83,3333. The lowest score students gained is on the language use which is 77,9762. This score is significantly different from the highest students gained on organization.

After knowing the mean scores of each subset, the researcher needs to see the homogeneity of variances. The homogeneity is shown in the table 6 below:

Table 6
The Result of the Homogeneity of Variances

Test of Homogeneity of Variances				
subsets_score	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	2,468	4	100	,050

Table 6 indicates that the p value is .050 which is exactly at the limit point of the 95% confidence. Since the p value .050, it indicates that the groups are homogeneous.

Table 7
The Result of ANOVA

subsets_score	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1523,810	4	380,952	2,304	,064
Within Groups	16532,738	100	165,327		
Total	18056,548	104			

Table 7 shows that the p value, .064, is greater than the set p value .05. Since the gained p value is greater than the set p value, it indicates that the researcher accepts the null hypothesis (Ho) which says there is no significant difference among the subsets of writing on the contribution to the L2 writing achievement of the students. It concludes that the researcher cannot proceed to the next test (pot hoc test) to see the difference among the subsets because there is no enough evidence to continue.

Conclusion

The effect of the collaborative work on students' L2 writing achievement

Based on the statistical analysis of the data, the formulated research problem on the effect of collaborative work on students L2 writing achievement is solved. The result shows that the experimental group, collaborative work outperforms its counterpart, non-experimental group which is individual work. The mean score of the students who worked collaboratively is higher than the mean score of the students who worked individually from which the researcher can take a conclusion that writing collaboratively is more effective than writing individually.

The result of t test demonstrated that the mean score of the students who worked collaboratively; 81,7143, is significantly different from the individual ones, 65,7143. The gained p value also proves that there is significant difference between collaborative work and the individual work. These findings are in harmony with the previous research (Shehadeh, 2011; Fernandez Dobao, 2012). They found that collaborative experiences had a beneficial effect on students' L2 achievement. Dobao (2012) states that higher level of success achieved by the collaborative work was due to the pooling of knowledge within the group in which different members likely shared their knowledge and collaborated to solve their language-related problem. Within the interaction of the students, they corrected each other from which every member learned new ideas they might not know yet. Feedback given by the peers would give them new knowledge and help them to write better in the area they had problem on, for example vocabulary or language use.

Negative or corrective feedback as part of the meaning negotiation process is considered one of the salient features of coversational interaction by which the interlocuters detect the existing discrepenciesin their output and try to resolve the communication breakdown. Lyster

and Ranta (1997) believed that corrective feedback encourages selfrepair involving accuracy and precision as well as comprehensibility. Thus, this type of feedback which occurs during the ineteraction contributes to the pooling of knowledge within the group member which is later believed to be one of the contributors to their L2 writing achievement in the present study. It is in line with Shehadeh (2011) who found that collaborative work on writing enables the students to generate ideas, pool ideas together, discuss and shape plan, generate their collaboratively, provide each other with immediate feedback, and put their text in better shape.

Despite of the pool of knowledge among the members which is calimed to contribute to the improvement of their L2 achievement, Shehadeh (2011) found collaborative work enhanced not only their writing ability, but also their self-confidence. The confidence is raising among the students because they realize that all of them made mistakes while they learned to produce the target language. Once they found mistakes on their peers uttarances, they were willingly helped the peer to correct the mistake in which they encourage each other to learn.

but their other skills as well that the collaborative writing is enjoyable for the students which is believed to leads to their learning. It is believed that once the students feel comfortable while interacting with their peers within a group, they will produce more ouput and give opportunity for the less able students learn more from their more capable peers' explanation on the language-related problem.

The effect collaborative Work on Students' L2 Writing Achievement with Different Personality Types

The findings of this study suggest that the extrovert students are more superior to its counterparts for some reasons. Sulaiman(2014) states that extrovert learners use the language to interact without inhabitation, tend to take action with less reflection. These characteristics are powerful to make the students learn better since they tend to work all out in a way they do not hesitate themselves to get involved in learning activities. When they are well engaged in their discussion, they will produce output which is useful for everyone within the group. The extrovert collaborative work is really beneficial as the device of learning to make learners engaged in the learning with the purpose of helping the less capable students to catch up with the more capable students where learning occurs.

Eysenck and Chan (1982) state that the extroverts think most clearly and develop more ideas in action, which is really beneficial for the students in idea development during the writing process. During the writing process, students are discussing which focus on meaning and form from which they complete each other's ideas so that they come up with a very good idea. This suggests that the pooling of ideas from the students would give all members of the group advantage in writing better.

The Contribution of Each Subset of Writing on Students' L2 Writing Achievement.

The ANOVA test shows that the p value is .065 which is higher than the set p value which is .05. It suggests that there is no difference among the subsets of the writing in the contribution of the students writing achievement. The possible causes of the insignificant result is that the homogeneity of the subject. It shows that the gained p value for the homogeneity of variance is .05 which is exactly on the limit value. It might influence the result of the ANOVA test which suggests that there is no significant difference among the subsets of writing to the students achievement.

Suggestions and Recommendations

The findings of this study revealed that there is significant difference between the collaborative work and individual work on the students' L2 writing achievement. Therefore, by using the collaborative work in teaching writing, teachers/lecturers can help the students better as a result the students will write better as well.

The result of this study suggests that different personality results in different writing achievement. This study concludes that the students who are extroverted outperform students who are introverted in terms of their writing performance. The extroverts produced better argumentative essay because the ideas are pooled from different students within the group which resulted in one best idea. They tend to produce better piece of writing than the introverted students.

To sum up, teachers/lecturers can use the method in the teaching of writing because of its effectiveness. Although there is no significant difference among the subsets in the contribution of students' L2 writing achievement but the overall result shows that the collaborative work is effective for the teaching writing especially for those students who belong to extroverted personality. Knowing the difference of the introverts and extroverts, teachers/lecturers are suggested to use particular method in the teaching of writing which fits the characteristics of these two personalities.

References

- Attamim, Z. 2007. *The Implementation of Cooperative Learning to Improve Students' Proficiency in Writing Paragraph at Muhammadiyah University of Ponorogo*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang. Graduate Program, State University of Malang
- Baret, N. E. & Chen, L. 2011. English Article Errors in Taiwanese College Students' EFL Writing. *Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing*, 16(3): 1-20
- Biria, R & Jafari, S. 2013. The Impact of Collaborative Writing on the Writing Fluency of Iranian Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 21:40-58

- Cahyono, B. Y. & Widiati, U. 2011. *The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia*. State University Malang Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irawati, E. 2008. *Pre-Writing and Drafting Strategies of Graduate Students in Writing Term- Paper in English. A Case Study*. Unpublished Dissertation. Malang: Graduate Program, State University of Malang.
- Isnawati, I. 2010. *Improving the English Writing Skill of the Third Semester English Department Students of STAIN Tulungagung Using Task-Based Language Teaching*. Unpublished Thesis. Graduate Program, State University of Malang.
- Kasman, S. 2004. *The Effect of Using Formal Outline in Writing Exposition*. Unpublished dissertation. Malang: Graduate Program, State University of Malang.
- Jafari, N & Ansari, D. N. 2012. The Effect of Collaboration on Iranian EFL learners' Writing Accuracy. *International Education Studies*, 5 (2): 125-131
- Kowal, M. & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73-93.
- Latief, M. A. 1990. *Assessment of English Writing Skill for Students of English as a Foreign Language at the Institute of Teacher Training and Education IKIP Malang*. Unpublished Dissertation, the University of Iowa. Iowa City.
- Oshima, A & Hogue, A. 2007. *Introduction to Academic Writing*. Third Edition. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Sabarun. 2006. *Improving Writing Ability of Fifth Semester Students of English Department of State University of Malang through Cooperative Learning Strategy*. Unpublished Thesis. Graduate Program, State University of Malang.
- Samuda, V. & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. London: Palgrave.
- Shehadeh, A. 2011. Effects and Student Perception of Collaborative Writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20:286-305
- Storch, N. 1999. Are Two Heads Better than One? *Pair Work and Grammatical Accuracy*. System. 7:363-374
- Storch, N. 2005. Collaborative Writing: Product, Process, and Students' Reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14:153-173
- Storch, N. 2007. Investigating the Merits of Pair Work on a text Editing Task in ESL Classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11(2) 143-159
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook on research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ulfiati, T. 2010. *Cohesive Devices in Papers Written by English Department Students of State University of Malang*. Graduate Program, State University of Malang.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wigglesworth, G & Storch, N. 2009. Pair versus Individual Writing: *Effects on Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy*. *Language Testing*. 26(3)