

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter draws conclusions from the data analysis and discussions which are presented on the previous chapter. The conclusions drawn from the present study are elaborated with some possible suggestions for further studies.

5.1 Conclusion

This study has investigated on the use of CMC, Hangout and PBWorks, as tools in collaboratiave writing. The quality of students' writing showed improvement, though they were not that significant. From holistic scoring, the groups mostly improved one level, which from minimum level 2 and level 5. Meanwhile from analytic scoring, mostly the groups had difficulty in showing claims. They showed the claim on their writing but it was not clearly stated. The readers should have carefully referred to what they were writing.

From interaction analysis, mostly students interacted equally in using synchronous CMC, either in socioaffective, organizational or in sociocognitive. Socioaffective reflects how student get along with the others during the interaction process. This interaction was subcategorized into social cohesion, emotional expression, intersubjectivity, personal exchanges and use of L1. From all subcategories, emotional expression obtained the highest percentage, 27.5% in Essay 1 and 26.9% in Essay 2. The emotional expression interaction were identified mostly by humors and emoticons.

Then organizational which indicates the planning, monitoring and evaluating of the task obtained 33.9% in Essay 1 and 32.6% in Essay 2. This theme is subcategorized into teacher involvement, group management, discussion management, task management, feedback management and technical management. In this study, teacher involvement obtained the highest percentage, either in essay 1 or essay 2, - 34.8% and 30.2%. The teacher involvement mostly in giving announcement and encouragement in finishing the task, as it was found that some groups did not do anything even a day before the deadline.

Lastly is sociocognitive which signifies how the students resolve together the task together. This interaction was subcategorized into topic selection, idea development, content arrangement, essay structure, argumentative plan type, peer review, task management and conclusion. For this interaction, task management obtained the highest percentage (43.9 % in Essay 1 and 24.2% in Essay 2). The task management was defined as episodes that involve those of task confusion, task clarification, task confirmation and task division.

Meanwhile in asynchronous CMC, they students interacted mostly only on sociocognitive where they have to revise their task writing, as it was emphasized that the main aim of asynchronous CMC is peer feedback. The socioaffective obtained about 37.2% in Essay 1 and 33.5% in Essay 2. This theme was subcategorized into social cohesion, emotional expression, intersubjectivity and use of L1. Intersubjectivity which was defined as comments regarding encouragement, personal requests, evaluation,

acknowledgement, seeking agreement, and agreeing or rejecting ideas obtained the highest percentage which was 73% in Essay 1 and 67% in Essay 2.

Organizational interaction in synchronous CMC did not occur much, which it showed it only obtained 3.6% in Essay 1 and 2.4% in Essay 2. This theme then was subcategorized into feedback management and technical management. The feedback management obtained the highest percentage, 92% in Essay 1 and 100% in Essay 2, which was indicated by the comments from the students to add comments on their drafts.

Unlike socioaffective and organizational, the sociocognitive dominated the interaction occurred in asynchronous CMC, - PBWorks. It obtained 59.1% in essay 1 and 64.1% in essay 2. The subcategories of sociocognitive in asynchronous CMC are alteration, suggestion, evaluation, explanation and clarification, which were in global or local and as complimentary or critical. The evaluation and suggestion became the focus on the students in revising their writing.

Lastly from the questionnaire and interview, the overall reflections of students showed that online collaborative writing is very useful and helpful their work, especially in final weeks every semesters where mostly all subjects give final projects. The UTAUT 2 which was used to measure the students acceptance in using new technology showed in positive view, though only in habit and behavioural intention where the students still felt unsure whether they will continue to use Hangout and Pbworks. As for Hangout, based on the interview, the students preferred LINE or Whatapps

applications as they have been accustomed to using it either for individual or group. Meanwhile for Pbworks, they need time to adjust in using in daily life or as alternative for doing collaboration.

5.2 Suggestions

Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) can be the most appropriate environment to learn writing if learner benefits are considered. CMC presents students opportunities for written interaction; not only in one-on-one interactions, but also in communication with a variety of partners (Warschauer, 1996). In addition, writing activity can be more motivating through the use of ICT (Wu, 2011). As a result, the use of computers in L2 writing classrooms has got more and more increased, and more attention is being given to the effects of computer-mediated communication (CMC).

Based on the findings in this study, it is suggested that the combination of SCMC and ACMC should be more implemented in tertiary environment. The use of these two modes of CMC significantly proved to improve students' interaction and motivation in learning foreign language. Furthermore, collaboration using both modes CMC improve students independency in learning and also indicates the high level of autonomy therefore opportunities of learning in ZPD afforded.

As the limitation of this study, the teacher's role in the collaborative language learning process may be another direction for future research. Finding from the current study indicated that the teacher had different role of collaborative learning. In addition to wiki-based peer review process, the

further research is required to investigate how much learners consider and make use of comments by group members in their revision.

Finally, empirical research on English language education in the Indonesian sociocultural context, at the moment, very limiter. Much more research in language education in general and the application of technology in language teaching and learning in this particular setting are expected in the near future.