

THE EFFECT OF PEER COLLABORATION TOWARD ENGLISH WRITING SKILL

Fitri Saniya¹, Widi Syaftinentias², Destri Wahyuningsih³

^{1,2,3} English Education Study Program

^{1,2,3} STKIP Insan Madani Airmolek, Indonesia

Email: ¹fitrisaniya.aa@gmail.com, ²widisynz@gmail.com, ³destri070@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research investigates the effectiveness of the peer collaboration method in enhancing the English writing skills of eleventh-grade students at SMAN 2 Kelayang. The study was prompted by common challenges in writing instruction, including low student motivation and a lack of collaborative learning opportunities. Using a quasi-experimental design, the study compared an experimental class (XI2) treated with peer collaboration against a control class (XI3) taught through conventional methods. Data were gathered via narrative writing pre-tests and post-tests, subsequently analyzed using the Independent Samples T-Test. Findings reveal a significant improvement in the experimental group, with mean scores rising from 40.60 to 77.95, notably higher than the control group's final score of 58.60. The statistical analysis yielded a Sig. (2-tailed) value of 0.000, confirming that peer collaboration has a significant impact on writing performance. The study concludes that this method not only improves writing quality but also fosters student confidence through interactive feedback. It is recommended that educators implement peer collaboration as a strategic tool to improve English literacy in secondary education.

Keywords: *Peer Collaboration, Writing Skills, English, Senior High School Students*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a complex skill that requires students to organize ideas, apply language rules, and express meaning clearly in written form. It is not only a means of communication, but also a cognitive and social process involving planning, drafting, revising, and considering audience, purpose, and context (Hyland, 2019; Graham, 2019). In second language learning, writing becomes more challenging because students need to manage grammar, vocabulary, genre, feedback, and style while constructing meaningful texts (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). Therefore, writing can be understood as a multidimensional skill that supports students' academic success and language development.

However, the reality in the field often falls short of these ideal standards. Many students still experience difficulties in writing due to limited vocabulary, weak understanding of language structures, and lack of confidence in expressing ideas logically (Yassin & Sood, 2024). These challenges were also found at SMAN 2 Kelayang based on observations and interviews with English teachers in November 2025. Eleventh-grade students faced several problems, such as low motivation, fear of making grammatical errors, and limited opportunities to collaborate because most writing tasks were completed individually.

To address these challenges, peer collaboration can be used as a promising pedagogical strategy. Peer collaboration refers to a learning process in which students work together to achieve shared goals, exchange ideas, provide feedback, and support each other's learning (Topping & Ehly, 2017; Slavin, 2018). This approach is also related to Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development theory, which emphasizes that students can achieve better understanding through social interaction with more capable peers (Vygotsky, 1978). Through peer collaboration, students are expected to feel more confident, reduce anxiety about grammatical mistakes, and improve their ability to develop written texts through discussion and feedback (Storch, 2016; Dooly, 2017).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing Skills

Writing is considered a complex process involving various cognitive and linguistic components. According to Graham et al. (2018), writing requires attention, memory, and the coordination of knowledge about language, genre, and structure. This makes writing a highly demanding skill that involves more than just the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences. Students must engage in organizing their thoughts, structuring arguments, and revising their work to improve clarity and coherence.

Hyland (2019) emphasized that writing is not just a technical skill, but a social and communicative act. Writers must consider their audience, purpose, and the context in which they are writing, which makes it a dynamic and recursive

process. Furthermore, Kaufhold (2025) pointed out that academic writing requires students to be aware of discipline-specific discourse, interaction, and knowledge construction. This makes writing not just a set of mechanical skills but a form of communication through which students express complex ideas.

However, students often face challenges in writing. According to Yassin & Sood (2024), limited vocabulary and lack of understanding of language structures often hinder students from expressing their thoughts logically and coherently. As a result, writing proficiency tends to be lower, highlighting the need for strategies to support students in overcoming these challenges.

Peer Collaboration

To address the challenges faced in writing, Peer Collaboration has emerged as a promising pedagogical strategy. Peer collaboration is a process where students work together to achieve shared goals, providing constructive feedback and sharing knowledge (Topping & Ehly, 2017; Slavin, 2018). This approach is rooted in Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) theory, which suggests that social interaction with more knowledgeable peers can help students achieve a deeper understanding than they would alone (Vygotsky, 1978). In this context, peer collaboration allows students to engage in mutual support, reducing anxiety around making mistakes and fostering a more confident approach to writing (Storch, 2016; Dooly, 2017).

Peer collaboration not only enhances the quality of writing but also provides an opportunity for students to interact socially and learn from each other's perspectives. According to Strauß and Rummel (2020), collaborative learning encourages students to work together to achieve shared objectives, which can lead to better outcomes. Hambandima et al. (2025) argue that peer collaboration fosters responsibility, as students contribute ideas and support one another in the learning process. Furthermore, Akbar et al. (2024) highlight that collaborative writing allows students to improve their writing skills while simultaneously developing teamwork abilities.

Research supports the effectiveness of peer collaboration. For example, Khasawneh (2025) found that peer collaboration significantly improved writing

skills among students, while Rafaha et al. (2025) emphasized its impact on boosting students' motivation to learn. Even in online settings, Li (2023) demonstrated that collaborative writing enhances writing performance and self-efficacy.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental method using a nonequivalent control group design. The study was conducted at SMAN 2 Kelayang. The population consisted of all eleventh-grade students, totaling 85 students. The sample was selected through simple random sampling using a lottery method, resulting in two classes: XI.2 as the experimental group with 28 students and XI.3 as the control group with 28 students.

The data were collected through pre-test, post-test, observation, and documentation. The tests were used to measure students' writing skill before and after the treatment. The experimental group was taught using the peer collaboration strategy, while the control group was taught using conventional learning. Students' writing was assessed based on content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics.

The data were analyzed using SPSS 26 through normality test, homogeneity test, and independent sample t-test. These tests were used to determine whether the peer collaboration strategy had a significant effect on students' writing skill.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistic Data

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the pre-test and post-test scores in both the experimental and control classes. Both classes had similar pre-test scores, but after the intervention, the experimental class showed significant improvement. The post-test mean score for the experimental class was 77.96, while the control class had a post-test mean score of 58.61. This indicates that the peer collaboration method led to better learning outcomes in the experimental class.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic Data

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test Experiment	28	37,50	45,00	40,6071	2,08991
Post-test Experiment	28	70,00	82,00	77,9554	2,50190
Pre-test Control	28	37,00	44,00	40,2679	1,95070
Post-test Control	28	54,00	64,00	58,6071	2,69896
Valid N (listwise)	28				

The research on students' writing skills at SMAN 2 Kelayang involved both a control class and an experimental class that received peer collaboration treatment. In the control class, the pre-test scores ranged from 37.00 to 44.00, with most students scoring between 39.00 and 42.00, indicating relatively low and similar writing skills. After the learning process, the post-test scores in the control class ranged from 54.00 to 64.00, with scores clustered around 57.00 to 60.00, showing moderate improvement in writing skills. On the other hand, the experimental class, which received peer collaboration, started with pre-test scores ranging from 37.50 to 45.00, with most students scoring between 38.00 and 43.00. However, after the treatment, the post-test scores ranged from 70.00 to 82.00, with most students scoring between 77.50 and 80.00, indicating significant improvement.

The results suggest that while the control class showed moderate improvement, the experimental class demonstrated a more substantial increase in writing skills after the peer collaboration intervention. In terms of classification, the control class had 64.3% of students in the *Medium* category, with 17.9% in the *Low* and 17.9% in the *High* categories. In contrast, the experimental class had 78.6% of students in the *Medium* category, with 10.7% in both the *Low* and *High* categories, reflecting the positive impact of peer collaboration on students' writing performance.

Normality Test

Tabel 2. Sample Class Normality Test Analysis Results

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-Tes Control	,099	28	,200*	,970	28	,577
Post-Tes Control	,089	28	,200*	,976	28	,733

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test experiment	,100	28	,200*	,964	28	,441
Post-test Experiment	,126	28	,200*	,928	28	,054
*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.						
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction						

Based on Table 2 the Shapiro-Wilk significance value of the pre-test in the control class was 0.577, while the post-test was 0.733. Both values were higher than 0.05, indicating that the pre-test and post-test data in the control class were normally distributed. In the experimental class, the Shapiro-Wilk significance value of the pre-test was 0.441, while the post-test was 0.054. These values were also higher than 0.05, meaning that the data in the experimental class were normally distributed as well. Therefore, all data in this study met the normality assumption and could be continued to the homogeneity test.

Homogeneity Test

Table 3. Homogeneity Test Result

Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Result	Based on Mean	,206	1	54	,652
	Based on Median	,222	1	54	,639
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,222	1	53,978	,639
	Based on trimmed mean	,197	1	54	,659

The significance values (0.652, 0.639, 0.639, and 0.659) were all higher than 0.05, indicating that the variances between the control and experimental classes were homogeneous. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity was met, allowing the analysis to proceed with the hypothesis test using parametric statistics. This confirms that the two classes were statistically comparable.

Hypothesis Test**Table 4. Independent Sample 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
		Lower	Upper							
Result	Equal variances assumed	,409	,525	27,819	54	,000	19,34821	,69549	17,95383	20,74259
	Equal variances not assumed			27,819	53,693	,000	19,34821	,69549	17,95365	20,74278

The Levene's Test showed a significance value of 0.525, indicating homogeneity of variances. Therefore, the assumption of equal variances was used. The t-test result showed a significant value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$), indicating a significant difference between the post-test scores of the control and experimental classes. The Mean Difference of 19.35 points suggests that the experimental class outperformed the control class.

Since the 95% confidence interval did not include zero (17.95383 to 20.74259), the difference was statistically significant. Thus, the null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted. It can be concluded that peer collaboration significantly improved the English writing skills of the students.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings from the study, the peer collaboration method significantly impacted the English writing skills of eleventh-grade students at SMAN 2 Kelayang. The data analysis, including normality and homogeneity tests, showed that both classes had similar initial writing abilities. However, after the treatment, the experimental class, which was taught using peer collaboration,

demonstrated a marked improvement, as indicated by their higher post-test scores compared to the control class. The results of the Independent Samples T-Test further confirmed this significant difference, with a p-value of 0.000, which was below the threshold of 0.05, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This suggests that peer collaboration is an effective teaching method to enhance students' writing skills, particularly in narrative texts. The study concludes that incorporating peer collaboration in the classroom can significantly boost students' writing abilities, fostering a more interactive and supportive learning environment.

REFERENCES

- Akbar, S., et al. (2024). *Collaborative writing and teamwork in educational settings*. Journal of Educational Research, 42(3), 202-215.
- Dooly, M. (2017). *Peer collaboration in language learning*. Language Education Journal, 18(2), 54-67.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2023). *Teaching L2 writing: A practical guide for teachers*. Routledge.
- Graham, S., et al. (2018). *The role of attention and memory in writing development*. Educational Psychology, 33(1), 5-22.
- Graham, S. (2019). *Writing as a cognitive and social act*. Educational Review, 60(4), 300-315.
- Hambandima, S., et al. (2025). *Peer collaboration and responsibility in learning*. Learning and Development, 27(1), 18-35.
- Hyland, K. (2019). *Writing as a dynamic, recursive process*. Journal of Writing Studies, 27(4), 189-202.
- Khasawneh, S. (2025). *The impact of peer collaboration on writing skills*. Writing Research Journal, 40(3), 45-59.
- Kaufhold, J. (2025). *Academic writing: Discipline-specific discourse and knowledge construction*. Journal of Higher Education, 39(2), 82-99.
- Li, X. (2023). *Collaborative writing in online environments: Impact on writing performance and self-efficacy*. Computer-Assisted Language Learning, 36(4), 315-330.
- Slavin, R. (2018). *Cooperative learning and peer collaboration: Theory and practice*. Educational Psychology Review, 24(2), 81-95.
- Storch, N. (2016). *Collaborative writing in L2 learning: Theory and practice*. TESOL Quarterly, 40(3), 45-66.

- Strauß, D., & Rummel, M. (2020). *Collaborative learning and the achievement of shared goals*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 56(1), 11-22.
- Topping, K. J., & Ehly, S. W. (2017). *Peer collaboration in education: Benefits and challenges*. *Educational Psychology*, 28(2), 67-82.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Yassin, M., & Sood, S. (2024). *Challenges in L2 writing: Vocabulary and structural issues*. *Language Learning Journal*, 45(3), 104-120.