

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PAIR WORK AND GROUP WORK ON STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN GIVING WRITING TASK

M. Labib Al Halim  
Universitas Billfath Lamongan, Indonesia  
E-mail: labibhalim27@gmail.com

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat apakah ada perbedaan skor rata-rata dalam pemberian tugas writing deskriptif teks antara siswa yang bekerja secara individu, berpasangan, dan yang kerja secara grup atau kelompok pada siswa Sekolah Menengah Pertama (SMP) Kelas VIII. Subjek penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas 8 SMP Negeri 3 Lamongan yang terbagi menjadi tiga kelompok. Kelompok pertama sebagai kontrol grup (individu), kelompok kedua dan ketiga sebagai eksperimen grup (berpasangan dan kerja kelompok). Perlakuan dari penelitian ini adalah sepanjang delapan kali pertemuan. Semua kelompok diberi perlakuan yang sama. Secara rinci, masing-masing kelompok diberi strategi yang sama. Mereka diajar oleh guru yang sama, materi yang sama dan alokasi waktu yang sama. Setelah mendapat perlakuan sebanyak 8 kali pertemuan, semua kelompok kemudian diberi posttest berupa menulis teks deskriptif. Data yang diperoleh kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan ANOVA satu arah (One way ANOVA) dan Post Hoc Test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan dalam skor rata-rata antara siswa yang mengerjakan tugas secara individu dan kerja kelompok, begitu juga antara siswa yang mengerjakan tugas secara berpasangan dan kerja kelompok.

**Keyword:** Menulis, Kerja Kelompok

## Introduction

The effect of different learning work on students' achievement is highly debated issue today. In fact, educational system in this country has been pushed to raise standards competence of learning, so that young generations can compete in the global marketplace. There are some methods that have been tried by the learner in

learning process to raise students' competence. One of the methods is giving a task.

The method of giving task is one of teaching methods which is applied in learning process. In learning, giving task is essential to strengthen and stabilize students' understanding of the lesson which is taught. The tasks can be given in several ways: individually, in pairs or in groups. The purpose of individual task is to ask students do their own duties based on his ability. While, pair or group task is intended to make students work together, discuss together to complete the task.

In individual work, the student has no interaction to others. It is silent way because no one is invited to talk, to share ideas or ask for help. But, this method makes students easier to concentrate and work faster especially for the familiar topic. In pair, the group is consisted of two students. They only have one partner to exchange ideas. The disadvantage of this model is when they get passive partner, the interaction and collaboration cannot be effective. In group work, the students are able to interact more than pair group. They discuss the task in team and each team member is responsible to the task. Moreover, there are sixteen interactions happened in group work. Everybody can give an idea.

Harmer states that, "there are three kinds of students' grouping, individual, pair works, and group work"<sup>1</sup>. In individual work, the student works individually or by him/herself. The student can edit the tasks in appropriate speed and learning style. The tasks can be assessed individually and the level of details can be adjusted. The student can prepare his/her personal ideas, views or argument. Pair work consists of two members who can interact each other, discuss the ideas, and share the arguments. Harmer states that students work in pair can practice their language, discuss the text, and take the information of the text together<sup>2</sup>. Group work consists of more than two members. There are four to six members in group work. It is also known as a small or cluster grouping. Harmer states that in group work, the students can discuss the text together in team which consisted of more than three persons<sup>3</sup>. In this models, the students

---

<sup>1</sup> Jeremy Harmer, "The Practice of English Language Teaching," *ELT Journal*, 2003, <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.4.401>.

<sup>2</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

<sup>3</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

can share their knowledge, ideas, arguments in one topic (depend on the task set by teacher) and respect others' ideas.

The researcher applies those kinds of different methods on writing descriptive text. The researcher is interested in analyzing students' difficulties in writing descriptive text through content, organization, and language use. In this research, the students are asked to describe about a place. The students should give information about the place, such as where the place is, how big it is, how cold or warm the place is, and what are the facilities. For example, when a student wants to describe about his house, then he/she should have background knowledge about parts of his house, such as how many rooms that this student has? What is the color of the wall? How wide or how high the house is.

Based on the observation of students writing task, there are some difficulties that students faced during writing the descriptive text. The first is introducing the object. Some students still confuse to identify the object. Second is in organizing the ideas. The students have to organize their ideas into good paragraphs to make their writing readable. Third, the students get difficulties in language use. Some students are lack of vocabularies to arrange a sentence. Some students are still doubt to choose the correct words while composing descriptive text. The researcher hopes this research can theoretically and practically contribute to the teachers. Among those four different methods of works; individual, pair, triad, and group work, which is more productive, more effective, and more satisfied from the score result. The result also can help the teachers to decide what methods are desirable when giving a task.

There are some researches related to the effectiveness of those kinds of different learning work on students' achievement. Sert has studied about "A comparative analysis of pair work and individual work assignments in two ELT grammar classes"<sup>4</sup>. The result indicated variety advantages of student collaboration in preparing written work such as less spelling mistakes and higher level of grammatical awareness. Additionally, pair work helped students build positive interpersonal relationships and create a high level of academic solidarity and confidence.

---

<sup>4</sup> Olcay Sert, "A Comparative Analysis of Pair-Work and Individual Assignments," *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2005): 236–53.

Khan has studied about “classroom interaction in ESL classrooms: A comparative study between group work and individual work”<sup>5</sup>. The result showed that both in reading and writing test, the learner in group did better than the individual. In group activity, there was collaboration among the learners. Learner could pick up the reading and writing skill through discussion and sharing, thus the performance in group was better than the performance of individual activity.

Hosseini, Bakhtiarvand, and Tabatabaei investigated the effect of individual, pair, and teamwork on the speaking fluency of Iranian elementary EFL learners<sup>6</sup>. From the result of pre-test and post-test, the result showed that the three groups performed significantly different on the post-test. Pair Work Group and Team Work Group outperformed Individual Work Group, indicating that the techniques of working in pairs and teams promote the speaking fluency of Iranian EFL learners. Other recent study is Al Tai investigated the effect of collaboration on Omani students’ writing: a comparison between individual, pair and group work<sup>7</sup>. The result showed that collaborative writing positively affects accuracy, fluency and lexical resource of the text.

### **Objective of the Study**

Based on the problem above, the researcher intends to see whether there is the difference in the mean score of writing descriptive text between students working in pair and working in group at junior high school students.

### **Research Hypothesis**

The researcher hypothesizes that first, there is no difference in the mean score between individual work and pair work. Second, the students work in group work method get higher score than students

---

<sup>5</sup> Rabeya Nasrin Khan, “Classroom Interaction in ESL Classrooms: A Comparative Study between Group Work and Individual Work,” no. April (2009).

<sup>6</sup> Seyed Hossein Hosseini, Morteza Bakhtiarvand, and Soudabeh Tabatabaei, “A Comparative Study on the Effect of Individual, Pair and Team Work on Speaking Fluency Of Iranian Elementary EFL Learners,” *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences* 4, no. 8 (2013): 17, <http://www.irjabs.com>.

<sup>7</sup> Yasmeen Al Tai, “The Effect of Collaboration on Omani Students’ Writing: A Comparison Between Individual, Pair and Group Work” 1, no. May (2015): 154–71.

work individual and in pair. It is because the students have more interaction and collaboration each other which can help them to write a good text.

## **Review of Related Literature**

### **Writing**

Writing is a way of communication. Writing is an act to create communication between a writer and reader. Through writing, the writer can express their ideas, feelings, thought and experiences in the writing form. Writing is an important skill that should be mastered by the students. This skill is used as medium of delivering the ideas, feeling and perceptions of the writer to the reader in written form. Ur states that writing is an expression of the ideas that convey messages to the reader<sup>8</sup>. In writing, the writer actually gives something that the readers' need. When someone writes something and then others read to the writing, there will be a social interaction.

### **The Writing Process**

Writing is a complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. At the sentence level those include control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation. Beyond the sentence, the writer must be able to structure and integrate information into cohesive and coherent paragraphs and texts. Richard and Renandya state that writing skills are highly complex. L2 writers must pay attention to the content, organization, and language use such as spelling, punctuation, and word choice<sup>9</sup>. Richard and Renandya also state that there are three steps in writing process. (1) Planning, this stage encourages students to write, (2) Drafting, this stage focuses on the fluency of writing and is not preoccupied with grammatical accuracy of the draft, and (3) Revising, this stage encourages the students to revise through collaborative writing<sup>10</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Penny Ur, "A Course in Language Teaching: Practice of Theory," 1991, <http://www.banarvan.com/DynamicContent/UsersDirectory/admin/MyFiles/Teaching Syllabus/penny ur old version.pdf>.

<sup>9</sup> W. A. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice.* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

<sup>10</sup> Richards, J. C., & Renandya.

It is strengthened by Harmer on his book. He states that the stages on writing are planning, drafting, revising, and final drafting<sup>11</sup>. Writing process as a classroom activity that incorporates those four basic stages is seen as a recursive process. It has cycle which integrates among stages. It can be seen as a process wheel in which it clearly shows the directions that the writers may take during their process in writing. See in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The wheel process of writing taken from Harmer<sup>12</sup>.

In Figure 1, Harmer compares writing to a “wheel.” Writers move not only around the circumference of the wheel but also across the spoke, which means writers revisit a certain stage as well as move from a planning stage to final draft stage. In the classroom, planning presupposes that students obtain new writing ideas through brainstorming, group work or note-taking in order to avoid the well-known writer’s block. Drafting entails choosing and sequencing the optimal ideas to be included in the piece of writing. Then, editing means putting everything together in a coherent and cogent manner whereas revising asks the learners to check their written work one more time for the sake of crossing out any possible inadvertences. Although paying attention to writing as a process is a time-consuming activity, it is quite helpful when teachers require students to decide together on the stages of composition even before engaging in planning writing. Mention has to be made of the fact that, in reality, the stages of writing are never linear.

In addition, Oshima and Hogue state that writing is a progressive activity. It means that when students write something

<sup>11</sup> Jeremy Harmer, “The Practice of English Language Teaching.”

<sup>12</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

down, they have already been thinking about what they are going to say and how they are going to say it. Then after they have finished writing, they read over what they have written and make changes and corrections<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, writing is never a one-step-action; it is a process that has several steps. According to Blanchard and Root, there are at least three steps involved in a writing process. Step one: Prewriting (Thinking about your topic and organizing your ideas). Step two: Writing (Using your ideas to write a first draft). Step Three: Revising (Improving what you have written)<sup>14</sup>.

In writing, students will rely on at least four types of knowledge: knowledge of the content, procedural knowledge to organize the content, knowledge of conventions of writing, and procedural knowledge required to apply the three other types of knowledge in composing a written product. Tribble states that in order to understand a specific task in writing, a writer requires the range of knowledge which can be summarizing as follows: (1) content knowledge: knowledge of the concepts involved in the subject area; (2) context knowledge: knowledge of the context in which the text will be read; (3) language system knowledge: knowledge of those aspects of the language system necessary for the completion of the task; and (4) writing process knowledge: knowledge of the most appropriate way of preparing for a specific writing task<sup>15</sup>.

Therefore, in order to be able to produce a good written text, a writer should require the range of knowledge. Besides, the writer also focuses on the macro and micro skills of writing. In addition, Nunan states successful writing involves: (1) mastering the mechanics of letter formation; (2) mastering and obeying conventions of spelling punctuations; (3) organizing content at the level of the paragraph and the complete text to reflect given/new information and topic/comment structures; (4) polishing and revising one's initial efforts; and (5) selecting an appropriate style for one's audience<sup>16</sup>.

Based on the definition above, the researcher concludes that writing is a process in which the writer is required to apply their knowledge in composing a written product such as content, format,

---

<sup>13</sup> US Economic Development Association, *Build a Neighborhood Profile: StatsAmerica*, n.d., <http://www.statsamerica.org/neighborhood/builder.aspx>.

<sup>14</sup> Karen Blanchard and Christine Root, *Karen Blanchard Christine Root* {7, n.d.

<sup>15</sup> C Tribble, *Writing* (Oxford: Oxford University Press., 1996).

<sup>16</sup> Tribble.

sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling. There are some steps in writing that can be done recursively, i.e. planning, drafting, editing, and writing the final product.

### **Micro and Macro Skills of Writing**

In order to be able to perform the writing process, learners need to acquire the micro-skills and macro-skills of writing. Ur states that writing should maintain micro aspect and macro aspect<sup>17</sup>. In micro aspect, the students practice specific written forms at the level of word or sentence (handwriting or typing, spelling, punctuation). On the other hand, in macro aspect, the students emphasize on content and organization. In this case, they express themselves using their own words, state a purpose for writing, and specify an audience. More detail description is given by Brown. He states that “micro-skills are related to imitative and intensive types of writing task whereas macro-skills are related to responsive and extensive writing” <sup>18</sup>. The descriptions are as follows.

#### **Micro-skills and Macro-skills**

The micro skills are described as follows; (1) produce graphemes and orthographic patterns of English; (2) produce writing at efficient rate of speed to suit the purpose; (3) produce an acceptable core of words and use appropriate word order patterns; (4) use acceptable grammatical systems (e.g. tense, agreement, pluralization), patterns and rules; (5) express a particular meaning in different grammatical forms; and (6) use cohesive devices in written discourse.

The macro skills are described as follows; (1) use the rhetorical forms and conventions of written discourse; (2) appropriately accomplish the communicative functions of written texts according to form and purpose; (3) convey links and connections between events, and communicate such relations as main idea, supporting idea, new information, given information, generalization, and exemplification; (4) distinguish between literal and implied meaning when writing; (5) correctly convey culturally specific references in the context of the written text; and (6) develop and use a battery of writing strategies,

---

<sup>17</sup> Ur, “A Course in Language Teaching: Practice of Theory.”

<sup>18</sup> Global Economy, “From Manufacturing Excellence to Innovation Powerhouse,” 2005, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.

such as accurately assessing in the first draft, using paraphrase and synonyms, soliciting peer and instructor feedback, and using feedback for revising and editing.

### **Aspects of Writing**

Writing is one of the most difficult skills in learning English. There are many things that must be concerned. First, students must concern to the choice of words. Second, students must be able to recognize the ideas. The students have to arrange the ideas, thought and feelings in good order. If the ideas are not arranged clearly, the reader will get confused in understanding the writing. Third, the students must be able to produce grammatical sentences with clear ideas and concepts. The last, the students must pay attention to the punctuations and rhetorical structure of the text. Those are the important aspects of writing that should be considered by the students in order to be able to write well.

### **Writing as a Process and Product**

There are several ways to approach writing in the classroom. It should be said at the beginning that there is not necessarily any right or best way to teach writing skills. Process approaches to writing tend to focus more on the varied classroom activities which promote the development of language use: brainstorming, group discussion, re-writing. Such an approach can have any number of stages, though a typical sequence of activities could proceed as follows: (1) generating ideas by brainstorming and discussion; (2) students extend ideas into note form, and judge quality and usefulness of ideas; (3) students organize ideas into a mind map; (4) Students write the first draft. This is done in class and frequently in pairs or groups; (5) drafts are exchanged, so that students become the readers of their work; (6) drafts are returned and improvements are made based upon the correction; and (7) a final draft is written.

In teaching writing, the writing approaches separately result in unbalanced students' writing performance. Therefore, by integrating these approaches to writing, learners can transfer the skills they have gained from each approach from one mode to another and have a much better writing performance. Accordingly, writing teachers can start teaching learners the rhetorical patterns in the product-based approach and familiarize them with different text organizations

through working on models, and combine it with feedback parts and interaction in the process-based approach.

## Teaching Writing in Junior High Schools

English is one of the compulsory subjects to be taught in junior high school. The practice of teaching English as a foreign language in junior high school of Indonesia is based on the curriculum 2006 is also known as the “*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan* (KTSP) or School-Based Curriculum (SBC)”. The KTSP is designed in order that every school can develop the teaching and learning process according to the student’s character and the situation of the school. As a result, teachers can develop their methods and techniques in the teaching and learning process and increase the students’ competencies too. The successful of the implementation of KTSP may rely on some factors. These factors include a complete readiness of the teacher’s language proficiency, the teacher’s language teaching, and the teacher’s ability to media or tools in the teaching and learning process. If those factors are fulfilled, the main goal of the implementation of KTSP which is to develop students’ competencies will be achieved.

The word “curriculum” is defined in various ways by experts but they have the common meaning. Brown defines curriculum as a series of activities that contribute to the growth of consensus among the staff, faculty, administration, and students<sup>19</sup>. This series of curriculum activities will provide a framework that helps teachers to accomplish whatever combination of teaching activities is most suitable in their professional judgment for a given situation, that is, a framework that helps the students to learn as efficiently and effectively as possible in the given situation. While, Feez and Joyze states that a curriculum is a general statement of the goals and the outcomes, the learning arrangement, the evaluation, and the documentation related to the management of the program within educational institution<sup>20</sup>. Based on the definitions of the curriculum above, it can be stated that curriculum is the guidance for the teacher in determining his ways or strategies in doing the teaching and learning process and it is also the guidance for the students in achieving what they expect in their learning process.

---

<sup>19</sup> JD Brown, “The Elements of Language Curriculum,” 1995.

<sup>20</sup> H. Feez, S. & Joyze, *Text-Based Syllabus Design* (Sydney: NCELTR., 1998).

English Language Teaching in junior high school is aimed at enabling students to reach functional level in a sense that they can communicate in spoken and written way to solve daily problems. Based on the KTSP, the purposes of English language teaching in junior high school are: 1) developing communicative competence in spoken and written language to reach functional literacy; 2) generating awareness about the nature and importance of English to improve nation's competitiveness in global society; and 3) developing students' understanding about the relationship between language and culture.

## **Descriptive Text**

### **The Definition of Descriptive Text**

Description is writing about characteristic features of a particular thing. According to Oshima and Hogue, descriptive writing appeals to the senses, so it tells how something looks, feels, smells, tastes, and or sounds. In addition, a good description is like a “word picture”; the reader can imagine the object, place, or person in his or her mind. A writer of a good description is like an artist who paints a picture that can be “seen” clearly in the mind of the reader<sup>21</sup>.

The generic structures of a descriptive text are as follows: (1) identification: an introduction to the subject of the description; and (2) description of features: describe the characteristic features of the subject. While the language features of a descriptive text are follows: (1) use of particular nouns; (2) use of detailed noun groups to provide information about the subject; (3) use of a variety of types of adjectives; (4) use of relating verbs to provide information about the subject; (5) use of thinking and feeling verbs to express the writer's personal view about the subject or to give an insight into the subject's thoughts and feelings; (6) use of action verbs to describe the subject's behavior; (7) use of adverbials to provide more information about this behavior; and (8) use of similes, metaphors and other types of figurative language, particularly in literary descriptions.

## **Kinds of Descriptive Text**

### **Description of People**

People are different, and writing description of people is different. They are probably already aware of some of the complications because they have often been asked, “What's so-and-

---

<sup>21</sup> US Economic Development Association, *Build a Neighborhood Profile: StatsAmerica*.

like?" In replying, they might resort to identification, an impression, or a character sketch, depending on the situation.

First is identification. Although people might provide identification, they would probably want to go further than that. Used mainly in official records and documents, identification consists only of certain statistical information (height, weight, age), visible characteristics (color of hair, skin, and eyes), and recognizable marks (scars, birthmark).

Second is impression. Unlike the identification, the impression may not identify a person, but it does convey an overall idea of him or her. Many details may be missing, yet the writer does provide in a few broad strokes a general feeling about the subject. Although impression is usually less complete and informative than identification, it may be more effective in capturing an individual's striking or distinctive traits.

Third is Character Sketch. More complete descriptions of people are usually called character sketch; they may also be referred to as profiles, literary portraits, and biographical sketches. As its name indicates, a character sketch delineates the character of a person, or at least his or her main personality traits. In the process, it may include identification and an impression, but it does more than tell what people look or seem like: it will show what they *are* like. A character sketch may be about a type rather than an individual, revealing the characteristics common to the members of a group, such as campus jocks, cheerleaders, art students, religious fanatics, and television devotees.

## Description of Places

In describing a place for example a room, what should people describe first?, the walls?, the floor?, Unlike a chronologically developed text, there is no set pattern for arranging sentences in descriptive text. It is not necessary to begin with one area and then proceeds to another one. Nevertheless, the sentences should not be randomly arranged.

The description must be organized so that the reader can imagine the scene being described. To make the paragraph more interesting, they can add a controlling idea that states an attitude or impression about the place being described. The arrangement of the details in the description is depends on the subject and purpose.

## Description of Things

To write a description about something, the writer must have a good imagination about the thing that will be described. Besides, to make the subjects as interesting and as vivid to our readers, he should use proper nouns and effective verbs.

First is using proper noun. To fill the descriptive writing with concrete details and figures of speech, the writer might also include a number of proper nouns of particular persons, places, and things. For examples: Arizona and University of Tennessee.

Second is using effective verb. It is known that using effective verbs are important to narration, but effective verbs can also add much to a piece of description. Writers use verbs to make descriptions more specific, accurate, and interesting. For instance, “the wind had chiseled deep grooves into the sides of the cliffs” is more specific than “the wind had made deep grooves.” The verb chiseled also gives the reader a more accurate picture of the wind’s action than made does.

## Mind Mapping Strategy

Buzan states that “Mind Mapping is a creative thinking instrument which reflects natural work brain. Mind map enables the brain to use all pictures and its association in radial design”<sup>22</sup>. From this opinion, it can be described that when students use mind mapping by making a keyword or main topic, they can produce other ideas related to the topic. Moreover, they can free their mind to generate everything in their brain so that lots of ideas can automatically more and more improve. Therefore, it would make them easier in constructing a text from those related ideas.

In writing descriptive text, the students have to describe and analyze something specifically. From this case, it can be concluded that mind mapping and descriptive text have seemed similar characters. Mind mapping method can help students to write descriptive text easily. They can put the central idea/main idea in the center and explain the ideas into sub ideas.

---

<sup>22</sup> T Buzan, *Smart Book Mind Map*. (Jakarta: Gramedia, 2007).

## Grouping Students

### Individual Work

Individual work is that the students do their own duties according to his ability. The students can edit the tasks for them in the appropriate speed and learning style. The tasks can be assessed individually and the level of details can be adjusted. The students can prepare their personal ideas, views or argument doing the work.

There is not much to write about working individually. One reason for asking students to work individually on a task is so that they can prepare their personal ideas, views or arguments in response to a problem or a piece of stimulus material. The students can work in their own pace not depending on someone else. They can decide what to do and concentrate easier and work faster. If they work on a familiar task, they can get it done quicker since there are no outside interactions.

### Pair Work

The requirement for pair work is that it must have more than one people or at least contains two members who interact with friends because students can practice language together. McDonough and Shaw say that pair work requires rather little organization on part of the teacher and at the least in participle, it can be activated in most classrooms by simply having learner work with the person sitting next to them<sup>23</sup>.

In addition, Harmer states “Pair Work allows students to use language (depending of course on the task set by the teacher) and also encourages student co-operation which is self-important for the atmosphere of the class and for the motivation it gives to learning with other”<sup>24</sup>.

In the same book Harmer also defines pair work as a way to increase students’ participation and language use. It can be used for enormous number of activities whether speaking, writing or reading. Pair work consists of two members. They can communicate each other with teacher controls<sup>25</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> C. McDonough, J. & Shaw, *Materials and Methods in ELT*. (Blackwell: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>24</sup> Jeremy Harmer, “The Practice of English Language Teaching.”

<sup>25</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

## **Group Work**

Group work is that consisted of more than two members. Students grouping around four to six members are common in any classroom teaching. It is also known as a small or cluster grouping. Harmer stated that “in group work, the students can write a group story or role –play a situation which involves five people. They can discuss an issue and come to a group decision”<sup>26</sup>. They can share their knowledge, ideas, arguments in one topic (depend on the task set by teacher) and respect others’ ideas.

Harmer states that small groups around five students provoke greater involvement and participation than larger group. They are small enough for real interpersonal interaction, yet not so small those members are over-reliant upon each individual. Because five is an odd number it means that a majority view can usually prevail. However, they are occasions when larger groups are necessary<sup>27</sup>.

## **Relevant Previous Studies**

Some researcher has studied about the effect of different work. Khan studied about “classroom interaction in ESL classrooms: A comparative study between group work and individual work”<sup>28</sup>. The result showed that both in reading and writing test, the learner in group did better than the individual. In group activity, there was collaboration among the learners. Learner could pick up the reading and writing skill through discussion and sharing, thus the performance in group was better than the performance of individual activity.

Other study was Hosseini, Bakhtiarvand, and Tabatabaei. They investigated the effect of individual, pair, and teamwork on the speaking fluency of Iranian elementary EFL learners<sup>29</sup>. From the result of pre-test and post-test, the result showed that the three groups performed significantly different on the post-test. Pair Work Group and Team Work Group outperformed Individual Work

---

<sup>26</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

<sup>27</sup> Jeremy Harmer.

<sup>28</sup> Khan, “Classroom Interaction in ESL Classrooms: A Comparative Study between Group Work and Individual Work.”

<sup>29</sup> Seyed Hossein Hosseini, Morteza Bakhtiarvand, and Soudabeh Tabatabaei, “A Comparative Study on the Effect of Individual, Pair and Team Work on Speaking Fluency Of Iranian Elementary EFL Learners.”

Group, indicating that the techniques of working in pairs and teams promote the speaking fluency of Iranian EFL learners.

A recent similar study to the current one was carried out by Al Tai. He investigated the effect of collaboration on Omani students' writing: a comparison between individual, pair and group work<sup>30</sup>. The result showed that collaborative writing positively affects accuracy, fluency and lexical resource of the text.

The importance of this particular study came from the fact that most previous studies compared individual, pair, and group work, while this study compared individual, pair, triad, and group work. Moreover, this research only focused on writing descriptive text. The similarity of this study to the previous studies was in analyzing the effect of grouping students on students' achievement.

## Research Method

### Research Design

In this research, the researcher applied quasi experimental research design. Since it was impossible to random the students, the researcher used quasi experimental research<sup>31</sup>. It was used to find out whether there is any difference in the mean score between students work in pair and work in group. The purpose of this research was to determine the effect of independent variable to dependent variable. Different model of work was as independent variable and students' achievement was as dependent variable (See Table 1.). The researcher got three from nine classes of equivalent level from the headmaster of SMPN 3 Lamongan. Those are class VIII-A, VIII-B, and VIII-C, (e.g. the other two classes were VIII-D to VIII-I).

**Table 1: Research Variables**

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable
Individual Work	
Pair Work	Students' Achievement in Writing Descriptive Text
Group Work	

<sup>30</sup> Tai, "The Effect of Collaboration on Omani Students ' Writing : A Comparison Between Individual , Pair and Group Work."

<sup>31</sup> A Latief, *Research Methods on Language Learning an Introduction* (Malang: UM Press, 2015).

Those three classes were divided into three groups. The first group was individual work, the second group was pair work, and the last group was group work. The researcher decided one of the classes into control group and the others into experimental groups (e.g. class VIII-A as the control group and class VIII-B, and VIII-C as the experimental group). The research design was presented in the following table (See Table 2.)

**Table 2: Quasi Experimental Design**

Group	Pretest	Treatment								Posttest
Individual Work (VIII-A)	y1	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	y2
Pair Work (VIII-B)	y1	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	y2
Group Work (VIII-C)	y1	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	y2

**Where;**

- (y1) : Pretest was used to discover students' writing ability before the treatments
- (y2) : Posttest was used to discover students' writing ability after the treatments
- X1 - X8 : The treatments (eight times) used concept mapping in writing descriptive text.

From table 2, it could be seen that the researcher used pretest and posttest. Pretest was intended to know the early knowledge of students writing ability in descriptive text. Afterward, all the groups were given treatment. The treatment was as long as eight times to get the maximum result. After having the treatment, all the groups were given posttest. It was conducted to assess the result of the treatment of all the groups.

### **Teaching Procedures**

Before conducting the treatment, the researcher prepared teaching material related to descriptive text that was needed during the treatment. The researcher elaborated the topics that were suitable for writing descriptive text.

In the first meeting, the researcher gave students prior knowledge about descriptive text. The second meeting, the researcher asked students to write descriptive text based on the generic structures of descriptive text (e.g. identification and description). The

third meeting, the researcher gave mind mapping strategies to write descriptive text. The fourth meeting, the researcher discussed and evaluated the used of mind mapping strategies in writing descriptive text. The fifth meeting, the researcher gave materials about simple present tense in writing descriptive text. The sixth meeting, the researcher discussed and evaluated the used of simple present tense in writing descriptive text. The seventh meeting, the researcher asked students to describe about Borobudur Temple. And the last meeting, the researcher discussed and evaluated students' text about describing Borobudur Temple

### **Subject of Research**

The subject consisted of three classes which are of equivalent level (e.g. 2<sup>nd</sup> year students of SMPN 3 Lamongan academic year 2017/2018). They were class VIII-A, VIII-B, and VIII-C. The researcher set VIII-A as individual work, VIII-B as pair work, and VIII-D as group work/team work. The researcher decided one of the classes into control group and the others into experimental groups (e.g. class VIII-A as the control group and class VIII-B, and VIII-C as the experimental group). Each class was consisted of 30 students, so the total number of students in this research was 90 students.

### **Research Instrument**

The researcher used test as the instrument of this study. The test was taken twice namely pretest and posttest. Pretest was used to know the early knowledge of students' writing ability in descriptive text, while posttest was used to measure students' writing ability after getting the treatment.<sup>32</sup> The writing test that should be done by the students was writing descriptive text. The descriptive text was a text to describe something, such as persons, places, or things. But then in this research, the researcher focused on describing place. The students were asked to describe about the familiar places in Lamongan. Here, the researcher chose Waduk Gondang and Wego as the object that must be described by the students. Waduk Gondang and Wego were two of Lamongan's tour objects which are located at Sugio regency. The test was administered with limited time. The students had to finish their writing test in 60 minutes.

---

<sup>32</sup> A Latief, *Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa* (Malang: UM Press, 2010).

The researcher gave the students a work sheet which required the students to perform writing activities. The researcher also used scoring rubric to score the student's writing descriptive text. The students got score 100 if they made a good writing. It contained the score of content (30%), the score of organization (30%), and the score of language use (40%).

### **Construct Validity Evidence**

The researcher used two steps to provide construct validity evidence of writing skill. The first step, the researcher defined the construct of the knowledge or skills to be assessed. The construct defined was about writing test. The second step, the researcher made a good prompt which required the students to perform writing activities<sup>33</sup>. Here, the researcher wrote instruction on the students' work sheet. The instruction must be as clear as possible to ensure that the students know well what they have to perform.

The instructions were as follows: (1) write your descriptive text about the place (give complete information about the object); (2) The paragraph should consist of 5-7 sentences; (3) Your paragraph should consist of generic structure of descriptive text (e.g. identification, description & conclusion); (4) The sentences should be constructed in correct grammar, punctuation; (5) You may use your dictionary; and (6) You just have 60 minutes to finish your writing.

### **Content Validity Evidence**

To assess students writing skill, the researcher set the specific aspects to be assessed. The aspects should cover all the basic of writing skill<sup>34</sup>. The aspects to be assessed in writing skill were the content, organization, and language use. Therefore, the researcher used the scoring rubric to ensure the content validity of the task (see Table 3.).

**Table 3: Scoring Rubric for Descriptive Text Writing**

---

<sup>33</sup> Latief, *Research Methods on Language Learning an Introduction*.

<sup>34</sup> Latief, *Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa*.

Aspect	Score	Performance Description	Weighting
<b>Content (C)</b>  - object information  <b>30%</b>	4	Very complete information describing the object (description of location, facilities, weather/temperature, and scenery); the object described is easy to visualize.	<b>3x</b>
	3	Adequate information describing the object; the object described is not easy to visualize	
	2	Limited information describing the object; the object described is difficult to visualize.	
	1	Minimal information describing the subject.	
		Well organization; main points and details are connected; the sentences are logically and effectively ordered; appropriate use of connectors.	
<b>Organization (O)</b>  - Sentence structure  <b>30%</b>	4	Fairly well organization; main points do stand out but sequencing of ideas is not complete; the sentences are logically and effectively ordered for the most part; missing some connectors.	<b>3x</b>
	3	Loosely organization; main points and details are disconnected; sentences are lacks logical ordered.	
	2	Format is not acceptable; not enough information to evaluate	
	1		
		Few errors in linguistic features; vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.	
<b>Language Use (L)</b>	4	Several errors in linguistic features; vocabulary, grammar,	<b>4x</b>
	3		

<b>40%</b> <hr/>	<b>- Vocabulary, Grammar, mechanics</b> <hr/>	<b>2</b> <hr/>	<b>1</b> <hr/>	and mechanics. Frequent errors in linguistic features; vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. Dominated by errors in linguistic features; vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.
---------------------	--	-------------------	-------------------	--

The formula to calculate the students writing descriptive text score from the scoring rubric can be seen below.

$$\text{Score} = \frac{3C + 3O + 4L}{40} \times 100$$

### Try Out of the Instrument

The researcher conducted try out before conducting pretest and treatment. The purpose of conducting try out was to test whether or not the instrument is acceptable by the students. It was used to measure the validity and reliability of the instrument<sup>35</sup>. The try out was given to the existing classes which are of equivalent level (e.g. class VIII-D and VIII-E). The result of try out was analyzed to estimate the validity and reliability.

### Inter-Rater Reliability

The researcher used inter-rater reliability to measure the reliability of the test<sup>36</sup>. The researcher used two raters to avoid the subjectivity. The raters were two English teachers of SMPN 3 Lamongan. Both raters have same criteria to score the students writing descriptive text by using the scoring rubric. The scoring rubric for assessing writing descriptive text was presented in content validity evidence.

The researcher gave the example to the raters to score students' writing descriptive text. There were three components that had to be scored by the raters. They were the score of content (30%), the score of organization (30%), and the score of language use (40%). If the students wrote very complete information describing the object, they got score 30 from the content. If the students' writing was well

<sup>35</sup> Latief, *Research Methods on Language Learning an Introduction*.

<sup>36</sup> Latief.

organized, they got score 30 from the organization. And if the students used correct vocabulary, grammatical, and mechanics, they got score 40 from language use. Thus, the total score that students got was 100.

The test was conducted to class VIII-D and class VIII-E. The result showed that the maximum of the difference score between two raters was eight. Since the difference scores between two raters did not exceed the tolerance limit, thus the writing score has high reliability.

## Data Collection

### Pretest

Pretest was conducted in the first meeting. It was intended to know the early knowledge of students' writing ability in descriptive text<sup>37</sup>. Pretest was given to all subjects (e.g. class VIII-A, VIII-B, and VIII-C). Pretest was administered on the same day. The pretest was conducted on November 12, 2018. The result of pretest showed that the mean score of class VIII-A was 66.60, the mean score of class VIII-B was 66.73, and the mean score of class VIII-C was 66.43. The scores of each group were tested by using one way ANOVA. It was conducted to know the mean score of pretest was significantly different or not. The result can be seen in Table 4.

Moreover, the result of pretest affected the researcher to determine the way to analyze the data of posttest. If the result of pretest was not significantly different, then the researcher used one way ANOVA to analyze the data of posttest. Conversely, if the result of pretest was significantly different, then the researcher used Kruskall Wallis (non-parametric test) to analyze the data of posttest.

**Table 4: One Way ANOVA Test**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.692	3	3.897	.028	.994
Within Groups	16170.300	116	139.399		
Total	16181.992	119			

Table 4. Showed that the mean score of each group was not significantly different. It could be seen from P value obtained was

<sup>37</sup> Latief.

0.994. It was higher than the level of significance 0.05. After knowing the balance of the data, the researcher used normality test. It was conducted to know whether the data was normally distributed or not.

## **Treatment**

### **Treatment of the Experiment and Control Groups**

The treatment was as long as eight meetings. The subjects were divided into four models of group: Individual Work (IW), Pair Work (PW), and Group Work (GW). The time allocation of each meeting was 2x40 minutes for each group. They were taught by the same teacher, the same concept, and the same materials. Where, the difference was in the procedure they did the tasks.

The instructions were given in the class. The participants of IW were asked to do the tasks individually not in pair or in team. They only interacted with the instructor or the teacher as much as they need recourse during the course. The participants of PW were divided into pairs. They worked in pairs. They could share a feeling, exchange the ideas, and share the arguments with their partner. The last participants of GW are divided into group of four persons.

The participants could interact more than pair work. They could exchange their ideas, and mix their ability with three other students. In GW, there were 6 interactions happen. Consequently, passive student, shy student, or below average student could catch up with others. They held discussion of the task in group and each group members was responsible for the task.

## **Posttest**

After doing the treatment, the last step of the data collection was administering posttest. The time allocation was same as the time allocation in pretest. The researcher set 60 minutes for every group to write the descriptive text. In posttest, the students were asked to describe Waduk Gondang. The posttest was given in the final meeting. The purpose of this test was to get the final score of students' writing descriptive text.

## **Data Analysis**

The next step, the researcher analyzed the data statistically using IBM SPSS statistics 20 for windows program with the following steps: First, the researcher calculated the descriptive statistics of posttest scores of each group. Then, the researcher used a one way ANOVA.

It was administered to see the significant difference among four groups. The last steps, the researcher used Post Hoc Test to illustrate the difference mean scores of each group. The last was making conclusion.

### **Hypothesis Testing**

To test the hypothesis testing, the researcher used a significance level of 0.05 (5%) to test the null hypothesis.  $H_0$  is accepted if P-Value (value of probability or Sig.) of univariate test is higher than 0.05 ( $>0.05$ ). Conversely,  $H_0$  is rejected if P-Value (value of probability or Sig.) of univariate test is lower than 0.05 ( $< 0.05$ ).

### **Research Findings**

#### **The Description of Posttest Score**

In this part, the researcher presented the result of the students' writing descriptive text score in posttest. The test was nearly similar with pretest both in allocation of time and content. The researcher also used scoring rubric to score students posttest. The descriptive statistics of posttest was presented in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: The Description of Posttest Score**

Methods	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum
individual	30	81.63	8.938	1.632	65	93
pair	30	82.17	7.106	1.297	65	93
Grop	30	87.40	5.028	.918	75	93
Total	90	83.73	7.587	.800	65	93

Table 5. Showed the students' score after getting the treatment. There was similarity in the maximum score of each group. But, there was difference in the minimum score between the groups. The minimum score of individual work and pair work was 65. While, the minimum score of group work was 75. On the other side, the mean score of each group was different. The mean score of individual work was 81.63, pair work was 82.17, and group work was 87.40. The mean difference was analyzed by using one way ANOVA.

### **One-Way ANOVA Analysis**

The researcher used One-Way ANOVA to know the significant difference of each group. The researcher took the output of

homogeneity of variances and the output of ANOVA. The result could be seen in Table 6. and Table 7. below.

**Table 6: Test of Homogeneity of Variance  
Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
3.422	2	87	.037

Table 6. Showed that there was significant difference of the variance. It could be seen from P-value was 0.037. The variance of the population was significantly different if P-value  $0.037 < 0.05$ . After knowing that the variance was significantly different, the researcher used the output of ANOVA. It was conducted to determine any difference in the mean score among the groups.

**Table 7: Analysis of Variance ANOVA  
ANOVA**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	609.267	2	304.633	5.871	.004
Within Groups	4514.333	87	51.889		
Total	5123.600	89			

Table 7. Showed that P- value was 0.004. It was lower than the level of significance 0.05. Thus, it was enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. The researcher could claim that there was significant difference in the mean score among the groups.

### Post Hoc Test Analysis

Post Hoc Test was used to reveal the mean difference of each group. The result could be seen in Table 8 below.

**Table 8: Post Hoc Test (Turkey HSD)  
Multiple Comparisons**

(I) methods	(J) methods	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
individual	Pair	-.533	1.860	.956	-4.97	3.90
	Grop	-5.767*	1.860	.007	-10.20	-1.33
	Individual	.533	1.860	.956	-3.90	4.97

	Grop	-5.233*	1.860	.017	-9.67	.80
Grop	Individual	5.767*	1.860	.007	1.33	10.20
	Pair	5.233*	1.860	.017	.80	9.67

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 8. Showed that the mean difference between individual work and pair work was not significant. It could be seen from the mean difference was (-.533), and P- value was 0.956. It was higher than the level of significance 0.05. It means that there was no significant difference in the mean score between individual work and pair work.

On the other hand, the mean difference between individual work and group work was significantly difference. It could be seen from the mean difference was (-5.767), and P- value was 0.007. It was lower than the level of significance 0.05. Therefore, it could be concluded that there was significant difference in the mean score between individual work and group work. Consequently, it could be concluded that individual work and pair work could be categorized similar or equal because the mean difference was not significant.

The second comparison showed the mean difference between pair work and group work was significantly difference. It could be seen from the mean difference was (-5.233), and P- value was 0.017. It was lower than the level of significance 0.05. Thus, it could be concluded that group work was the best method in giving a task of writing descriptive text. It strengthened the research finding conducted by Sajedi on his experiment research entitle “collaborative summary writing and EFL students’ L2 Development”<sup>38</sup>. The result showed that the students assigned to group have writing improvement. The writing ability improved significantly in term of content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics.

It also strengthened the previous findings conducted by Khan on her research entitle “classroom interaction in ESL classrooms: A comparative study between group work and individual work”<sup>39</sup>. The result showed that both in reading and writing test, the learner in

<sup>38</sup> Seyyede Paria Sajedi, “Collaborative Summary Writing and EFL Students’ L2 Development,” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98 (2014): 1650–57, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.589>.

<sup>39</sup> Khan, “Classroom Interaction in ESL Classrooms: A Comparative Study between Group Work and Individual Work.”

group did better than the individual. In group activity, learner could pick up the reading and writing skill through discussion and sharing, thus the performance in group was better than the performance of individual activity. It also strengthened the research finding conducted by Dobao on his research entitle “A comparison between individual, pair, and group work”. The result showed that group work resulted in more accurate text than pair and individual work.

The result of this research also strengthened the theory proposed by harmer. He states that “in group work, the students can write a group story or role –play a situation which involves five people. They can discuss an issue and come to a group decision”<sup>40</sup>. In group, the students can share their knowledge, ideas, arguments in one topic (depend on the task set by teacher) and respect others’ ideas.

In sum, the result of this study strengthened the previous findings which concluded that students work in group did better than students work individual or in pair. Conversely, the result of this study was also hesitated the previous finding which concluded that students work in pair did better than students work individually. It was because the results of this study showed that the students work individually and in pair were not significantly different. But then, it could not be compared because other factors could also affect the result of the research such as the difference of subjects, materials test, and level of students.

## Conclusion

After all data were analyzed and discussed on previous discussion, the researcher concluded that there was significant difference in the mean score of writing descriptive text among students working individual, pair and group work. From the data obtained, it showed that group work was the best method in giving a task of writing descriptive text.

---

<sup>40</sup> Jeremy Harmer, “The Practice of English Language Teaching.”

## Bibliography

Blanchard, Karen, and Christine Root. *Karen Blanchard Christine Root* {7, n.d.

Brown, JD. “The Elements of Language Curriculum,” 1995.

Buzan, T. *Smart Book Mind Map*. Jakarta: Gramedia, 2007.

Economy, Global. “From Manufacturing Excellence to Innovation Powerhouse,” 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.

Feez, S. & Joyze, H. *Text-Based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: NCELTR., 1998.

Jeremy Harmer. “The Practice of English Language Teaching.” *ELT Journal*, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.4.401>.

Khan, Rabeya Nasrin. “Classroom Interaction in ESL Classrooms: A Comparative Study between Group Work and Individual Work,” no. April (2009).

Latief, A. *Research Methods on Language Learning an Introduction*. Malang: UM Press, 2015.

———. *Tanya Jawab Metode Penelitian Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Malang: UM Press, 2010.

McDonough, J. & Shaw, C. *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Blackwell: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. *Methodology in Language Teaching. An Anthology of Current Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Sajedi, Seyyede Paria. “Collaborative Summary Writing and EFL Students’ L2 Development.” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98 (2014): 1650–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.589>.

Sert, Olcay. ““A Comparative Analysis of Pair-Work and Individual Assignments.” *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2005): 236–53.

Seyed Hossein Hosseini, Morteza Bakhtiarvand, and Soudabeh Tabatabaei. “A Comparative Study on the Effect of Individual,

Pair and Team Work on Speaking Fluency Of Iranian Elementary EFL Learners.” *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences* 4, no. 8 (2013): 17. <http://www.irjabs.com>.

Tai, Yasmeen Al. “The Effect of Collaboration on Omani Students’ Writing: A Comparison Between Individual , Pair and Group Work” 1, no. May (2015): 154–71.

Tribble, C. *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press., 1996.

Ur, Penny. “A Course in Language Teaching: Practice of Theory,” 1991.

<http://www.banarvan.com/DynamicContent/UsersDirectory/admin/MyFiles/Teaching Syllabus/penny ur old version.pdf>.

US Economic Development Association. *Build a Neighborhood Profile: StatsAmerica*, n.d.

<http://www.statsamerica.org/neighborhood/builder.aspx>.