Students' Cognitive, Affective, Behavioural and Social Engagement in Collaborative Writing

Keterlibatan Kognitif, Afektif, Sikap, dan Sosial Siswa dalam Menulis Kolaborasi

Ainul Addinna[1,*] **Ririn Ovilia**[2] **Carbiriena Solusia**[3] **Syafitri Ramadhani**[4]
Universitas Negeri Padang [1,3,4], Monash University[2]
*Corresponding author. Email: ainul.addinna@fbs.unp.ac.id
doi: 10.24036/jbs.v12i3.129994

Abstract

One of the effective strategies to improve writing skills is Collaborative Writing (CW). In the CW process, group members will engage and interact in the process of writing a text. Hence, student engagement becomes an important point that needs to be studied. Based on the EWT (Engagement with the Task) model from Philip and Duchesne, there are 4 dimensions of student engagement, namely cognitive, affective, attitudinal and social engagement. This research aims to analyze students' cognitive, affective, behavioral and social engagement in learning academic writing using collaborative writing method. Based on this objective, the appropriate research design is qualitative research using observation as a data collection technique and the instruments used are observation sheets and field notes supported by video recording during the learning process. From the results of the analysis conducted, it was found that during Collaborative Writing with peers the majority of participants in this study were involved cognitively, affectively and attitudinally. In terms of social engagement, the patterns of all pairs were collaborative and expert/novice relationship.

Key words: *Collaborative writing; Cognitive Engagement; Affective Engagement; Behavioral Engagement; Social Engagement.*

Abstrak

Salah satu strategi yang efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis adalah Collaborative Writing (CW). Dalam proses CW, anggota kelompok akan terlibat dan berinteraksi dalam proses penulisan sebuah teks. Oleh karena itu, keterlibatan siswa menjadi poin penting yang perlu diteliti. Berdasarkan model EWT (Engagement with the Task) dari Philip dan Duchesne, terdapat 4 dimensi keterlibatan mahasiswa, yaitu keterlibatan kognitif, afektif, sikap, dan sosial. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis keterlibatan kognitif, afektif, sikap, dan sosial mahasiswa dalam pembelajaran academic writing dengan menggunakan metode collaborative writing. Berdasarkan tujuan tersebut, desain penelitian yang sesuai adalah penelitian kualitatif dengan menggunakan observasi sebagai teknik pengumpulan data dan instrumen yang digunakan adalah lembar observasi dan catatan lapangan yang didukung dengan rekaman video selama proses pembelajaran. Dari hasil analisis yang dilakukan, ditemukan bahwa selama melakukan Collaborative Writing dengan teman sebaya, mayoritas partisipan dalam penelitian ini terlibat secara kognitif, afektif dan sikap. Dalam hal keterlibatan sosial, pola semua pasangan adalah kolaboratif dan hubungan ahli/pemula.

Kata kunci: *Menulis Kolaborasi; Keterlibatan kognitif; Keterlibatan afektif; Keterlibatan sikap; Keterlibatan sosial*

INTRODUCTION

For English Department students, academic writing ability is a great significance as it is required to complete their four-year study at University. Yet, writing for academic purposes is well-known for its challenging task in terms of cognitive, linguistic and even psychological aspects (Hyland, 2019; Syahril & Weda, 2018) which sometimes involves emotional state of students as well (Langum & Sullivan, 2017). Hence, the hardness experienced especially for EFL learners while writing can result in demotivating students and increasing their writing anxiety levels (Erkan & Saban, 2011). Therefore, in order to enhance students' academic writing ability, various attempts have been made by great numbers of writing researchers

such as integrating technology to ease the writing process, experimenting and implementing various writing strategies and reviewing writing from various aspects and fields.

Regarding the integration of technology, one of the recent attempt are mostly talked about is the use of artificial intelligence or any useful apps in writing. Grammarly, for instance, has been advertised massively as it helps students write well in which it provides some alternatives and correction on student's' writing. Additionally, it is proven effective while implemented in the class (O'Neill and Russell, 2019). It is unquestionably helpful for students in which they are able to obtain feedback in terms of linguistics and mechanics of writing. However, nor I against or support the use of Grammarly in writing an academic text, I personally believe that the students' ability to write a comprehensive and coherence writing needs to address first. Then, the technology will come in handy when the foundation of students' writing ability has been established.

Furthermore, a substantial numbers of writing strategies implemented by numerous scholars, collaborative writing is one that has been consistently and massively implemented in writing class for decades especially in Indonesia. This is mainly because it has been proven effectual in improving students' writing abilities and performance in both EFL and ESL contexts (Addinna, Hilmi, & Ovilia, 2020; Zhang, Ghibbon & Li, 2021; Hsu, 2023). Collaborative writing is conceptualized as a process of producing a piece of writing based on group work. During this process, all team members contribute to the content and facilitate each other to express different viewpoints, develop critical thinking skills, and present rational and defensible arguments that ultimately result in a piece of writing (Yarrow & Topping, 2001). In other words, during the collaboration the students are certainly interacting, and engaging in discussion in order to make decision, gather ideas, arrange them orderly and deliver them in an organized and coherent manner. Therefore, student engagement during collaborative writing plays important part to the success of collaborative writing practice.

According to Shernoff (2013), engagement is defined as "a complex construct, encompassing both observable and unobservable psychological events." He further states that for a decade in 1990s there had been a broad discussion that engagement entails behavior and emotion aspects as well. Student engagement is now considered as an important prerequisite for success in the learning process in which students devote their physical and psychological energy for getting the targeted outcome (Schunk & Mullen, 2012).

The studies on student engagement in various learning context have been addressed and received much attention in recent years. However, student engagement is not a simple notion to study. Frederick (2004) divides the engagement into three dimension- cognitive, behavioral, emotional aspects. According to Chen, Liu & Lin (2023), students engagement is demonstrated as multi-faceted constructs derived from two major models which are EWL (Engagement with Language) proposed by Svalberg (2009) and SWT (Engagement with Task) from Philip and Duchesne (2016). In line with Frederick (2004), the dimensions in EWL Model are cognitive, behavioral and emotion. Meanwhile, EWT involves cognitive, affective, behavioral and social constructs. These two models display the distinction even it also shares similarities. One the noticeable difference in which EWL emphasize on how cognitive, behavioral and social aspects affect the language learned. Meanwhile, EWT is more complex as the students' cognitive, affective behavioral and social constructs do not solely influence the language but also on the outcome of the given task (Chen, Liu & Li, 2023).

Based on the EWT model from Philip and Duchesne (2016) which is employed in this study, there are four dimensions of student engagement; cognitive, affective, behavioral and social engagement. Cognitive engagement (CE) refers to sustained attention, effort during learning process, metacognitive self-regulation strategies from planning to evaluating process and student motivation (Philip and Duchesne, 2016; Shernoff, 2013). Second, Affective Engagement (AE), also known as emotional engagement, refers to students' enthusiasm, interest, pleasure, and boredom in completing the task assigned (Philip and Duchesne, 2016; Shernoff, 2013). AE is related to students' emotions when they are engaged with the task and other students in doing the task. This aspect can be observed from the students' emotion. For example, they are well engaged when they show positive emotion such as enjoyment, and vice versa. The third dimension is Behavioral/attitudinal Engagement (BE) which is described

as being "on-task", the involvement and the efforts devoted to the task completion which is displayed through good or bad behavior during the learning process (Philip and Duchesne, 2016; Shernoff, 2013). Some scholars argue that this dimension overlaps with the other three dimensions in which students demonstrate their cognitive, social, and emotional engagement through behavioral indicators. However, others also believe that it still has differences. Finally, social engagement is associated with social relationships between learners, which is manifested by the degree of togetherness and reciprocity of team members (Philip and Duchesne, 2016).

To date, there has been research that examines student engagement in various learning contexts. Chen, Liu & Lin (2023) conducted a study aimed at analyzing the four dimensions of student engagement in providing peer feedback in a second language context. The cognitive engagement was viewed from discussion between the participants about language aspects and meaning. The observation results showed that participants were cognitively engaged in both forms. Furthermore, behavioral engagement was observed from three aspects; time spent on task, number of turns and word count. The findings showed that six out of eight pairs were behavioral engaged during the task. For affective and social engagements, the data were collected from an interview to eight willing participants. It was revealed that most participants' engagement is relatively extensive, while two expressed negative emotions and low mutuality.

Another study was conducted by Sulaiman and Thakur (2022) aiming to investigate the effectiveness of collaborative learning on students' Cognitive Engagement and students' task completion in Oman. Based on the results of experimental research found that collaborative research can increase cognitive engagement and task completion of students. Yet, this study only focuses on students' cognitive engagement. Furthermore, research that investigated the effectiveness of a tool called Social Learning Analytic (SLA) on students' social and cognitive engagement was conducted by Chen, Ouyang and Jiau (2022). In this study, researchers applied this tool in Online Collaborative Writing (OCW). The results showed that this SLA tool was able to improve students' social skills and cognitive engagement of students in collaborative writing, and they agreed that this tool was very useful during the OCW process. Regarding online collaborative writing, Iskandar and Pahlevi (2021) examined the students' emotional engagement while writing collaboratively via google document. The results showed that the students are enthusiastic during the process of writing.

Although this aspect (students' engagement) is considered a determinant factor of success, the number of studies examining this topic, especially in the field of writing, is inversely proportional. The previous relevant research focuses more on examining aspects of motivation, student-belief, self-regulation and environmental influences on learning outcomes results (Glynn, Armstron, & Taasoobshirazi, 2011), so the number of studies examining student engagement is still not many. Moreover, from the relevant studies elaborated, research that examines student engagement from the four dimensions focuses on student engagement on peer- feedback in the second language writing. Hence, this study addresses the gap in the existing research by analyzing the four dimensions of student engagement (cognitive, affective, attitudinal, and social) in learning collaborative writing practice in EFL context.

METHODS

The research aims to analyze students' cognitive, affective, behavioral, and social engagement in collaborative writing at English Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Padang. To analyze the four dimensions of student engagement, the appropriate research design is Qualitative research. The participants in this study were 4th semester students who were taking Essay Writing course. One class consisting of 28 students joined this study. In the writing class, collaborative writing is one strategies that consistently employed in each genre of writing taught. Before they do independent writing, joint construction in pairs is often done. Before the participants were observed, they have done collaborative writing twice indicating that it was not the first time they did collaborative writing.

In addition, to collect the required data, two instruments were employed; observation checklist and questionnaire. containing indicators of each dimension of student involvement ranging from cognitive, affective, attitudinal and social and field notes assisted by a video recorder as a supporting tool. Recording serves to look back at student involvement in the data processing process and ensure that nothing escapes observation. Observation was done twice. In this observation, the students were assigned to write a Hortatory essay in pair based on given topics in 75 minutes. While they were writing, they were also observed.

The observation was guided by observation checklist. The observation checklist for Cognitive engagement was adapted from Prominent Cognitive Engagement by Li (2020). There were 10 indicators. The checklist for BE dimension was adopted from Behavioral Engagement Questionnaire (BEQ) by Miserandino (1996). There were seven indicators – involvement, persistence, avoiding behaviour, ignorance, giving up, participation and concentration. In addition, AE was adopted from Zheng & Yu (2018). The indicators were feeling and emotion, willingness, discouragement, judgement and appreciation. For SE, the observation checklist was adapted from Chen & Liu (2023). The social engagement was to see the forms of collaboration such as Experts/Novice, dominant/dominant, and dominant/passive relationship.

After considering the results of observation, the cognitive and affective engagements were not clearly seen during the observation. Therefore, a questionnaire to find out the students cognitive and affective engagement were distributed. The questionnaire was developed based on theory on the observation checklist. The questionnaire was distributed after the observation was done.

FINDINGS

This study aims to investigate the four dimensions of student engagement while during collaborative writing. The results of each dimension of student engagement are elaborated in the following sections.

1.   Cognitive Engagement

In revealing the cognitive engagement while during collaborative writing, two instruments were employed–observation checklist and questionnaire. In the observation checklist, there were 10 indicators for cognitive engagement. The indicators were mostly about what the students did before, during and after the collaborative writing such as taking the time to brainstorm ideas, using their prior knowledge regarding the topic, being engaged and involved with the topic and forgetting other things, putting a lot of efforts, discussing with a partner when getting stuck, forcing themselves to finish, and checking their writing. However, not all of indicators were observable during the observation. Therefore, a questionnaire was used to confirm about the student cognitive engagement. The result of questionnaire is displayed in the following table.

Table 1. Results of Cognitive Engagement Questionnaire

No	Statements	Percentage				Mean
		SA	A	D	SD	
1.	I mentally organize what I am going to write before starting it.	28.57	67.86	3.57	0	3.25
2.	My partner and I draw the mapping before we start writing.	50	42.86	7.14	0	3.43
3.	My partner and I exchange ideas in brainstorming process.	16.71	35.71	3.57	0	3.57
4.	I participate in the discussion with partner in the process of gathering ideas.	57.14	42.86	7.14	0	3.57
5.	I use my background knowledge in writing.	42.86	50	7.14	0	3.43

6	In the process of writing, team members discuss about the next ideas to write.	64,29	35,71	0	0	3.64
7.	My partner and I divide the task for each in collaborative writing.	53.57	39.29	7.14	0	3.46
8	I often lead the discussion before and during the writing.	14.28	60.72	25	0	2.89
9	We divide the job equally such as I write the introduction and my partner writes body paragraph.	42.86	28.57	21.42	7.14	3.07
10	After finish writing a text, we take turn to read the text and make some editing.	42.86	42.86	14.28	0	3.29
11	One person checks the mechanics.	32.14	53.57	10.71	3.57	3.14
12	I have enough time to complete the writing collaboratively.	28.58	50	14.28	7.14	3
13	I wonder if my method in collaborative writing is effective.	32.21	53.57	14.28	0	3.18
14	I ask myself if the text resulted from collaborative work matches the expectation	14.28	78.58	7.14	0	3.07
15	I ask myself the causes my successes and my failures	32.15	60.71	7.14	0	3.25

The results of this CE questionnaire were divided into three sections- before, during and after the collaborative writing. First, there were four statement showing the student cognitive engagement. From the results, it is clearly seen that less than 10% of students who were not cognitively engaged in the process of gathering ideas. It also implies that more that 90% participants were actively engaged. Secondly, five statements were for writing process with a partner. In regard to team discussion and making use of background knowledge, over 90% students actively participated and activated their prior knowledge on topic. Furthermore, about dividing the task equally, about 25% participants did it, while 75% were admitted to write collaboratively. Last, 75% students often led the discussion. This result is related to the social engagement whether both team members were dominant or one was passive.

For post writing process, about 85% participants did some editing on what they have constructed. It indicates that these participants realized that the writing process did not end after the text was composed. There should be an editing process by reading the whole text and reviewing. The results were similar to the next statement about checking on some mechanics in writing which was amounting to 85%. After editing, the students were done some reflections on what they have accomplished together. Slightly below 70% students thought that the time provided was adequate to finish the task assigned, and they also wondered about the effectiveness of strategies used and the expected result amounting to 85% to 92% respectively. Lastly, they also reflected on their success and failure which was slightly above 90%.

From these results, some conclusions were drawn. First, the number of participants who were engaged cognitively were more likely high. It displays the fact that they students were cognitively engaged in pre writing process in which they did what necessary to gather ideas and brought their prior knowledge into the text. Secondly, in whilst writing the results were slightly lower in terms of dividing the task and leading the discussion. However, most of participants were cognitively engaged in whilst writing. Lastly, they students actively did some reflections in post writing to monitor what they were good at and what should be improved in the next writing.

2. Student Affective Engagement

Affective engagement is related to students' emotion while doing the collaborative writing. These feelings were hard to observe in class and it was very personal to each student. Therefore, it was measured using the questionnaire, which was directly distributed after they finished writing. In this questionnaire, there were 15 statements to observe students' affective engagement during collaborative writing in class. The results were presented in the table below.

Table 2. Results of Affective Engagement Questionnaire

No	Statements	Percentage			
		SA	A	D	SD
1.	I enjoyed working collaboratively in writing a text	42.9	46.3	7.2	3.6
2.	I was not worried about completing the collaborative writing project on time.	25	50	17.8	7.2
3.	I felt excited to write collaboratively with a partner.	53.7	35.7	10.6	0
4.	I had enough time to complete the writing collaboratively	28.6	50	17,9	3,5
5.	I was satisfied with the feedback provided while working on the collaborative writing project	28.6	19	1	0
6	I was so delightful when my partner participated in the discussion.	17	10	1	0
7.	I was happy that I could contribute to writing process	18	10	0	0
8	I was excited to see the result of my writing collaborated with a partner	17	9	2	0
9	I felt at ease in writing process because I have friend to discuss with	12	10	4	2
10	I was not afraid to make mistakes in collaborative writing.	8	12	8	0
11	I was excited with the results.	11	15	2	0
12	My partner helped me with gathering ideas process.	15	11	1	1
13	My partner has been very helpful that I begin to love writing.	16	8	4	0
14	I think writing is not boring when it is done collaboratively.	19	8	1	0
15	I think I can do writing better when I collaborate with friend.	15	10	2	1

The first statement expressed students' enjoyment in collaborative writing. Most of the students stated that they really enjoyed writing collaboratively with friends, amounted to 92.7%. Those who disagreed were quite few. The second one was about concerns in completing the text on time. From the results shown in the table above, 31% felt worried that they could not finish on time. While 69% were not concerned.

Furthermore, 92.7% chose to write in collaboration with friends. The remaining 7.3% prefer to write individually. The fifth point is about the feedback obtained when writing with friends. More than 96% were satisfied with the feedback received. This may be due to the fact that the results obtained were quite good and the feedback was also quite good. Regarding the participation of team member in discussions, 100% felt very happy when their friends were also active in providing ideas and active in discussions. Correspondingly, more than 94% of participants felt happy when they themselves could also contribute to the completion of a text.

Approximately 90% felt a sense of excitement when seeing the results of collaborative work, and 85.5% felt calm in the writing process because they were accompanied by a friend to discuss. Although they were happy and calm when they had a friend to write a text with, 32% of the participants still felt afraid when they made mistakes in their writing. However, more than 92% felt satisfied with the results they got because they helped each other in every process. As a result, more than 85% started to like writing and 94.5% thought that writing was not a boring activity and 90% felt that their writing would be better if they wrote in collaboration.

From the results obtained, some important points regarding the affective engagement of the participants in this study were drawn. First, the majority of participants felt happy when writing in collaboration with friends. Thus, most of them preferred writing together rather than writing individually although there were a small number who chose to write alone. Second, they felt happy to contribute to the completion of the text and felt delighted if their partner also contributed. Third, they did not feel bored in writing when it was done collaboratively, and were not afraid of making mistakes because there were friends who might correct them. So, it can be concluded that affectively they are very happy, excited and motivated in collaborative writing. In other words, the participants in this study were affectively engaged in collaborative writing.

3.   Student Behavioural Engagement

In observing this engagement, an observation checklist adopted from the Behavioral Engagement Questionnaire (BEQ) by Miserandino (1996) was used. Based on this questionnaire, attitude engagement can be seen from seven indicators, namely involvement, persistence, avoiding behavior, ignorance, giving up, participation and concentration. The first indicator was involvement. At this point what is observed was the involvement of both group members in the writing process. This can be seen from the interaction between the two group members. If there is no interaction where one person is occupied with writing while the other is doing something else, then they do not get a checklist for this point. From the observation, out of the 14 groups observed, all groups showed their involvement in discussion. Before they started writing, they talked about the points to be written. Some even made an outline before starting the writing process.

The second point was persistence. The essence of this point is that even though group members face problems, they still continue to solve them. During the writing process, there were some groups that faced problems especially in terms of vocabulary. They tried to consult with a team member about the vocabulary. If they still could not figure it out, they asked group sitting next to them. Last effort when the previous ones failed was to ask the lecture in the room. They did not stop; they kept searching by asking classmates or lecturers who were in the class.

Furthermore, avoiding is a condition where when the problem at hand gets harder, they ignore it and move on. During the observation, the researcher found that all group members did not show avoiding attitude. At the time of observation, quite a lot of group members discussed with other group members to ask for difficult vocabulary and when they did not find the answer, they would ask the lecturer. So the researcher did not see any avoiding attitude shown by the group members. The next point is ignoring. The observation checklist says "they never seem to pay attention when the writing process starts." When the writing process began, all group members were eager to get started. They were given a choice of two topics. From the beginning of the process they were very excited to choose the topic and they started to gather ideas on what to write about. So in conclusion, all groups did not show any negligence during the writing process.

The fifth point is giving up. This attitude is the opposite nature of persistence, where at this point students give up when they get difficulties when writing. From the observation, the researcher noticed that all groups tried to complete the instructed task. They did not show an attitude of giving up. However, when viewed from the results collected by all groups. There

were 6 groups whose results did not match what they should have been. However, it is uncertain whether this was because they gave up or because their writing skills were at that level. Hence, it can be concluded that in the writing process, all groups did not show a giving up attitude. They kept finishing until the time ran out.

The last point is participating. This point emphasizes that every member of the group participates. From the observation, all group members showed their contribution and participated in writing process. The last point is concentrating. This point focuses on whether students concentrate on what they write. Based on the results of the observation, two conclusions can be drawn. First, all members of the group showed that they were concentrating in doing each writing process. Second, however, during the approximately 75-minute process, there were a few moments when some group members lost concentration and chatted with another group but this did not happen for a long time. It can be concluded that all group members were concentrating on completing the writing process. In short, during the collaborative writing, the behaviours shown by 14 groups were all positive. All groups were persistence, actively involved, communicating, and concentrating. They were not giving up, avoiding or ignoring the problems.

4. Student Social Engagement

According to Chen & Liu (2023), social engagement was measured by observing the nature of group member interaction. Storch (2002) points out four patterns: collaborative, expert/beginner, dominant/dominant, and dominant/passive. In collaborative and expert/beginner pattern. The interaction between the group members were sharing, and negotiating willingly. The point is they share and no one is ignored in the negotiating and meaning-making process in writing. Meanwhile, students who form the other two patterns (dominant/dominant, and dominant/passive) do not pay attention to their partner's opinion and ideas.

In determining the social relationship, there are several factors taken into considerations such as the individual contribution to the completion of the writing, the number questions asked, the frequency of suggestion and discussion. From the observation results, 10 groups were in collaborative mode of interaction. This relationship shows that both group members have equally strong roles in every process from contributing ideas, developing them into texts and editing. In order to observe this form of relationship between members, the researcher decided that it should be looked at more closely and at a closer distance. Therefore, the researcher and research assistant stood near each group to hear what was said and the responses received. Furthermore, it was found that 4 groups showed expert/ novice relationship. This can be seen from the communication made by the group members. Members in these 4 groups were equally active in contributing to the writing process. However, one member is contributing more on ideas and the other were more on asking question and giving fewer ideas and opinion. In regard to the third and fourth patterns, there were no group members showing the dominance in discussion and ignoring other member's opinion. There was not found any ignorant member during the collaborative writing process. Therefore, the social interaction patterns of all pairs were collaborative and expert/novice relationship.

DISCUSSION

The concept of student engagement is diverse in which there are multiverse dimensions from various scholars. Frederick, Blumenfeld and Paris (2004) categorize student engagement into three — cognitive, behavioural and emotional. Finn and Zimmer (2012) differentiate student engagement into four dimensions namely academic, social, cognitive and affective engagement. Meanwhile, Philip and Duchesne (2016) divide it into four which are cognitive, behaviour, affective and social engagement which is used in this study.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the student engagement in Collaborative Writing (CW), one of the most effective writing strategies to improve students' writing ability.

Collaborative Writing requires the students in a group to interact, discuss, participate and collaborate indicating that students will be engaged one another to finish the task assigned. In terms of cognitive engagement, the findings revealed that most of the students were cognitively engaged in pre, whilst and post writing processes. This result is in line with the study conducted by Chen et al (2021). The mere difference from these studies is that in this study the collaborative writing was done conventionally in which the students sit in group, while in Chen's study, the collaborative writing was done online with the help of SLA tool. One of main complication during collaborative writing is to keep them active interacting and collaborating because sometimes the students just divide the task and do it individually. In this study, several students admitted to divide the task. However, in Chen's study (2021) to keep this problem from happening, SLA tool was used to maintain the communication. Furthermore, this study was supported by study conducted by Sulaiman and Thakur (2022) which aimed to investigate the effectiveness of collaborative learning on students' Cognitive Engagement and students' task completion in Oman. Based on the results of the experimental research it was found that collaborative research can increase students' cognitive engagement and task completion.

From the affective engagement, the students were showing the positive attitude toward the process, and all the feelings were positive. It indicates that the students were emotionally engaged with the whole process. These positive feelings were also shown in the students' behaviour in which they maintain very positive behaviour such as being persistent, motivated, not being ignoring during collaborative process. These results are supported by research conducted by Chen, Liu & Lin (2023) who conducted a study aimed at analyzing four dimensions of student involvement in providing peer feedback in the context of a second language. During collaborative peer feedback, the students were engaged in four dimensions. Cognitive engagement was seen from the discussion between participants about aspects of language and meaning. The results showed that the participants were affectively engaged. Furthermore, behavioural engagement was observed from three aspects; time spent on the task, number of turns, and number of words. The results For affective and social engagement, data was collected from interviews of eight willing participants. It was revealed that most participants had relatively extensive engagement, while two participants showed negative emotions and a low sense of belonging.

The emotions shown by the participants in this study was also felt by the participants of the study carried out by Iskandar & Pahlevi (2021). Based on the interview conducted, the participants showed enthusiasm during the discussion. Similar to the study conducted by Chen et al (2021), the collaborative writing in Iskandar and Pahlevi's was also done online for three consecutive weeks. Moreover, it is also in line with a study Ebadi & Rahimi (2017) in which students assumed that using google document for online collaborative writing is very suitable. Students also expressed that online collaborative writing is very fun. Shehadeh (2011) revealed that students in collaborative writing situation responded positively, and enjoyed the writing process.

Concerning behavioural engagement, most of the groups were engaged with the task. These results were strengthened by the results of the study Liu, Liu. & Liu (2018) investigating the impacts of online collaborative writing on students' group awareness. Based on the study by Liu, Liu, & Liu (2018), online collaborative writing increased students' behaviour engagement in learning. This study is similar to two previous studies in which the collaborative writing was carried out online. In fact, Online Collaborative Writing has obtained many educational researchers' interests because of its potential pedagogical benefits. Recent research shows that collaborative writing can assist students to work collaboratively to achieve the intended goal (Caspi & Blau, 2011), and increase students' critical thinking (Moonma, J., & Kaweera, 2022) Traditional face-to-face CW groups generate more efficient work than single author for a writing task (Addinna, Hilmi, & Ovilia, 2020). Despite the fact that collaborative writing is done online or not, it is effective to make the students engaged in those four dimensions.

CONCLUSION

From the results of the analysis conducted, it was found that during Collaborative Writing with a friend the majority of participants in this study were cognitively engaged. In terms of affective, the results showed that more than 80% felt happy, not anxious and excited in writing collaboratively with peers. The traits shown by the participants during the process were positive feelings. Furthermore, in terms of attitude, the observation results showed that they also showed an attitude of willingness to participate, not ignoring, not giving up when finding problems, persistent. This attitude is the realization of the participants' affective involvement. The last dimension is the social involvement dimension. At this point, what is seen is the relationship between the two group members. The observation showed that out of 10 couples, 14 couples showed collaborative pattern, and the rest showed a dominant-passive relationship where the dominant one led all the processes from beginning to end. In conclusion, there were four student engagements in Collaborative Writing.

REFERENCES

Addinna, Ainul, Lafziatul Hilmi, and Ririn Ovilia. 2020. Collaborative writing strategy in EFL classes: Comparing individual and pair writing ability reviewed from cognitive learning styles. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research,* 2020, 411, 177- 181.

Boals. Adriel. 2012. The use of meaning making in expressive writing: When meaning is beneficial. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 31(4), 393-409.

Caspi, Avner, and Ina Blau. 2018. Collaboration and Psychological Ownership: How does the tension between the two influence perceived learning? *Soc Psychol Edu*, 14, 283-298.

Chen, Si, Fan Ouyang, and Pengcheng Jiao. 2022. Promoting student engagement in online collaborative writing through a student-facing social learning analytics tool. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning. *J Comput Assist Learn*, 38, 192–208.

Chen, Wenxue, Donghong Liu, and Cancan Lin. 2023. Collaborative peer feedback in L2 Writing; Affective, Behavioural, Cognitive and Social Engagement. Front. Psychology. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1078141.

Ebadi, Saman, and Masoud Rahimi. 2017. Exploring the impact of online peer-editing using Google Docs on EFL learners' academic writing skills: a mixed methods study. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 30(8), 787-815. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2017.1363056

Erkan, Dilek Yavuz, and Saban Ayten İflazoğlu. 2011. Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly,* 13(1), 163–191.

Finn, Jeremy D, and Kayla S. Zimmer. 2012. Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook of Research on Student Engagement (pp. 97–131). Boston, MA: Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_5.

Fredricks, Jennifer A, Phyllis C Blumenfeld, and Alison H Paris. 2004. School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059.

Glynn, Shawn M., Peggy Brickman, Norris Armstron, and Gita Taasoobshirazi. 2011. Science motivation questionnaire II: Validation with science majors and non-science majors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 1159-1176. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tea.20442.

Hsu, Hsiu-chen. 2023. The effect of collaborative prewriting on L2 collaborative writing production and individual L2 writing development. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0043

Hyland, Ken. 2019. Second language writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iskandar, Rahmadania Putri Ferdianawati, and Muhammad Reza Pahlelevi. 2021. Students' Emotional Engagement in Online Collaborative Writing through Google Document. *ETERNAL*, 12, (2), 58-67.

Kustati, Martin, and Yuhardi. 2014. The effect of the Peer-Review Technique on students' writing ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 1(2), 71-81.

Lambert, Craig, Jenefer Philp, and Sachiko Nakamura. 2017. Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance. *Lang. Teach. Res.* 21, 665–680. doi: 10.1177/1362168816683559.

Langum, Virginia, and Kirk P. H Sullivan. 2017. Writing academic English as a doctoral student in Sweden: Narrative perspectives. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.12.004.

Liu, Ming, Leping Liu, and Li Liu. 2018. Group Awareness Increases Student Engagement in Online Collaborative Writing. *The Internet and Higher Education*. 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2018.04.001

O'Neill, Ruth, and Alex M T Russell. 2019. Grammarly: Help or Hindrance? Academic Learning Advisors' Perceptions of An Online Grammar Checker. *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 13(1), 88-107.

Philp, Jenefer, and Susan Duchesne. 2016. Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annu. Rev. Appl. Linguist*, 36, 50–72. doi: 10.1017/S0267190515000094.

Sahril, and Sukardi Weda. 2018. The Relationship of Self Efficacy Beliefs, Motivation and Writing Performance of Indonesian EFL Students in Higher Education. *Journal of English as an International Language*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1246914

Schunk, Dale, and Carol A Mullen. 2012. *Self-efficacy as an engaged learner" in Handbook of research on student engagement. eds. S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly and C.Wylie.* New York: Springer.

Shehadeh, Ali. 2011. Effects and student perceptions of online collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(4), 286-305.

Shernoff, David J. 2013. *Optimal learning environments to promote student engagement.* New York: Springer.

Sulaiman, Moosa Ahmed Ali, and Vijay Singh Thakur. 2022. Effects of Cooperative Learning on Cognitive Engagement and Task Achievement: A Study of Omani Bachelor of Education Program EFL Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 13 (1) 38- 55. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no1.3.

Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. Mind in society. Harvard University Press.

Yarrow, Fiona, and Keith J Topping. 2001. Collaborative writing: The effects of metacognitive prompting and structured peer interaction. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71(2), 261–282.

Zhang, Meixiu., John Gibbons, and Mimi Li. 2021. Computer-Mediated Collaborative Writing in L2 Classroom. Systematic Review. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100854

Zheng, Yao, ShulinYu, and Zhenan Tong. 2022. Understanding the Dynamic of Students Engagement in Project-Based Collaborative Writing: Insight from a Case Study. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221115808