



The Nature of Collaboration in Collaborative Editing Task: Evidence of First Language Use and Patterns of Interaction

Agnes Vebian Haloho^{1*}, Lasito²

^{1,2}English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

Submitted: 21 March 2023

Revised : 28 April 2023

Accepted : 30 May 2023

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the nature of collaboration in an EFL collaborative editing task, particularly the evidence of first language (L1) use and patterns of interaction that students used and formed when working with a passage editing task. The study recruited 22 students in grade eleven of SMA Xaverius, Pringsewu. The study follows the framework of Storch's dyadic interaction pattern (2002) and Storch and Aldosari's L1 function to code and analyze its data. The data of this study were transcripts of 11 pairs of students participating in an EFL editing task. This study found that the number of first-language use is bigger than the target language use. In percentage, the student average produced around 55,7% of words in the first language and 43,3% of words in the second language. The main function of the L1 is for grammar deliberation, followed by the deliberations over vocabulary (20,2% of all L1 turns), task management (11,1% of all L1 turns), mechanics deliberation (5% of all L1 turns), and last is generating ideas (4,5% of all L1 turns). The main interaction pattern used by the learners was the collaborative pattern (eight out of eleven pairs). The remaining pairs fit dominant/dominant, dominant/passive, and Expert/novice for each of the pair, respectively.

Corresponding e-mail:

*) 161993.agnesvh@gmail.com

Keywords:

Collaboration; Collaborative Editing, First Language Function; Patterns of Interaction.

INTRODUCTION

Pair and group work have been common practices in the classroom and have become topics of extensive research in general education. In language learning, pair and group work activities are regarded as a cooperative learning strategy that helps the student improve productivity and provides communication classroom opportunities (Zhang, 2010). Initially, this strategy is supported by Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978), which argues that a person's language cognitive development is primarily influenced by people and their surroundings. This theory claims that



interaction between people is essential for language learning to develop the cognitive aspect. In this case, pair or group work is used as a strategy for language learning. Vygotsky, in his theory, also explained that a child would get more knowledge of language when they interact with other people in the environment, particularly when they engage in interaction with adults.

In the context of second/foreign language learning, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (1978) pointed out the potential advantages of peer interaction in a way that while participants communicate with each other, they will engage in meaning-negotiation and hypotheses-testing about the second/foreign language. Research informed by sociocultural theory has highlighted that the student who works in pairs provides more knowledge from peers who engage in activity with a less experienced person/peer in the collaboration process. In the EFL context, novice students or students with low levels of English proficiency can also help their peers (Kim & McDonough, 2008). In line with Ohta (2001), who indicated argues that students can help their peers because each student has different strengths and weaknesses.

Although pair work has proven to be facilitative for language learning when learners work in pairs, they might behave differently, and the nature of pair work might affect the learning outcomes. Storch (2002) explained that the learners could not ignore the fact that in face-to-face interaction, the learner negotiates not only the topic but also their relation. It means that in face-to-face interaction, the learner might have different behavior during the negotiation in the pair work, which can affect their learning outcomes. A growing number of studies that examine dynamics of pair behavior in second language contexts have shown not only that there are differences in the pattern of pair behavior but, more importantly, that some patterns are more conducive to learning than others (i.e., Storch, 2002; Watanabe & Swain; 2007; Kim & McDonough, 2008).

Research has been conducted on the relationship between the pattern of interaction and language learning from different foci (Watanabe & Swain, 2007; Kim & McDonough, 2008; 2011). In their study, Watanabe and Swain (2007) considered issues such as the relationship between patterns of interaction and post-test results. The findings of this study suggested that the patterns of pair interaction greatly influenced the frequency of LREs and post-test performance. When the learners engaged in collaborative patterns of interaction, they were more likely to achieve higher post-test scores regardless of their partners' proficiency level. It seems that proficiency differences do not necessarily affect the nature of peer assistance and L2 learning. Kim and McDonough (2008) looked at the effect of interlocutor proficiency on patterns of interaction. They found that the collaborative dialogue with advanced interlocutors contained significantly more lexical LREs and correctly resolved LREs. In terms of their patterns of interaction, the learners showed different pair dynamics when collaborating with interlocutors from different proficiency levels. In their recent study, Kim and McDonough (2011) investigated the effect of pre-task modeling on patterns of interaction. Half of the learners in this study viewed videotaped models of collaborative interaction prior to carrying out the tasks, while the other did not receive pre-task modeling. The finding of this study indicated that learners who received pre-task modeling produced more LREs and correctly resolved a more significant proportion of those LREs than learners who did not receive any models. They also demonstrated more collaborative pair dynamics than learners who did not receive models. Overall, these studies have highlighted that students who adopt a collaborative interaction pattern are more successful in language learning.



In Indonesia, two examples of researchers conducted a study related to the pattern of interaction in pairwork activity using Storch's (2002) theory. Mufiz et al. (2017) investigated students' nature in pair interaction due to its vital role in learning. The result showed that five patterns emerged in pair interaction, i.e., collaborative pairs, dominant/dominant pairs, dominant/passive pairs, expert/novice pairs, and passive/passive pair. However, feedback provided by collaborative and expert learners contributed to the revision changes of their partners' writings so that the development of writing aspects under these two patterns was better than others. Besides, other factors that contributed to the students' writing were confounding variables such as student proficiency, writing capability, and teacher feedback. Rahayu (2020) investigated verbal interaction in collaborative writing between students from two countries with different L1 when writing an academic essay in a foreign language writing class. Eight students from Indonesia and China participated and were divided into Indonesian-Indonesian pairs and Indonesian-Chinese pairs. The findings showed that pairs who adopted a collaborative pattern denote three categories in their collaborative spoken interaction: what to write (ideas), where to write (structural organization), and how to write (language-related). However, Indonesian-Indonesian pairs discussed how to write (language-related) more than the Indonesian-Chinese pairs.

Even though much research on language pedagogy indicated the advantages of the use of pair work in the second language classroom, students sometimes seem reluctant to work in pairs, mainly when doing grammar-focused tasks (Storch, 2007). The students prefer to work individually rather than work collaboratively in pairs. Storch (1999), in her study, found that students who worked in pairs did the task more accurately than those who worked individually. Storch (2007) found that transcribed pair talk showed that most pairs engaged actively in deliberations over language and tended to reach correct resolutions. Many studies these days, however, put more attention on speaking-focused tasks rather than grammar-focused tasks in using pair work (see, for examples, Oktaviani & Roza, 2015; Jatmiko, 2017; Yulitrisya & Don, 2018; Assubaidi, 2019). Therefore, it is crucial to analyze grammar-focused tasks in pair work. In this study, the grammar-focused task used is the text editing task.

Carless (2008), in his study, mentioned that one of the concerns teachers might have about the use of pair work, particularly in foreign language classes where learners share an L1, is that learners might use their L1 rather than L2 in their pair work. Supporting the interaction, sometimes learners use L1 in learning L2, mainly students with low proficiency in L2. Septeria (2015), in her study, claimed that although using more L2 in the classroom during the L2 learning class would make the student get familiar with the target language, the student with low proficiency in L2 would not understand what the teacher explained to them. This condition might cause the student to get confused and not communicate in the classroom.

Using L1 in pair work might be a normal psychological process that allows learners to initiate and maintain verbal interactions (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2012). Zulfikar (2018), in his study, explained that in EFL or ESL learners' interaction, they usually have conversations in their L1 discussing the tasks' important elements, such as an appropriate word choice and register, before performing the task. In addition, L1 can be a valuable tool for collecting ideas that can help the learner in learning L2 and promote interaction among the learners in the L2 environment. In addition, Storch and Aldosari (2010) also identified the function of L1 in the L2 learning classes during the interaction.



L1 can serve functions for task management, discussing and generating ideas, grammar deliberation, vocabulary deliberation, and mechanics deliberation.

It worth noted that the studies outlined above treat participants in group or pair work format based on students' language proficiency. The current study is set in an authentic context in which grouping is conducted without considering students' language proficiency, as studies have shown that both weak and strong students can give contributions in the group/pair work (Storch, 2002; Watanabe & Swain; 2007; Kim & McDonough, 2008). Following this claim, the present study aims to validate whether or not students' proficiency will hinder their participation and collaboration in pair work activities in passage text editing tasks.

RESEARCH METHOD

The approach used in this study was descriptive qualitative research. Bogdan and Taylor (as quoted by Julana, 2018) stated that qualitative is a research procedure that results in descriptive data, such as words in written or oral form from people and their behavior that can be observed. Hence, this study used the descriptive qualitative research method because the research focused on describing phenomena that occurred naturally without any manipulation. Descriptive research also provides detailed information on an event, condition, or situation using either quantitative, qualitative or a combination of methods (Strider, 2001). In this study, the researcher described and categorized the pattern of dyadic interaction found during the editing task and analyzed the first language use (L1) in the interaction, including the amount and the function served. This study was conducted in some stages: doing classroom observation, transcribing, categorizing, and analyzing the data.

The main data of this study was the students' utterances generated from the transcription of eleven dyads of learners completing the editing task in a foreign language class. The audio recording was transcribed verbatim. The pattern of the dyadic interaction was categorized, and the first language (L1) use was analyzed. In analyzing the data, the theory proposed by Storch (2002) is used to describe and categorize the patterns found in dyadic interaction. Storch and Aldosaris' (2010) references were used in this study to analyze the function of the first language (L1) present in the interaction. The amount of L1 words found in each turn is analyzed in percentage. The percentage that the L1 words formed out of the total number of words produced (L1 + L2).

In calculating the number of words, the researcher used some criteria. First, false starts, fillers (e.g., hmm), and incomplete words (e.g., pheno...) were omitted from the count. The third is any overlapping talk counted as a turn for each of the learners. For example, when both of the students said simultaneously, 'Flood kan banjir..' this was counted as a turn for each participant composed of 1 word in the L1 and one word in the L2. The filler 'kan' was not counted as a word. The turn that produces when the student talk to the teacher is also omitted from the count. (Lasito & Storch, 2013 and Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are presented in three sub-sections based on the three research questions. The data were obtained from EFL classroom students in SMAS Xaverius Pringsewu. Two meetings were held



by the researcher. The first meeting consisted of half the students' number and the second meeting of the remaining half. This learning system was applied during the pandemic.

A. The Amount of First Language (L1) Used by the Learners in Their Interaction

The purpose of the first research question is to analyze the number of first-language production during the interaction. Table 1 below presents the amount of the total words generated by the pair and each student, students' turn, L1 words, and L2 words per individual. This table also presents the percentage of the L1 and L2 words. The Results and Discussion section should be 40-60% of the total article length. A combined Results and Discussion section is appropriate.

Pair	Learners	Total Word Pair	Turns	Total Words	L1		L2	
					Words	% Words	Words	% Words
Pair 1	S1	682	30	365	184	50,4%	181	49,6%
	S2		29	317	206	65%	111	35%
Pair 2	S3	2808	231	1337	760	57%	577	43%
	S4		231	1471	844	57%	627	43%
Pair 3	S5	321	10	105	39	37%	66	63%
	S6		9	216	66	30%	150	70%
Pair 4	S7	1014	71	289	208	71%	81	29%
	S8		72	725	365	51%	350	49%
Pair 5	S9	1271	100	905	583	64%	322	36%
	S10		99	366	272	74%	94	26%
Pair 6	S11	153	10	73	40	54%	33	46%
	S12		10	80	71	89%	9	11%
Pair 7	S13	806	46	693	475	68%	218	32%
	S14		45	113	101	89%	12	11%
Pair 8	S15	276	37	126	30	24%	96	76%
	S16		37	150	26	17%	124	83%
Pair 9	S17	1374	82	848	349	41%	499	59%
	S18		82	526	392	75%	134	25%
Pair 10	S19	264	22	159	131	82%	25	18%
	S20		23	105	61	58%	44	42%
Pair 11	S21	933	79	452	159	36%	293	64%
	S22		79	481	330	68%	151	32%
Average		900,18	65,18	465,3	258,7	55,7%	206,4	43,3%
Range		153-2808	9-231	73-1471	26-844	14-89%	9-627	11-76%

Table 1. The Number and Percentage of L1 Words per Pair

According to the table above, from 22 students who participated in discussions in pairs, it was found that each pair generated 900,18 words, ranging from 153 – 2808 words. The average of words generated by the students is 465,3 words, ranging from 73 to 1471 words. Each student generated 65,18 turns, ranging from 9 to 231 turns. As shown in this table, the students used their first language more than the second language; the student average produced 258 words in the first language (55,7%) and 206 words in the second language (43,3%).



The biggest number of total word pairs was generated by pair 2 with 2808 words, producing 231 turns per student. In this pair, each of them produced L1 in number 760 (S3) and 844 (S4) words for L1. Followed by pair 9 with 174 words, producing 82 turns per student. In this pair, each of them produced L1 in numbers 394 (S17) and 392 (S18) words for L1. Pair 5 generated 1271 words. This pair produced 99 turns and 272 L1 words for Kristin and 100 turns, and 583 L1 words for S9.

Pair 4 generated 1014 words. This pair produced 71 turns and 208 L1 words for S7 and 72 turns and 365 L1 words for S8. Pair 11 produced 933 words and produced 79 turns per student. In this pair, each of them produced L1 in numbers 159 (S21) and 330 (S22) words for L1. Pair 7 generated 806 words. This pair produced 45 turns and 101 L1 words for S14 and 46 turns and 475 L1 words for S13. Pair 1 generated 682 words. This pair produced 29 turns and 206 L1 words for S2 and 30 turns and 184 L1 words for S1.

Pair 3 generated 321 words. This pair produced nine turns and 66 L1 words for S6 and ten turns and 39 L1 words for S5. Pair 8 produced 276 words and produced 37 turns per student. In this pair, each of them produced L1 in number 30 (S1) and 26 (S16) words for L1. Pair 10 generated 264 words. This pair produced 26 turns and 131 L1 words for S19 and 23 turns and 61 L1 words for S20. Pair 6 produced 153 words and produced ten turns per student. In this pair, each of them produced L1 in number 40 (S11) and 71 (S12) words for L1.

B. The First Language (L1) Function in the Learners' Interaction

As shown in Table 1, the students generally used their L1 more than L2. Thus, the purpose of the second research question is to find the functions served by the L1 during the interaction for task completion.

Pair	Function Of L1					Total
	Task Management	Discussing And Generating Ideas	Grammar Deliberations	Vocabulary Deliberations	Mechanics Deliberations	
Pair 1	2	1	7	2	0	12
Pair 2	4	2	29	9	2	46
Pair 3	2	2	2	0	0	6
Pair 4	1	1	14	6	1	23
Pair 5	2	1	18	9	4	34
Pair 6	2	0	3	0	0	5
Pair 7	0	1	13	4	1	19
Pair 8	1	0	4	0	1	6
Pair 9	5	1	9	5	0	20
Pair 10	0	0	5	1	0	6
Pair 11	3	0	13	4	1	21
Total	22	9	117	40	10	198
%	11,1%	4,5%	59%	20,2%	5%	

Table 2. The Function of L1



Table 2 shows the distribution of L1 functions in 11 pairs. The table shows that the main function of L1 was grammar deliberation (59% of all L1 turns). Grammar deliberation appears in 117 instances from all pair discussions. Storch and Aldosari (2010) explained that Grammar deliberation is a condition where the L1 was used to discuss morphosyntax and text structure. The example of Grammar deliberation that appeared in the discussion in pair 7, lines 1- 5.

1. S13 : *Flood are, kalo are itu buat jamak kan berarti harusnya is dong? Iya kan? Iya ga sih aku juga ga pinter....., sumpah ga tau, flood is ... of water that*
2. S14 : *Submerge.*
3. S13 : *Submerge, land a .. flood berarti ini harusnya “is” iya enggak?*
4. S14 : *Iya kali, berarti garisin ini?*
5. S13 : *Pake pensil dulu lah nanti takut salah, “is” lingkarin aja.*

In this example of discussion, they discuss the use of tense. They discussed whether flood is followed by tobe “are” or “is,” and they agreed that flood is followed by tobe “is.”

The second function was deliberations over vocabulary (20,2% of all L1 turns). This function of L1 was used in deliberations over word/sentence meaning, word searches, and word choice. The vocabulary deliberation function appeared in 40 instances from all pairs in the discussion. Below is an example of vocabulary deliberation in pair 11, lines 33 -39.

33. S21 : *Ini nih, why use n?*
34. S22 : *Apa? Two season tend ... tend.*
35. S21 : *Ini ko pake n?*
36. S22 : *This?*
37. S21 : *Yes.*
38. S22 : *Cenderung itu artinya. Tend*
39. S21 : *But.... this... ini ada n nya ini kan Cuma know?*

In this discussion, JesS17 and S22 talked about the meaning of the word tend.

The third function was Task management (11,1% of all L1 turns). This function of L1 was used, in turn, to clarify instructions, recruit attention, and comment on the quality of the work produced. It also included any turns that simply contained a phatic. This function appeared in 22 instances from all pair discussions. The example of task management function was picked from pair 2, lines 5 – 8.

5. S4 : *Ini yang di edit itu berarti... pakai itu ga sih... yang kayaverb three.*
6. S3 : *Ini kan nanti ini ada yang salah ... each paragraph... nanti disalin disini yang bener gimana gitu...*
7. S4 : *Iya.... berarti yang salah itu for example pakai past tense.. apa gitukan.*
8. S3 : *Iya... sama kata and to be nya... nah like this one ... flood ...*

In this discussion, S3 and S4 discuss the instruction editing task. They discuss how the task will be completed. They also discuss the tense that they will use to make the text better.



The next function was Mechanics deliberation (5% of all L1 turns). This L1 function was used to discuss punctuation, spelling, and pronunciation. The Mechanics deliberation function appeared in 10 instances from all pair discussions. The example of the mechanic's deliberation function was picked from pair two lines 158-160. In the discussions below, pair 2 discuss the spelling of the word *expanse*. S3 wants to add the word “*expanse*” in the sentence. Then she asks S4 to write down the word. S4 then asks S3 how the spelling of the word “*expanse*.”

158. S3: *Sure. Iya. Of.. of an expanse . e.x.p.a.n.s.e.*
 159. S4: *Gimana? Expanse?*
 160. S3: *Expanse .. of water.*

The last function was generating ideas (4,5% of all L1 turns). This L1 function was used to generate or comment on ideas generated, particularly in the composition task. The Discussing and generating ideas function appeared in 9 instances from all pairs in the discussion.

The example of this L1 function was picked from pair 9 Line 5, 12-13. Pair 9 in the discussion below talked about word choice. They discuss whether they can change the word from the sentence “*Flood are overflows of water that submerge the ground*” to “*flood are the water overflows the ground.*”

- 5 S17 : *Oh i think maksudnya banjir adalah air yang meluap menggenangi tanah gitu kali ya? Berarti ini kurang tepat sih kata-katanya, ini boleh ganti ga ya? Change the sentence gitu with our word.*
 12 S18 : *Boleh tuh kata miss asri, berarti mau diganti apa ini, any suggestion?*
 13 S17 : *Emm kalo artinya tadi banjir adalah air yang meluap menggenangi tanah berarti kalo menurut aku we change the sentence with flood are water overflows the ground, gini aja gak sih? Gini saja sih lebih simple.*

C. The Patterns of Dyadic Interaction Found in an EFL Senior High School Level

According to Storch (2002), there are four patterns of dyadic interaction; they are collaborative, expert-novice, dominant-dominant, and dominant-passive. The patterns are distinguished according to equality and mutuality. Equality refers to the level of contribution and control over the task, and mutuality refers to the level of engagement with each other's contributions. Pairs are coded as working collaboratively when they show high levels of equality and mutuality. That is, in such pairs, both learners contribute to the task and engage with each other's suggestions. From the finding in Table 3, nine pairs complete the editing task in a collaborative pattern.

In dominant/dominant pairs, although both students of the pair contribute to the task, what distinguishes them from collaborative pairs is their low level of engagement or mutuality with each other's contributions. In such pairs, learners tend to ignore or reject each other's contributions. From the finding, there is only one pair that completes the editing task in the dominant/dominant pair. In dominant/passive pairs, one learner takes or is afforded control of the task; the other participant contributes little, and there is little engagement with each other's contributions. In an expert/novice



pattern, one participant also seems to take a more leading role in the pair activity, but what distinguishes this pattern from the dominant/passive pattern is that this dominant participant tries to encourage the so-called ‘novice’ to contribute to the task. Each of these two patterns of interaction is only found in one pair per pattern.

Therefore the purpose of the first research question was to find out the patterns of interaction between pairs of EFL Senior High School students while completing collaborative editing tasks. A single pattern of interaction was identified for each peer response transcript, and the number of instances of patterns of interaction for each pair across one session was identified. In total, 11 patterns from each pair were identified, and they are presented in Table 3.

No	Pair	Pattern of interaction			
		Collaborative	Dominant /Dominant	Dominant /Passive	Expert /Novice
1	Pair 1	√			
2	Pair 2		√		
3	Pair 3	√			
4	Pair 4			√	
5	Pair 5	√			
6	Pair 6	√			
7	Pair 7				√
8	Pair 8	√			
9	Pair 9	√			
10	Pair 10	√			
11	Pair 11	√			
Total		8	1	1	1

Table 3. The Patterns of Dyadic Interaction

As shown in Table 3, the main interaction pattern used by the learners was the collaborative pattern. Eight pairs used the collaborative pattern: pair 1, pair 3, pair 5, pair 6, pair 8, pair 9, pair 10, and pair 11. The remaining pairs fit dominant/dominant (pair 2), dominant/passive (pair 4), and Expert/novice (pair 7).

Pair 9 is an example of the type of interaction found in collaborative pairs. S17 and S18 contribute jointly to the composition and engage with each other’s contribution. In the discussion below, pair 9 (S17 and S18) give each other contributions and ideas about the task. They also value each other’s opinions. In lines 48-54, they were collaboratively discussing task management. They both agreed to cross the mistakes. Lines 55 – 64 they discussing the word most, whether the word most is used twice in the sentence or only once. Collaborative (high mutuality and high equality), e.g., Pair 9, Lines 48-64.

48. S18 : *Ya ini udah bener bukan? Ini udah bener kan ya?*
 49. S17 : *Iya bener.*
 50. S18 : *Should we cross the misatkes? Di lingker-lingkerin gak sih?*
 51. S17 : *Iya yang tadi ini is ini are.*
 52. S18 : *Is... kayaknya yang using are itu diganti is semua gak sih?*
 53. S17 : *Yaudah ganti ya., dilingkerin.*
 54. S18 : *Iya, yaudah ini tulis dulu ya.*



55. S17 : *Nanti dulu. kalimat ke dua udah benar kan? It's true.*
56. S18 : *Ah ini kayaknya ada yang kurang tepat gak sih? Kan ini kan ada of the most, nah ini ada lagi ini.*
57. S17 : *Hmmm the most*
58. S18 : *Jadi kaya langsung disasters of the world, iya gak sih? Atau emang benar pake ini lagi?*
59. S17 : *Itu second sentence semua bukan sih?*
60. S18 : *Iya...*
61. S17 : *Banjir adalah bencana sebagian besar umum di dunia.*
62. S18 : *But the translate is true ya? Tapi ini kayaknya salah deh, Ca, Iya gak sih. Kayak gak genep kalimatnya kalo gini.*
63. S17 : *Tapi ada sih yo, bahasa inggris yang dua – duaan gitu.*
64. S18 : *Yaudah tulis aja ya, trus ini.....*

Meanwhile, three pairs did not finish the discussion. They are pair 3, pair 10, and pair 6, but these three pairs are found in a collaborative pattern.

Pair 10 (S20 and S19) is an example of pair that did not finish the discussion yet found in the collaborative pattern. Both of them contributed to the task. In the transcription below, they discuss the word choice and also the passive, active voice in the editing task.

1. S20 : *Banjir adalah lautan air..... berarti yang of water itu tu dipakein eemm.*
2. S19 : *From?*
3. S20 : *From, jadi water from water..., it can also berarti itu diganti.*
4. S19 : *Also nya diganti.*
5. S20 : *Di ganti be kan?*
6. S19 : *Be caused.*
7. S20 : *Berarti it can be.*
8. S19 : *Caused.*
9. S20 : *Be caused .. the .. probability of flooding, iya ga sih? Gimana ini? ya Berarti kan, apa tadi dimana?*
10. S19 : *Juga bisa menyebabkan kemungkinan banjir meningkat.*
11. S20 : *Berarti it can be bukan emm bukan it can also.*
12. S19 : *Iya.*

Pair 2 illustrates interaction exemplifying a dominant/dominant pattern (low mutuality and high equality). Pair 2 in this discussion actively contribute to the task, but it is not joint construction. They do not always agree with each other contribution. For example, in lines 243 – 265 below, both of them have different an opinion about the use of ‘ing.’ S4 argued that “causing flooding to happen” was right, but S3 argued that the word cause did not follow the suffix “ing.”

243. S4 : *I think kalo duple “ing” itu gapapa deh.*
244. S3 : *Cause ga usah pake “ing” ... ga usah pake “ing”*



245. S4 : *Cause flooding?*
 246. S3 : *Yes, cause flooding happen.*
 247. S4 : *Kenapa ga cause.. causing flood happen juga bisa.*
 248. S3 : *Causing flood happen?... causing?*
 249. S4 : *Causing flood happen.*
 250. S3 : *Mmm, iya ..*
 251. S4 : *Apa?*
 252. S3 : *Causing flood happen ga usah pake flooding flooding an kebanyakan.*
 253. S4 : *Tapi i think... mmm tapi kayaknya itu loh cause flooding happen.*
 254. S3 : *Iya.*
 255. S4 : *Kan soalnya ada ini ...*
 256. S3 : *Terjadi .. happen.*
 257. S4 : *Jugaan kan ini ada verb nya can itu verb bukan sih?*
 258. S3 : *No, kalo subjectnya ga dikasih “ing” .. tulis ... ini kan bukan itu...
 Bukan kata sifat.*
 259. S4 : *Berarti causing flood happen?*
 260. S3 : *Yes..*
 261. S4 : *Ini udah flooding loh?*
 262. S3 : *Coret-coreit terus..*
 263. S4 : *Causing flood?*
 264. S3 : *Yes flood happen titik.*
 265. S4 : *I think can cause flooding happen?*

Pair 4 shows a Dominant/passive (low mutuality and low equality) pattern of interaction. It comes from the pair talk of pair 4 (S8 and S7). Here, S8 produced more words than S7, and she also dominated the interaction while completing the task, whereas S7 handed over the decision about the task to S8. Line 63 – 69 shows that S8 made the decisions by herself. She decided to choose the word “make” rather than the word “makes.”

63. S8 : *Okay ... area ... no no mana sih oh iya bener ... continu.*
 64. S7 : *Can make ... harusnya apa?*
 65. S8 : *Make atau makes?*
 66. S7 : *Terserah aja.*
 67. S8 : *Make aja.... okay one more paragraph ya enggak?*
 68. S7 : *Udah kerjain aja, itu apanya yang ga dipake apa diganti?*
 69. S8 : *Ya kalo ga dipake ga papa.*

The last pattern found in Pair 7 is the Expert/novice (high mutuality and low equality) pattern. From the discussion below, S13 considers herself an expert, and S14 seems to have become a novice. S13 tends to lead the task. She does not impose her view but rather tries to explain. Lines 6 – 13 show that S13 tries to explain the use of verb three in the past tense.



6. S13 : *Kalo emm kalo tenses itu kan apa namanya, ini pake jenis apa, tapi disini tuh continuing..., oh ini nih ini past tense, dalam teks itu kan kebanyakan inikan udah terjadi tuh.*
7. S14 : *Iya.*
8. S13 : *Past tense, berarti kalo inikayamasih diniang apa sih kalo diniang? Present tense berarti harusnya continuing itu diganti verb 3 eemmm ... continued .. continued.*
9. S14 : *Heeh.*
10. S13 : *Ininya pake "ed" diganti.*
11. S14 : *Pake "ed"*
12. S13 : *Iya "ed" continued "ed"*
13. S14 : *Salah lagi.*

From the finding and discussion above, the student-generated more of their first language rather than their second language. Whereas the study conducted before, students produced more L2 than L1. (Storch and Aldosari; 2010; Storch and Aldosari; 2012; Lasito and Storch; 2013). The main function of the first language through the editing task was grammar deliberation, and the last function was mechanic deliberation. This finding is different from the study of the L1 function by Storch and Aldosari (2010), the student-produced task management functions more than grammar deliberation, yet the deliberation over the mechanics was the last function in this study. Although this study was set in an authentic context without considering students' language proficiency as in previous studies (Storch, 2002; Watanabe & Swain, 2008; Kim & McDonough, 2008; Kim & McDonough, 2011), most of the pair in this study used a collaborative pattern during the discussion. It validates that students' proficiency did not hinder their participation and their collaboration in pairwork activities in the passage editing task.

CONCLUSION

The pair work in language learning activities is regarded as a cooperative learning strategy that helps the student improve productivity and provides opportunities for communication in the classroom. In this study, the pair work was analyzed cover from three aspects: The amount of the L1 and L2 words produced in pair discussion, the function of L1 produced in pair discussion, and the patterns of pair interaction. However, the collaborative editing task was given to the pair so that each pair could produce a word to be analyzed.

The study's finding shows that 22 students who conducted discussions in pairs showed that their first language is more significant than the second language, with students averaging produce 258 words in their first language and 206 words in the second language. In percentage, student average. Produced around 55,7% of words in their first language and 43,3% in their second language. The finding also shows the distribution of L1 function is that the main function of L1 was grammar deliberation (59% of all L1 turns), followed by deliberations over vocabulary (20,2% of all L1 turns), task management (11,1% of all L1 turns), mechanics deliberation (5% of all L1 turns) and last is generating ideas (4,5% of all L1 turns). This finding indicates that student in this study generated



their first language more than the target language. Most of the first language functions are used for grammar deliberation. This is caused by the task given being grammar focused task or an editing task. Even though the student used their first language during the discussion, they still can discuss collaboratively in completing the task.

REFERENCES

- Kim, Y. & McDonough, K. (2008). The Effect of Interlocutor Proficiency on the Collaborative Dialogue between Korean as Second Language Learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 211–34.
- Kim, Y. & McDonough, K. (2011). Using Pre-task Modeling to Encourage Collaborative Learning Opportunities. *Language Teaching Research*. 15(2)183–199.
- Lasito., & Storch, N. (2013). Comparing Pair and Small Group Interactions on Oral Tasks. *RELC Journal*, 44: 361.
- Septeria, L. A. (2015). *Learners' Perceptions Toward the Use of L1 And L2 (Indonesian) In English Classroom*. Salatiga.
- Storch, N. (1999). Are Two Heads Better than One? Pair Work and Grammatical Accuracy. *System*, 27, 363–74.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of Interaction in ESL Pair Work. *Language Learning*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 119-158.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the Merits of Pair Work on a Text Editing Task in ESL Classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 2; pp. 143–159.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is There a Role for the Use of the L1 in an L2 Setting? *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 4. pp. 760-770.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, Ali. (2010). Learners' Use of First Language (Arabic) in Pair Work in an EFL Class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4) 355–375.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of Proficiency Differences and Patterns of Pair Interaction on Second Language Learning: Collaborative Dialogue between Adult ESL Learners. *Language Teaching Research*. Vol. 11. No. 2, 121–142.
- Zulfikar. (2018). Rethinking the Use of L1 in L2 Classroom. *Englisia*. Vol. 6, No. 1, 43-51.