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ABSTRACT

Article aims to investigate the relationship between students’ attitudes on the use of Facebook and blog as learning tools in writing class. Two groups of students were made as experimental and control group. The experimental group used Facebook and blog in as learning tools for thirteen sessions while the control group only used Binusmaya, local multi channel learning. It was assumed that Facebook and blog would be able to help students in three level of writing mastery: the vocabulary, the accuracy and the fluency in writing. Students’ attitudes were gathered through survey and the results compared to their final test scores. The result shows that students’ lack of enthusiasm was in line with students’ level of achievement in writing and that Facebook and blog did not give significant influence on improving students’ writing competence.
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ABSTRAK

Artikel menyelidiki keterkaitan antara perilaku mahasiswa terhadap penggunaan Facebook dan blog sebagai media belajar menulis dalam bahasa inggris. Terdapat dua kelompok mahasiswa dijadikan objek penelitian dimana sekelompok mahasiswa menggunakan tambahan aktivitas blog dan Facebook dan lainnya hanya menggunakan media binusmaya. Sikap mahasiswa diukur melalui respon mereka melalui survey dan kemudian di bandingkan dengan skor akhir mereka di akhir semester. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa tidak menunjukkan entusiasme yang tinggi dalam menggunakan Facebook dan blog sebagai media belajar dalam group. Skor akhir mereka juga tidak menunjukkan perubahan yang signifikan terhadap kemampuan menulis mereka.

Kata kunci: students’ attitude, Facebook, blog, writing competence
INTRODUCTION

With the rapid growth of information technology, teaching and learning process of students experiencing changes tremendously. Prensky (2001), in his article Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants, states that now the educators and parents need to change the paradigm especially now that the children of the generation are born after the emergence of information technology. Being surrounded with Information Technology applications, these young individuals are extremely familiar with the easy accessibility of information and the media provide them.

The development of information technology, especially the Internet, has entered a more advanced stage of the better known as Web 2.0. This concept emerged as the answer to what can be done by information technology in the future. With Web 2.0, learners are always in the stimuli to learn interactively with a variety of easy-to-find information and materials either in the form of text, images, or other multimedia forms.

One example of Web 2.0 applications easily found right now is podcasting and social networking applications such as blogs and Facebook. Many studies mention that technologies such as podcasting has helped many language learners in improving the skills that are received (receptive skills) such as the ability to get the message, speech or the pronunciation of the target language, and the expression of the foreign language learned. As social networking, Facebook and blogs have many interesting features that give language learners the tools to share opinions, information and ideas.

Based on reports from 2007 U.S. Fed News, The University of Texas at Austin's Texas Language Technology Center (TLTC) found that application of podcasts, blogs and content of interactive on-line such as Facebook has quickly replaced the book text books and tapes in language learning. The center provides its students a various foreign language programs in which students have a free access to the audio, video, and on line resources.

Stowe in his coverage in the Daily Tribune Business Weekly also reported that blog has grown and developed into a tool in education. In the field of language learning, blogs and wiki, are believed to have enabled language learners to share ideas and practice as well as their ability to write in a language learned in the atmosphere at a more relaxed, informal and (almost) without any pressure. Furthermore, blogging gives users the flexibility to be creative with words, pictures and even videos. Somewhat different with podcasting, blogging as a means friendship in the virtual world also has its own fans. Blogging or manage to update his blog, is a regular means of issuing an opinion in written form in the target language that trains students to use the target language in the context of a real, not made up contexts.

Meanwhile, social network like Facebook has even experienced faster growth in terms of number of account owners in the past few years. The popularity of face book, as reported by The Times on line on March 17th, 2010, has ousted Google in US alone. According to the article, in 2009, Facebook has more than 400 million regular users worldwide with the home page saw 7.07 percent of traffic. In that year, Google’s traffic percentage was only 7.03 percent. From http://technology.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/tech_and_web/the_web/article7064973.ece

In an initial language learning route, Horwitz (in Hsieh, 2008) argues that language teachers should understand learners’ beliefs about language learning in order to facilitate the learning process so that teachers would be able to come out with suitable teaching method and media. The fact that ‘belief’ usually underlies the attitude and the students’ engagement in the class only adds to the significance of conducting belief analysis.
Moreover, Attitudes, according to Brown (1994), like all aspects of the development of cognition and affect in human beings, develop early in childhood and are the results of parents’ and peers’ attitudes, contact with people who are different in any number of ways, and interacting affective factors in the human experience”. Attitude scales attempt to determine what an individual believes, perceives or feels. Attitudes can be measured toward self, others, and a variety of other activities, institutions, and situations (Gay in Hilary Page-Bucci, 2003).

Attitude is an important concept that is often used to understand and predict people's reaction to an object or change and how behavior can be influenced (Fishbein and Ajzen in Page-Bucci, 2003). Gardner (in Inal, Evin & Saracaloglu, ND) defines attitude as an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual's beliefs or opinions about the referent. It is also seen as a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations to which it is related (Allport in Page-Bucci, 2003). Furthermore, it is also seen as a learned orientation, or disposition, toward an object or situation, which provides a tendency to respond favorably or unfavorably to the object or situation.' (Rokeach in Page-Bucci, 2003).

A study on motivation and language learning has been pretty popular in the past few years. Robert C. Gardner has been the prominent name investigating the relationship between Attitude, Motivation and Language Learning. One of the most famous studies he has done was on Attitude Motivation Test Battery Manual (AMTB) in which he used it to study the effects of motivation on Canadian students’ attitudes in learning French. Clement & Gardner (quoted in Hsieh, 2008) suggest that when one examining factors that influence foreign language learning and communication, motivational processes should be on top of the list. Why? It may answer the question on why some people find it hard to learn a foreign language.

Also in Hsieh (2008), Gardner claims that there are at least three basic indicators of learner motivation: learners’ effort, learner’ desire to learn the language, and learners’ satisfaction with learning. Furthermore, Gardner argues that all the three components are necessary to describe foreign language learning motivation and can be assessed with the Attitude/Motivation Test Battery. The scales making up the AMTB are integrativeness (integrative orientation, interest in foreign languages), attitudes toward the learning situation (evaluation of teacher and course), motivation (motivational intensity, desire to learn the target language, and attitude toward learning the target language), language anxiety (language class and language use anxiety), and instrumental orientation (learning for utilitarian purposes).

In the past few years, along with rapid evolution of information technology and the massive use of computers worldwide, the studies on the impacts of information technology and computers to language learning has been a new buzz. The buzz word is then called Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). Studies on CALL range from students and teachers’ attitudes on the use of CALL (Kremenska, 2007; Raby, 2007 and Park & Son, 2009) and the variety of CALL has to offer to students, like the studies on web 2.0 and many other.

Previous studies investigating students’ attitudes on the uses of CALL has shown that most EFL and ESL teachers have positive attitudes toward the use of computers in general and recognize the benefits of using CALL in the language classroom (Park and Son, 2009). In terms of motivation, Park & Son found that the teachers also believe that CALL can provide students with highly motivated learning environments and opportunities to engage in meaningful and authentic learning as they provide a place for experiencing different cultures and communicating with other people in the target language.

This research aims to answer the enquiries related to students’ beliefs and attitudes on the use of selected web 2.0 applications and its impacts on their learning success. It is hoped that by
investigating and defining their motivation, it would lead to an understanding of students’ beliefs about their own abilities in learning and completing particular tasks (Bandura; Stipek, cited by Miltiadou in Page-Bucci, 2003). Furthermore, Horwitz (in Hsieh, 2008) stresses on the importance of understanding these beliefs in order for language teachers to facilitate students’ learning better.

The following research questions guided the study: (1) How do the students react to the use of blog and Facebook in the writing class?; (2) How do the beliefs and attitudes are reflected in their learning?; and (3) Do students who use both blog and Facebook as extra means of learning score higher on the final test than those who have only Binusmaya in the process?

This research, however, is not intended to be fully scientific or quasi-scientific, but rather a descriptive evaluation of students’ opinions, beliefs and attitudes toward the use of web 2.0 applications, blog and Facebook, and their correlation to students’ writing competence progress.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Participants and Procedures

Participants were all undergraduate students of their second semester enrolled in the English Department of Binus University. They were 58 students of 14 males and 44 females and of mixed English proficiency ranging from 1.80 to 3.90 (out of 4.00) GPA. They all have taken writing I course in the previous semester. The 57 students are from 02 PAG and 02 PCG classes and treated, for this research, as controlled group students (33 students of 02 PAG) and 25 students as experimental group (02 PCG).

Writing II course is the continuation of Writing I. In Writing II, students are expected to excel in writing ideas in the paragraph level. For this research, the experimental group’s teaching process involved 2 WEB 2.0 applications, such as: face book, blog and BINUS local e-learning web, Binusmaya. While for the controlled class, they only used Binusmaya as their only on line tool of learning and joined the Facebook on voluntary base. The use of Binusmaya for the controlled group was only as means of uploading on line tasks.

In the experimental group, students were grouped into 4 and were assigned to create blogs and to update the blogs on regular basis from the periods of March 2009 – January 2010. The creation of the group blog is to measure students’ integrative orientation, which is the drive to be working as a member of the group. Gardner (1960) argues that the drive has been researched to help improve students’ linguistic attainment. It was expected that students were encouraged to write and share information in English more comprehensively.

The Facebook account was especially designed to create a dare-to-make mistake attitude where students were invited to voluntarily be involved in researcher’s Facebook account. A Facebook group activity called ‘the paragraphers’ was created to anticipate a longer or more thorough information or discussion. Participations in both applications are to be put against their attitudes during the class. Students’ responses and attitudes are gathered by using Likert scale. The collected responses are to be compared with their achievement on the final test. Students’ activeness during the study is also monitored. The data is considered as a tool to measure students’ positive/ negative responses on the use of both applications.

Additional measure is then given to the experimental group. Pres test and post test are conducted to the Experimental group to measure their progress while the final test (UAS) will be considered as evaluative test where the results of both groups are compared. The result of the first
comparison will be used to measure the progress of the students in the experimental group while the second comparison result will be used to answer the inquiry of whether or not the web 2.0 treatment have better effects on students’ writing skills.

Data Collection: Questionnaire, Quantity of Web 2.0 Uploads and Tests

The questionnaire was inspired by Gardner’s Attitude Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) design made popular in 1984. The Attitude/Motivation Test Battery is a research instrument made to evaluate, in general, the relationship of sub-tests and composite test scores with indexes of language achievement and the attitudes toward foreign language study, the effects of particular programs and the relation of attitudes and motivation to students’ behavior in the class. Gardner used a total of 104 indexes in his research.

Like Gardner’s AMTB, the questionnaire aims to investigate the effects of the use of a particular program on students’ achievement and its relation with the attitudes toward the Learning Situation. The questionnaire is divided into three groups i.e. Part A questions are all related to students; their ways of learning a language, exposures to internet and multimedia written in English.

This part is specially designed to give significant background to forecast students’ responses to the idea of using Blog and Facebook as official means to improve their writing.

In Part B, questions are divided into two parts. The first five questions are designed to gather the information on students’ belief on whether blogs and face book have helped them improve their writing ability. The second parts of the questions aim to investigate students’ attitudes on the use of blog and Facebook as means of learning. Likert scale type of questionnaire is used to gather the data required. The ten items are written as statements in which students have to respond by choosing between Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. Part C is the last part of the questionnaire. There are two open ended questions asking students’ opinions on the advantages and the disadvantages of using blog and Facebook in the writing class and the factors that influence their level of participations in the class.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Respondents

Twenty two students have responded to the questionnaire. The twenty two students’ average years of learning has been 10.45 years of both in formal and informal settings (English lesson courses and school). In question number two, students were given 6 options on how they have learned English, the majority has approved to have exposed themselves listening to English songs (14), reading English texts (8), watching English program-TV (13), internet (14), I-pod (3), and talking to native speakers friends (3). The first two questions have presented the data on how long this group has actually learned English, regardless how they learned and how successful they were, and how they have exposed themselves passively in English-related media. It gives a clear picture that for many students, the Internet is the most common place to encounter foreign language as they have been pretty familiar with internet and other medium like TV, radio or even I-Pod.

Web 2.0 as term and application has been also a familiar feature for these students who have frequently updated their Facebook status (15), read news (15) and playing on line games and others (5). 20 students say that they even have blogs with 16 out of 22 claims that they have used English in their blogs. It is important for teachers of foreign language to have this sort of data prior to teaching a group of students. Such data will be helpful in helping teachers to prepare the material and the media needed to support the teaching process.
How Do the Students React to the use of Blog and Facebook in the Writing Class?

Part B of the questionnaire is divided into two different focuses: students’ beliefs on progress (questions 1-5) and their attitudes during the class (questions 6-10). The answers are then scaled from: Strongly Agree (SA, 5), Agree (A, 4), Undecided (U, 3), Disagree (D, 2), Strongly Disagree (SD, 1) for the favorable items and from: Strongly Disagree (SD, 5), Disagree (D, 4), Undecided (U, 3), Agree (A, 2) to Strongly Agree (SA, 1) for unfavorable items. Scaling items are depicted in Figure 1 and 2 below.

The first question asked whether by using the blogs and joining Facebook accounts have improved students’ confidence. The response is an average of 3.59, in favor of students’ indecisiveness whether they have improved their confidence in writing.

Question number 2 asks whether students felt that they have technically improved, especially on their ability to construct sentences to make them meaningful. The question was constructed to know students’ beliefs on the technical writing skill they have gained from this activity. A positive response has come out of this item with 4 at the average for the favor of better confidence in the ability to construct English sentences.

In answering whether they have improved their accuracy in writing, students were a little bit unsure of their progress with the scale of only 3.2. Accuracy is the competency to produce correct English sentences in accordance with Standard English grammar, spelling and punctuation smoothly. The accuracy of Writing II students are expected to be at the level of presenting ideas logically and systematically based on the structure of the paragraph taught. The answer came as a no surprise as students have repeatedly complained on how difficult it was to meet the accuracy level expected.

On the other hand, students show different reaction when asked whether they felt that they have learned more vocabulary and daily English expressions. 4.2 of scale react favorably to this item believing that they have improved significantly. Unfortunately, there was no evidence of how they have actually learned the new words.

The next item asks whether they think that blogging is an effective way of improving writing skill. The average scale of 3.7 shows students’ hesitation to fully agree on the question with many of them is split into Agree and Undecided. However, when asked whether they thought that Facebook and blog are too personal to use as group learning tool, 1.9 average of the class disapprove the statement. It means that they see Facebook and blog as appropriate tools to use for group learning despite their indecisiveness in telling whether they have improved their writing skills.
Reflection of Beliefs and Attitudes in Learning

Students were also indecisive in admitting whether they have regularly updated their group blogs and left comments on their friends’ posts with the average scale of 3.3 and 3.45 in favor of irregularity in updating group blog. It appears that students were hesitant in admitting if they have regular posts on their blogs and on their friends’. Students were also hesitant when asked whether they only re-posted materials on their blogs and Facebook with the average scale of 3.04. During the class, the researcher pushes students to update the blogs by scoring the quantity and the quality of their weekly updates. The following Table 1 is the summary of students’ post and their scores.

| Names of blogs                          | Numbers of posts | Scores (1-5) | Notes                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| http://silverdestiny.wordpress.com      | 71               | 4            | Developed and maintained by 6 members from March 2009 – January 2010. Stopped once the class is over. |
| http://denewfield.wordpress.com         | 31               | 3            | Developed and maintained by 6 members from March 2009 – January 2010. Stopped once the class is over. |
| http://ritzy2012.wordpress.com          | 29               | 3            | Developed and maintained by 6 members from March 2009 – January 2010. Stopped once the class is over. |
| http://writing02.wordpress.com         | 8                | 1            | Was only activated in May and June 2009. 7 posts were original.       |

The scores range from 1 to 5 and described in the following rubric:
1 : less than 10 posts
2 : Repost with some links and additional comments and or less than 15 original ideas or posts.
3 : Repost with some individual comments and opinions and or less than 20 original ideas or posts.
4 : Genuine ideas and opinions and or less than 25 original ideas or posts.
5 : Genuine ideas and opinions and or more than 25 original ideas or posts.

The students’ engagement during the class can also be represented in their activities in the Facebook account and the Facebook group. As has been mentioned, students were involved on the Facebook account on voluntary basis. As the host to both tools, the researcher initiates almost all the posts and updates on both applications. The following Table 2 is the detail of the number of posts in the Facebook account and group.

| Number of members | Numbers of posts | “the paragraphers” | Notes                                                                 |
|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 50 : 23 PCG and the rest | 3 notes          | 35 members         | 24 students are all in the groups. 11 students come from pag.          |
| PAG                |                  |                    |                                                                      |
| 10 links           |                  | 2 topics: 11 Responses |                                                                      |

In the last item, students were asked whether they felt comfortable in using both Facebook and blog as learning tools. Most students opted to give indecisive answer, with the inclination to Agree. The average scale of the item was 3.7.

In the open ended question part, students were asked two questions. First question asked of their opinions of the advantages and the disadvantages of using face book and blog in helping them to learn English. The result (see Table 3) comes out with eight (8) advantages and ten (10) disadvantages. The largest numbers of respondents, 7 (24%), claimed that face book and blog improve their writing skills and followed by 6 (21%) respondents who claimed the two applications helped them get information they need. Equal numbers of respondents, 4 (14%), claimed that Facebook and blog are
helpful in improving users’ vocabulary and English. 3 (10%) and 2 (7%) respondents said that Facebook and blog are advantageous as means of sharing opinions and in the process, making them creative (2 respondents, 7%). Only 1 respondent (3.50%), however, claimed that he/has better confidence in expressing ideas through writing after using blog and Facebook in learning.

Table 3 The Advantages of Using Blog and Face Book in Learning English

| No | Items                                      | % of responses | # of responses |
|----|-------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1  | improve vocabulary                        | 14%            | 4             |
| 2  | Improve writing skills                    | 24%            | 7             |
| 3  | Improve users' English                    | 14%            | 4             |
| 4  | read and get information                  | 21%            | 6             |
| 5  | sharing opportunity                       | 10%            | 3             |
| 6  | Means of Expressing opinion               | 7%             | 2             |
| 7  | improve confidence in writing             | 3.50%          | 1             |
| 8  | making you creative                       | 7%             | 2             |

Respondents have come with more varied answers when asked of the disadvantages of using Facebook and blog for language learning as can be seen in Table 4. In this part of the question, respondents show reluctance in answering the question with six respondents (26.30%) did not provide any answer. Time has been seen as main constraint in writing in a blog, point 1 and 2 (six respondents), followed by other issues like internet availability-related issues, point two and eight.

Table 4 The Disadvantages of using Blog and Face Book in Learning English

| No | Item                                      | % of responses | # of responses |
|----|-------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1  | It takes time to write                    | 18%            | 4             |
| 2  | internet café costs money                 | 8.60%          | 2             |
| 3  | No disadvantage                           | 13.10%         | 3             |
| 4  | No Answer                                 | 26.30%         | 6             |
| 5  | No idea                                  | 4.40%          | 1             |
| 6  | Spending too much time on line           | 8.60%          | 2             |
| 7  | Blog doesn't help me much                 | 4.40%          | 1             |
| 8  | Don’t have internet at home              | 8.60%          | 2             |
| 9  | afraid of being embarrassed              | 4.40%          | 1             |
| 10 | I don't share the same opinion with other members | 4.40% | 1 |

The last open-ended question asked students the factors that may have influenced their engagement in the class. The questions aim to identify the internal and the external factors that influence their participation in the class. According to Joosten, Bundy and Einfeld (2009) when ones are motivated intrinsically, they tend to do something for the natural fulfillment involved and they tend
to be more independent (i.e. regulated by the self). In contrast, those who are extrinsically motivated, have the tendency to do things in order to get a separable outcome (e.g. a reward) (Joosten, Bundy & Einfeld, 2009) The following Table 5 sums up the students’ response on the question: what factors that influence your participation in the class?”

Table 5 Students’ answers on the question: “what factors that influence your participation in the class?”

| Students | Factors that influence your participation |
|----------|-----------------------------------------|
| 1        | The lesson, the studying environment, my mood |
| 2        | The lesson and friends                   |
| 3        | My desire                               |
| 4        | I like it because I can tell stories, share things with others and in itself is a pleasure. |
| 5        | I want to be a good writer and I want to get best score for my writing |
| 6        | To understand the materials explained by the lecturer; to get more information about the material; to get the better score from the individual assignments which are given on the class meeting |
| 7        | The grades                              |
| 8        | The kind lecturer and friends           |
| 9        | How the teacher teaches                 |
| 10       | Learning method and situation in the class |
| 11       | My teacher                              |
| 12       | My friends who help me                  |
| 13       | I love English. That’s it.              |
| 14       | N/A                                     |
| 15       | N/A                                     |
| 16       | To be active                            |
| 17       | I want to know how many vocabulary that I have learned and I want to improve it |
| 18       | The teacher; the classmates; the class environment; the material |
| 19       | No idea                                 |
| 20       | The desire to learn                     |
| 21       | The responsibility                      |

The blue highlighted responses represent the external factors that influence students’ participation while the yellow ones represent otherwise. From the answers, it can be seen that students’ participation during the classes were mostly influenced by the external factors. It is also important to note that no student mentions both Facebook and blog as a motivating factors. Students, in general, were intrinsically motivated by their own desire, sense of responsibility and their fondness of English. While extrinsically, factors like the teacher, mood, friends and environment are still their main external factors.

Do students who use both blog and Facebook as extra means of learning score higher on the final test than those who only Binus maya?

To be able to get complete description of students’ progress, the Writing 1 scores of the two researched classes, the results of the pre-test and the post test of PAG’s class, and the final test scores of both classes are all then compared and shown in Figure 3 and 4.
Students’ Writing 1 and Writing 2 Scores

![PCG's Writing 1 and Writing 2 Scores](image1)

Figure 3 PCG’s Average Score in Writing I and Writing II: 72 => 74 in Writing 2

![PAG's Writing 1 and Writing 2 Scores](image2)

Figure 4 PAG’s Average Scores in Writing 1 and Writing II: 69 => 76 in Writing 2

The experimental group (02 PCG) scores improve from the average of 72 to the average of 74 (2 points). However, the controlled group (02 PAG) has improved even higher, from 69 to 76 (7 points). Both writing I classes were only supported by Binusmaya in the process and taught by 2 different lecturers. Both groups show improvement in their writing.

Pre Test and Post Test Scores (Experimental Group)

The pre test and the post test done on the experimental group can be reported below:

Average score of the pre test: 48.4  
Average score of the post test: 63  
The percentage of the improvement: 14.6.

The experimental group shows an insignificant improvement from their average pretest scores of only 48.4 to become 63 in average. The percentage of improvement made by the students, despite the exposure with Facebook and blog in 3 month time, has only reached to 14.6 percentage of improvement.
Final Test Results

Final test results of students are shown in Table 6 and 7.

### Table 6 The Scores of the PCG Students in Writing II

| Students | NILAI | TM | MI | MID | UAS | AKHIR |
|----------|-------|----|----|-----|-----|-------|
| 1        | 70    | 66 | 65 | 67  |     |       |
| 2        | 70    | 70 | 65 | 68  |     |       |
| 3        | 50    | 0  | 20 | 20  |     |       |
| 4        | 50    | 76 | 65 | 66  |     |       |
| 5        | 70    | 70 | 65 | 68  |     |       |
| 6        | 75    | 82 | 90 | 85  |     |       |
| 7        | 75    | 72 | 60 | 67  |     |       |
| 8        | 70    | 70 | 60 | 65  |     |       |
| 9        | 80    | 72 | 65 | 71  |     |       |
| 10       | 85    | 80 | 70 | 76  |     |       |
| 11       | 90    | 83 | 85 | 86  |     |       |
| 12       | 75    | 70 | 65 | 69  |     |       |
| 13       | 75    | 76 | 75 | 76  |     |       |
| 14       | 70    | 68 | 60 | 65  |     |       |
| 15       | 65    | 68 | 0  |     |     |       |
| 16       | 90    | 78 | 100| 92  |     |       |
| 17       | 75    | 65 | 70 | 70  |     |       |
| 18       | 90    | 80 | 90 | 87  |     |       |
| 19       | 80    | 91 | 85 | 86  |     |       |
| 20       | 70    | 65 | 65 | 66  |     |       |
| 21       | 80    | 82 | 85 | 84  |     |       |
| 22       | 80    | 65 | 80 | 76  |     |       |
| 23       | 85    | 75 | 80 | 80  |     |       |
| 24       | 95    | 98 | 100| 99  |     |       |
| 25       | 0     | 0  | 0  |     |     |       |
| 26       | 50    | 84 | 65 | 68  |     |       |
| 27       | 90    | 76 | 90 | 86  |     |       |

### Table 7 The Scores of The PCG Students in Writing II

| Students | NILAI | TM | MID | UAS | AKHIR |
|----------|-------|----|-----|-----|-------|
| 1        | 70    | 73 | 50  | 61  |       |
| 2        | 75    | 76 | 75  | 76  |       |
| 3        | 70    | 62 | 50  | 58  |       |
| 4        | 62    | 62 | 50  | 56  |       |
| 5        | 78    | 78 | 95  | 87  |       |
| 6        | 40    | 64 | 0   |     |       |
| 7        | 80    | 62 | 70  | 70  |       |
| 8        | 80    | 67 | 70  | 72  |       |
| 9        | 85    | 85 | 70  | 78  |       |
| 10       | 40    | 0  | 0   |     |       |
| 11       | 75    | 71 | 60  | 67  |       |
| 12       | 95    | 77 | 90  | 91  |       |
| 13       | 95    | 91 | 85  | 89  |       |
| 14       | 80    | 68 | 75  | 74  |       |
| 15       | 85    | 87 | 85  | 86  |       |
| 16       | 80    | 70 | 90  | 82  |       |
| 17       | 80    | 74 | 75  | 76  |       |
| 18       | 75    | 70 | 70  | 74  |       |
| 19       | 80    | 58 | 65  | 66  |       |
| 20       | 90    | 86 | 90  | 89  |       |
| 21       | 85    | 81 | 80  | 82  |       |
| 22       | 75    | 63 | 65  | 67  |       |
| 23       | 90    | 82 | 80  | 83  |       |
| 24       | 90    | 89 | 90  | 90  |       |
| 25       | 75    | 56 | 55  | 60  |       |
| 26       | 75    | 65 | 65  | 67  |       |
| 27       | 90    | 93 | 95  | 94  |       |
| 28       | 90    | 89 | 95  | 93  |       |
| 29       | 85    | 86 | 65  | 76  |       |
| 30       | 90    | 82 | 90  | 88  |       |
| 31       | 80    | 81 | 80  | 81  |       |
| 32       | 75    | 62 | 50  | 59  |       |
| 33       | 70    | 67 | 55  | 62  |       |
| 34       | 80    | 81 | 80  | 81  |       |

By using standard deviation formula, the students’ scores above can then be summarized in the following:

**PCG Class (experimental group)**

\[
\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum(X-M)^2}{n-1}}
\]

Sum of the scores: 1,868
Mean: 74.72
Median: 71 aptitude
Squares of figures in 2nd column: 5304
5304/ (25-1) = 221
Variance: 221
It is found that Standard Deviation (i.e. square root of variance) is 14.8
The following Figure 5 describes the position of the data:

![Figure 5 Scores Falling within 1, 2 and 3 Standard Deviations of the Mean Of PCG.](image)

This means that most students of the experimental groups have the scores within 14.8 of the mean i.e. 74.72 (59.86-89.58) or only 47.50% of PCG students’ scores in the range between 59.86 to 89.58.

**PAG Class (Controlled group)**

The controlled group scores is summarized as the following (see also Figure 6):

- Sum of the scores : 2432
- Mean : 76
- Squares of figures: 4026
- \(\frac{4026}{(33-1)} = 125.8\)
- Variance: 125.8
- Standard Deviation (i.e. square root of variance): 11.2

![Figure 6 Scores falling within 1, 2 and 3 standard deviations of the mean of PAG.](image)

This means that most students of the controlled group have the scores within 11.2 of the mean i.e. 76 (53.6-98.4) or 50% of PCG students’ scores fall in the range between 53.6 to 98.4.
The data shows that the students of the controlled group have outscored the students of the experimental group. The difference is quite significant. As most students of the experimental groups have the scores within 14.8 of the mean i.e. 74.72 (59.86-89.58) or only 47.50% of PCG students’ scores in the range between 59.86 to 89.58, the controlled group have the scores within 11.2 of the mean i.e. 76 (53.6-98.4) or 50% of PCG students’ scores fall in the range between 53.6 to 98.4. Figure 7 below describes how the scores of the students in the controlled group has consistently been higher than those of the experimental group.

![Figure 7 A Comparison of PCG and PAG Test Results](image)

**CONCLUSIONS**

Students were not particularly motivated with the idea of using face book and blog as learning tools. It is reflected in the lack of regular activities in both Facebook and blog groups. It is assumed that students are less motivated due to some factors: First, there was a changing paradigm from seeing both blog and Facebook as a hobby, to becoming an obligation. The scoring factor used as extrinsic motivator may have also become a diminishing factor. Students who have treated Facebook and blog as hobby, 80% have had blog and 100% have Facebook account, have been apparently affected. Secondly, was the fact that was once individual has now become a team work. Some students have mentioned that they had problems working as a team and preferred working individually. In line with the lack of enthusiasm and participation, the majority of students believe that their writing competence in three areas: vocabulary, fluency and ability to construct sentences (accuracy), were not really improved with the use of both application. The scores of the students using blog and Facebook were not also higher than those of the controlled group. It shows the less significance of using blog and Facebook in helping students to improve their writing skills.

**Suggestion**

On certain stages, Facebook and blog may still have to stay in the individual area where students have privileges. It takes extra efforts not only to condition students’ attitudes on working as team in ‘individual-based’ applications, but also to change the attitudes of the students toward the uses of both applications in learning. Further research is needed to investigate appropriate model and methodology in using Web 2.0 applications (Facebook and blog) as means of learning to improve students’ language competence.
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