

# **Dogme approach in asynchronous discussion to enhance EFL learners' writing achievement: A quasi-experimental study**

**Dian Pawitri Ayu<sup>\*</sup>, Patuan Raja, Tuntun Sinaga**

University of Lampung, Indonesia

Manuscript received December 28, 2024, February 28, 2025, accepted March 17, 2025, and published online May 7, 2025.

## **Recommended APA Citation**

Ayu, D. P., Raja, P., & Sinaga, T. (2025). Dogme approach in asynchronous discussion to enhance EFL learners' writing achievement: A quasi-experimental study. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 12(2), 154-169. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v12i2.28156>

## **ABSTRACT**

This study explores the effectiveness of Dogme, a communicative approach, in enhancing the writing skills of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) high school students through asynchronous discussions. By integrating Dogme principles, which prioritize student interests and emergent language, the study aims to improve the efficacy of asynchronous discussions in language learning. A quasi-experimental quantitative design was employed, involving a class of high school students who participated in six asynchronous discussion sessions modified with Dogme principles. Data were collected via pre- and post-intervention writing tests, with student writings evaluated across five aspects. The results, analyzed using a Repeated Measures t-test, revealed significant improvement in writing achievement, evidenced by a higher post-test mean score (82.1) compared to the pre-test (69.8), with a two-tailed significance value below 0.05. This enhancement is attributed to students' ability to choose discussion topics and utilize emergent language, enabling richer content development in their writing. Thus, this study confirms the viability of incorporating Dogme principles into asynchronous EFL teaching methods to boost writing performance.

---

**\* Corresponding author:**

Dian Pawitri Ayu  
University of Lampung  
Jl. Prof. Dr. Ir. Sumantri Brojonegoro No.1, Kota Bandar Lampung, Lampung 35141, Indonesia  
Email: [dianpawitri@gmail.com](mailto:dianpawitri@gmail.com)

**Keywords:** *Asynchronous discussion; Writing achievement*

## **1. Introduction**

The development of technology and information nowadays allows people to get connected worldwide. They can easily share their ideas and information using various online platforms in written form. Fundamentally, this situation can be managed to inspire and motivate people through writings. Graham et al. (2013) argue that writing provides a powerful tool for influencing others as people use writing to share information, tell stories, explore personal identities, and narrate experiences. Therefore, teaching writing plays an important role in English learning to help learners develop and maintain their written communication. Students must be able to arrange complex sets of information in writing a variety of written discourse to get involved in occupational or academic purposes (Grabe & Kaplan, 2014; Miftah, 2016). They add that intermediate students, who already have a basic understanding of writing, need to further develop their ability to produce well-structured texts. Thus, they must learn to both read and write from diverse sources. These students should frequently work on extended projects which need certain kinds of analyses, syntheses, and critical evaluation. Therefore, in Indonesia's national curriculum, the learning objectives of English subject for senior high school students focus on the production of English text ranging from descriptive to analytical exposition. It is expected that they are able to write many kinds of texts that are commonly used in day-to-day life.

However, Indonesian students at this level still find it difficult to produce a piece of writing. It is expressed by Ashrafiyany et al. (2020) that most Indonesian students struggle to come up with initial ideas and concepts because they lack background knowledge on the topic. In addition, Toba et al. (2019) also mention that students encounter challenges with content elaboration. They cannot explore and develop the relevant topic and it results in the unknowledgeable and unclear composition of ideas. However, such obstacles are sometimes caused not only by students' internal issues but also by external factors, such as the teaching method used by teachers. A recent study from Febriani (2022) reveals that students experience difficulties when the teacher's strategy and method are not implemented properly. The adoption of ineffective teaching techniques can decrease students' motivation to study, which has an impact on how effective students absorb the learning material.

Furthermore, several teaching methods have been introduced and adopted for a long time (Sharma et al., 2024), one of them is the discussion method. It is mentioned by Abdulbaki et al. (2018) that the use of discussion methods can encourage students to convey their thoughts and point of view by contrasting their perspectives with their friends during the discussion. In addition, this method can help students to obtain a lot of ideas which can be beneficial for them during the process of writing. According to Karina (2017), the discussion method exposes students to various views and ways that support their perspectives; therefore, it helps students determine their writing content. Erika

(2022) also argues that before composing a text, it is highly helpful for students to collaborate in groups to share their ideas and knowledge.

Since the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic in 2019 both teachers and students use communication technology more frequently, then they continue until today. It is claimed by Riwayatiningsih and Sulistyani (2020) that the teaching and learning process has shifted from traditional face-to-face classrooms to online distance learning since the time of the pandemic and it continues in the post-pandemic. Therefore, it is possible for teachers to apply the discussion method in an online setting by having asynchronous discussion. Aras and Ybnu (2022) define asynchronous discussion as a text-based discussion using an online platform. Hence, the discussants do not need to be present simultaneously for participating in the discussion as it can be carried out anywhere and anytime as long as they have a stable internet connection. Moreover, asynchronous discussions offer distinct advantages compared to traditional discussions. Traditional classroom discussions can be challenging for students with low self-confidence, as they struggle to express their ideas and take longer time to formulate arguments. It is difficult for them to give responses and articulate their thoughts clearly (Omar et al., 2012; Safarnejad & Montashery, 2020). As a consequence, it consumes a considerable amount of time while the duration for conducting the learning process is limited (Cashin, 2011). Aras and Ybnu (2022) believe that asynchronous online discussion helps to reduce students' psychological issues and boosts their self-esteem. In comparison to when they are asked to share feedback with their peers in a limited amount of time, the students were more likely to consider the feedback in greater detail and with greater clarity when they were given more time and more space to provide feedback (Astrid et al., 2021). Hrastinski (2008) supports that asynchronous discussion improves students' ability to comprehend information as it does not require an immediate response. In addition, asynchronous discussions foster deeper engagement by allowing students to connect, create, and critically communicate, enhancing students' participation in learning activities by allowing them to produce more insightful replies and more qualified absorption of discussed topics (Mohammadi et al., 2018; Jinot, 2020). After all, students can receive greater knowledge and information through asynchronous discussion as they share their thoughts with each other and have a chance to discuss the learning topic from their point of view.

Nevertheless, there are some flaws in the use of asynchronous discussion in the teaching and learning process. First, students' interests are neglected so that they easily lose track of the main point of the discussion (Clark, 2003; Tiene, 2000). As a result, students find it difficult to express their ideas and produce arguments as they do not have sufficient information to support their views. Additionally, students' knowledge or familiarity with the topic being discussed can influence them to contribute in an online discussion (Cheung et al., 2008; Hew et al., 2010). Mansour (2024) expresses a similar viewpoint by stating that communication in asynchronous discussion is somewhat limited as students are unfamiliar with the topic and had not yet fully developed their

understanding. Besides, they can be distracted if they fail to remain within the scope of the discussion topic (Rofi'i & Herdiawan, 2024).

To address the mentioned issues regarding the limitations of asynchronous discussion in language teaching, the implementation of the method should be modified by integrating principles that may solve the limitation. Dogme approach comes with an idea that is in line with the viewpoint above. Dogme was first introduced by Thornbury in 2000 as an attempt to promote students' freedom in proposing materials and learning topics (Thornbury, 2005). According to Daguiani and Chelli (2020), Dogme promotes instruction that does not rely on published textbooks but instead relies on conversational communication in the classroom, which enables language to emerge from the learners' interests. In addition, they explain that Dogme emphasizes learners' genuine needs and views them as the primary source of teaching. Dogme originally has three basic principles namely conversation driven, material light, and emergent language. It is highlighted in the first and the second principles that topics and content derived from students should be considered. It is in accordance with the statement from Daguiani (2022) that Dogme enables teachers to let students pursue their preferred topics, providing solutions for those challenging teaching and learning situations. For that reason, the use of Dogme may also help teachers as they do not need to provide such complex material since students can choose their own. It can also decrease students' boredom since they learn something that they are interested in.

The second problem regarding the use of asynchronous discussion is students' difficulties in conveying their messages which are related to the production of emergent language. Students have trouble expressing their ideas in English so they translate the sentences from their native language into English which then causes misconceptions (Ghodrati & Gruba, 2011; Olesova & Oliveira, 2013). According to the third principle of Dogme, the production of emergent language is an element of the learning process that should be accommodated by the teacher. This is because emergent language is typically the result of a student's inability to describe or express certain objects and terms that should not be considered as errors. Xerri (2012) explains that teaching is responsive to the language generated during the lesson, thus students' errors should be viewed as learning opportunities. The teacher can manipulate the emergent language generated by students during the discussion process by employing this concept.

In short, asynchronous discussions in language learning present challenges such as neglecting students' preferences and language production, making it difficult for them to express their ideas clearly. Incorporating Dogme approach may allow teachers to organize maximum interaction during discussions (Nataliia & Anastasiia, 2024). It is in line with Dogme principles that language learning should prioritize communication in contextual settings by incorporating students' interests and emergent language to improve their language development. Therefore, this research was intended to find out the effect of Dogme approach in asynchronous discussion on students' writing achievement. This study could provide valuable insights into the practical implementation of Dogme in

asynchronous discussions, offering teachers innovative strategies to develop students' writing skills.

## **2. Literature review**

### *2.1. Writing*

Writing is crucial for encouraging language learning. The compositional nature of writing has shaped pedagogy that emphasizes idea generation, logical organization, and the use of discourse markers and rhetorical conventions to create cohesive written texts (Brown, 2001). In addition, Westwood (2008) highlights that writing requires an effective coordination process of cognitive, linguistic, and psychomotor skills. As a productive language skill, writing involves some aspects of language such as words, sentences, and large chunks of writing to communicate (Purnamasari et al., 2021). Furthermore, Yao (1997) addresses that from a cognitive perspective, writing is seen as a knowledge-transforming activity in which writers construct conceptual knowledge structures, produce propositional sequences to explain and justify their understanding, and create coherent textual and linguistic structures to represent their conceptual knowledge. On the other hand, a social perspective perceives writing as a communication act that involves the creation and application of linguistic codes in a communicative environment that is defined by culture. The social perspective places an emphasis on how authors engage in social contact with readers. As defined by Hidayati (2018) that writing is the act of interacting with others through conveying messages and expressing ideas to readers in written form. It involves a process of discovery, organization, and communication of the writer's thoughts to the reader.

McMahan et al. (2017) argue that the goals of writing as a form of communication include entertaining, informing, and persuading readers. Therefore, the composition of the content in a writing should be in line with the purpose aimed by writers so that the ideas can be delivered effectively. Furthermore, ensure the reader can easily comprehend the content, the composition and structure of the texts should be clearly organized. It is necessary to do so in order to prevent confusion and various perceptions among readers. Thus, writers can successfully transfer their ideas through writing.

It is clear from the explanation above that writing is a means of expressing thoughts and ideas. In order to preserve the quality of the communication with readers, it is essential to pay close attention to the organization and the substance of the writing. Thus, the readers can easily comprehend the message contained in the text written.

### *2.2. Dogme approach*

The Dogme approach originally gained attention in 2000 due to an article written by a methodologist named Scott Thornbury with the title of "A Dogme for ELT" in which he criticized the overuse of textbooks used to teach foreign languages, which in his view burdens and confuses the learning process. According to Akmalovna (2022), Dogme approach prioritizes real conversation between the teacher and the students and among

students. She claims that Dogme approach is communication-based and focuses on activating students' potential through interaction between students and teacher, the active application of personal experience, the use of personal information, and situational language presentation. Added by Daguiani and Chelli (2020) that Dogme advocates teaching that does not rely on published textbooks but relies on conversational communication in the classroom which helps language to emerge from the learners' interest. They also explain that Dogme focuses on learners' actual needs and considers them as the primary reference of teaching. In other words, students can internalize and produce language successfully if it is spontaneous and relevant to them.

Furthermore, Thornbury and Meddings (2009) states that Dogme propose three core principles as foundation in applying this approach, those are: conversation driven, material light, and emergent language.

### *2.2.1. Conversation driven*

Language teaching and learning should emphasize conversation and communication, which can lead to a variety of interaction patterns. Accordingly, it can be said that Dogme highlights the importance of dialogue and communication within every lesson and believes that students can practice their language if they are asked to talk about themselves; as a result, it opposes the transfer of knowledge, in contrast to traditional educational models. According to this principle, teaching with Dogme ELT implies that: 1) create a classroom environment that is appropriate to encourage interactive talks among students; 2) the topics should come from people in the classroom; 3) the benefits of the talks or conversations should be taken incidentally, whether to highlight the forms or to light up the topics being discussed; 4) scaffolding is necessary to bridge the talks in the target language; and 5) students should participate as a group (Yanti, 2018).

### *2.2.2. Material light*

Student-produced content is preferable to published resources and textbooks that frequently reflect cultural biases, which put a greater emphasis on grammar than on communication objectives. This suggests that teachers are requested to change their dependency on textbooks in the Dogme ELT and are encouraged to prioritize adopting a materials-light approach more. Thornbury (2005) suggests that the learning content should likely to engage learners and to trigger learning processes by providing space for the learner's voice, accepting that the learner's knowledge, experience, concerns, and desires are valid content in the classroom. Dogme is not anti-technology, but it rejects technology that prevents true communication-based and learner-centered strategy.

### *2.2.3. Emergent language*

In this principle, language is not transmitted yet it gives learners the best conditions or opportunity to use the language when it naturally arises in their conversation. This is

considered an opportunity for learners to engage in the process of reflecting on and developing their language rather than as a weakness or error made by them. Besides, students create vocabulary that is not necessarily taught to them. Thus, one of teachers' responsibilities is to aid in the development of language. Teachers may promote the development of communicative competence by rewarding students for productive discussions, reinforcing the exchanges, and considering and assessing the class interactions.

In writing instruction, the Dogme approach can be beneficial to respond to the main concern of creating students-centered learning and involving students' interests in the learning activities. This approach also perceives the emergent language produced by students as something valuable that should be noticed and discussed during the learning process. As a result, they may find it easy to elaborate their writing content. It happens because they have a lot of ideas to put on their writing as they discuss interesting topics that they like and know well. Besides, their writing may contain less grammatical errors since the teacher is concerned with the emergent language and errors found during the discussion. Thus, the principles of Dogme approach are suggested to be applied by the teacher in order to support an effective and favourable learning atmosphere as students are given opportunities to bring their own topics and reflect their errors.

In short, the Dogme approach challenges traditional methods by prioritizing real conversations and rejecting heavy reliance on textbooks. The key principles of this approach highlight the importance of creating engaging and learner-centered settings by placing emphasis on conversation, prioritizing material generated by students, and allowing language to emerge naturally. Considering the implementation of the principles in the classroom can provide the students an interactive learning process and a meaningful experience.

### *2.3. Asynchronous discussion*

In the setting of group work, discussion becomes a common and basic thing to do as an effort to reach a mutual agreement among members. It is considered an activity which involves written or oral expression of different points of view in a given situation (Cashin, 2011). Due to the development of technology, discussion can be done asynchronously through an online platform. This setting provides the opportunity for the participants to engage in a non-real-time discussion as they may share their ideas and opinions at any time. That is why asynchronous discussion offers flexibility for the students and teacher to interact on their own schedule with a certain time deadline (Syafrizal et al., 2021). As a consequence, students are more prepared in constructing ideas which result in favourable benefits. Aras and Ybnu (2022) mention that asynchronous discussion enables students to acquire a deeper understanding of the topic being discussed. They also state that students can reread all of the sent responses at any time, thus they have more time to reflect on their friends' ideas and provide an appropriate response to the statements afterward. Moreover, Veranika (2017) comes with a similar

idea by saying that in asynchronous discussion students have additional moments to thoroughly prepare what they intend to say before contributing to the discussion which can promote their critical thinking skill and more elaborated content.

In addition, asynchronous discussion can also be used to prompt students to respond to particular ideas and promote supportive communication since learners are the active information senders and receivers throughout the discussion process. Jinot (2020) mentions that asynchronous discussion supports effective learning through interactions in an online learning environment by giving the students a chance to communicate their knowledge. It is motivated by a number of factors, including the students' need for more freedom in presenting their arguments and their desire for more control over the direction of discussion (Dewi & Santosa, 2022). Moreover, Bakar et al. (2013) argue that learners can handle and manage the learning environment in asynchronous discussion. It is believed that allowing students to carry out responsibility for their own learning may foster and encourage ownership of learning. Consequently, this will promote collaborative learning among group members.

Accordingly, it can be concluded that facilitating students to have an asynchronous discussion, can help them to freely express their ideas and share the information that they have. As a result, they can achieve better understanding of the material and develop greater communication with their peers along with the increase of their self-confidence.

### **3. Method**

Using a quantitative approach, this research employed a quasi-experimental study to see the significant improvement of students' writing performance after being taught through asynchronous discussion by implementing Dogme principle. The population of this study consisted of eleventh-grade students from an Islamic private school in Indonesia. The school implemented a blended learning system after the Covid pandemic, enabling the integration of asynchronous discussions within the learning process. In addition, the research applied intact group sampling, a non-probability sampling technique, to determine the samples. A class consisting of 32 intermediate students aged 16 to 17 years old was involved as participants of this research. They were assigned to compulsory English lessons at school.

To gather the data, the researcher administered two tests namely pre-test and post-test in the form of writing assignments. Students were required to write an argumentative essay based on their discussion topics during the learning process. Likewise, students' writings were examined using authentic assessment based on the aspects of writing proposed by Jacobs et al. (1981) which consist of content, vocabulary, grammar, language use, and mechanics. After that, the students' scores were analyzed using the Repeated Measure T-test to see students' writing improvement from the first test to the second test.

#### 4. Findings

After administering pre-test and post-test, the mean scores of both tests were compared in order to know the difference of students' writing in pre-test and post-test. The data for the mean of the tests are served in Table 1.

**Table 1.**

N-gain of pre-test and post-test score

	Mean	N-gain	T-value	Sig.
Pre-test	69.8	12.3	11.569	.000
Post-test	82.1			

Based on table 1 the mean of students' writing test rises from pre-test to post-test. The average score of their writing before getting the treatment is 69.8 which is lower than the mean of students' post-test results with the number 82.1. By having this information, the researcher calculated the gain of the test which led to the result that the students' scores incredibly increased by 12.3 points. It can be assumed that students' writing was enhanced from the first to the second test. Additionally, the difference of the students' scores distribution in pre-test and post-test can be seen in the following table.

**Table 2.**

Distribution of students' scores

Interval	Pre-test		Post-test	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
55-60	1	3%	0	0%
61-65	8	25%	0	0%
66-70	7	22%	0	0%
71-75	8	25%	3	9%
76-80	7	22%	7	22%
81-85	1	3%	14	44%
86-90	0	0%	7	22%
91-95	0	0%	1	3%

It is shown in table 2 that one student got the pre-test score below 61 at around 55 to 60 while none of the students received a grade within this range on the post-test. Similarly, there were eight and seven students who scored between 61 to 65 and 66 to 70 respectively on the pre-test, whereas none of the students obtained a post-test score between 61 to 70. Moreover, the score between 71 to 75 was reached by eight students on the pre-test. On the other hand, only three of the students were scored within the same range on the post-test. It is also seen that the total of students who were graded between 76 to 80 on both tests was equal. In contrast, the highest pre-test score range attained by the students was 81 to 85, having one student in total. Meanwhile, the total number of students who received the score between that range was increased by 13 students on the

post-test. Lastly, seven out of thirty-two students successfully received the score between 86 to 90 and one student got the highest grade above 90.

In addition, to determine whether there is a significant improvement of students' writing achievement after being taught using Dogme approach in asynchronous discussion or not, statistical testing was run. By using Repeated Measures of Statistical Package for Social Science, the researcher saw the level of significance of the test. The hypothesis is proved if  $sign < p$  in which  $p = 0.05$ . The result of the analysis is displayed in the following table.

**Table 3.**

Repeated measure t-test

		Paired Samples Test								
		Paired Differences								
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference								
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower	Upper	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
Pair 1	Posttest - Pretest	12.188	5.959	1.053	10.039	14.336	11.569	31	.000	

Table 3 depicts the result of the computation of the two-tailed value. It can be noticed that the significance of the test is 0.000 which means the hypothesis is accepted since  $0.000 < 0.05$ . It proves that students' writing achievement was improved from pre-test to post-test after being taught through asynchronous discussion using the Dogme approach. Another piece of evidence supporting this conclusion is that the t-value (5.573) shows a higher number than the t-table (2.0395). Hence, it can be implied that there is a significant improvement of students' writing after the implementation of the modified asynchronous discussion.

### 5. Discussion

The findings reveal that students' writing achievement was enhanced after being taught through asynchronous discussion using the Dogme approach. This is proved by the increase in the students' pre-test and post-test scores. Initially, the average of the students' grades was 69.8 which then rose to 82.1 after they received a treatment using the modified method. The genre of the text written by the students was analytical exposition text which expects the writers to develop their arguments regarding a topic. Nevertheless, it is observed in the students' pre-test writings that most students did not elaborate their ideas well. It can be said that students' arguments in their writing lack detail as they only mentioned the main idea without providing further explanation. As a

result, their ideas were not organized well and their writings were considered choppy. Moreover, it was also noticed that the students had problems in constructing sentences using correct and proper grammar. They frequently produced various errors, particularly in terms of tenses, subject and verb agreement, and articles. Occasionally, it was quite difficult to understand the students' ideas due to those problems. It can be said that those overall issues then affected the quality of students' writing in the pre-test.

The implementation of Dogme approach in asynchronous discussion helped the students to overcome the problems. The students were given a chance to have a discussion in a platform before working on their writing. Through this activity, they were enlightened with various ideas and thoughts from their friends. In line with the statement from Thornbury and Meddings (2009) that learners learn and acquire knowledge better in social and dialogic processes. Thus, in other words, the more information the students got, the easier for them to elaborate their writing. Moreover, Daguiani (2022) expresses that the first principle of Dogme enables teachers to allow students to carry on their preferred topics, placing greater emphasis on their interests and needs. Therefore, under the implementation of the modified asynchronous discussion the students were given the opportunity to choose the discussion topic that they were interested in.

In this case, the students prefer to choose topics related to their school life, such as phone checking by teachers, cheating, bullying, and the school's grading system. As a result, during the discussion process, students were eager to express their opinions regarding the topic. They actively responded to their friends' arguments by telling their ideas from their point of view. Besides, some of them tried to connect their arguments with their experiences by mentioning their disagreement regarding the topic discussed. It is assumed that the students were able to generate a large number of ideas and to produce unexpectedly critical arguments due to their deep understanding of the topic as it was in line with the students' lives. Yanti (2018) mentions that the content or topic used in the classroom should be taken from the people in the classroom itself. The experiences, knowledge, ideas, or opinions of the topic being discussed can be used to lead learners to use the language in their talks. In line with that, Thornbury (2005) argues that the topic which is most likely to captivate learners and stimulate the process of acquiring knowledge that is provided by the learners.

As previously discussed, giving the students freedom to choose their discussion topic could encourage them to lively engage with the discussion and come up with a lot of arguments. Consequently, they had a great extent of ideas to be included in their writing as they discussed something that they were concerned about. The ideas gathered during the discussion could help the students prepare their writing outline, assisting the students in arranging the content of their writing. It is mentioned by Wahyudin (2018) that in the process of outlining, the students are trained to write down the topic sentences supported by the detailed sentence. The discussion above aligns with the statement from Alharthi (2021) that language teachers must create conditions where students may regularly write about topics that interest them while receiving feedback from teachers to help them get

better at writing. Abdalgane et al. (2023) add that escalating opportunities for students to showcase their opinions, concerns, and desires is seen as highly valuable, showing that they are a genuine part of the learning process. This may result in the satisfying outcome of their learning, one of which is their capability to produce a well-developed text.

Furthermore, the teacher paid attention to the students' emergent language in the learning process through the use of Dogme in asynchronous discussion. In this research, the teacher observed the language produced by the students during the discussion. She took notes on several errors made by them particularly which caused misunderstandings. After that, students' emergent language was discussed in the class as a part of the lesson by giving the students a chance to correct their errors while at the same time allowing them to gain a new understanding of how to use the language appropriately. It is in line with the idea stated by Coleman (2022) that teachers should take notes of students' errors caused by limited grammatical or lexical knowledge. Then, at an appropriate point in the lesson, the teacher analyses it with the class and may create activities addressing it during that or the following lesson. Similarly, Xerri (2012) mentions that teaching is responsive to the language generated during the lesson and students' errors are seen as an opportunity for learning to take place. This is not perceived as the weaknesses or mistakes committed by learners but rather viewed as opportunities for learners to engage in the process of reflecting and improving their language (Yanti, 2018). In accordance with that statement, providing the students with useful feedback on their errors proved to give a positive impact on the students' writing achievement.

## **6. Conclusion**

The Dogme approach can be effectively integrated into English language teaching by embedding its principles into specific steps of a pedagogical method. This study demonstrates that such modifications can positively impact students' language production, as evidenced by their ability to provide detailed elaboration and employ coherent structures in their writing. Furthermore, identifying the limitations of a teaching method and addressing them—such as by adapting it with a communicative approach like Dogme—is essential for educators. This process ensures that the method fosters meaningful improvements in student learning outcomes. The findings of this study confirm that students taught using the modified Dogme-based method achieved significant score gains, largely due to the autonomy and flexibility they were granted in selecting discussion topics and engaging in dialogue. However, this research was limited to quantitative data analysis within a quantitative framework. Future studies are encouraged to adopt a qualitative approach to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the findings. Such research could offer deeper insights into the underlying factors, motivations, and experiences that quantitative data alone may not fully capture.

## References

- Abdalgane, M., Musabal, A., & Ali, R. (2023). Utilizing Dogme approach to promote EFL learners' oral skills at the tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(1), 100–107. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1301.12>
- Abdulbaki, K., Suhaimi, M., Alsaqqaf, A., & Jawad, W. (2018). The use of the discussion method at university: Enhancement of teaching and learning. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(6), 118–128. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n6p118>
- Akmalovna, A. S. (2022). The information about Dogme language teaching. *Ta'lim fidoyilari*, 5(9), 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6532696>
- Alharthi, S. (2021). From instructed writing to free-writing: A study of EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211007112>
- Aras, M. S., & Ybnu, M. (2022). Using asynchronous discussion for teaching and learning in EFL class during pandemic. *Journal of Teaching and Education for Scholars (JOTES)*, 1(1), 1–6. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/557950/using-asynchronous-discussion-for-teaching-and-learning-in-efl-class-during-pand>
- Ashrafiany, Hasanuddin, & Basalama, N. (2020). The students' writing difficulties in writing an essay based on cognitive process. *Lingua*, 16(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.34005/lingua.v16i1.560>
- Astrid, A., Rukmini, D., Fitriati, S. W., & Syafryadi. (2021). Experiencing the peer feedback activities with teacher's intervention through face-to-face and asynchronous online interaction: The impact on students' writing development and perceptions. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(2), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.17323/JLE.2021.10585>
- Bakar, N. A., Latiff, H., & Hamat, A. (2013). Enhancing ESL learners speaking skills through asynchronous online discussion forum. *Asian Social Science*, 9(9), 224. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n9p224>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Prentice Hall Regents.
- Cashin, W. E. (2011). *Effective classroom discussions*. IDEA paper, 49, 1–5. [https://www.ideaedu.org/idea\\_papers/effective-classroom-discussions/](https://www.ideaedu.org/idea_papers/effective-classroom-discussions/)
- Cheung, W. S., Hew, K. F., & Ng, C. S. L. (2008). Toward an understanding of why students contribute in asynchronous online discussions. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 38(1), 29–50. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.38.1.b>
- Clark, T. (2003). Disadvantages of collaborative online discussion and the advantages of sociability, fun and cliques for online learning. *Proceedings of the 3.1 and 3.3 Working Groups Conference on International Federation for Information Processing: ICT and the Teacher of the Future*, 23–25.
- Coleman, C. C. (2022). *The Dogme approach: A mixed methods study of Czech higher-secondary school pupils' perceptions*. (Master thesis, Masaryk University).
- Daguiani, M. (2022). *Developing students' speaking skill through "Dogme ELT" teaching approach a case study of second year students at the department of English*. Mohamed Kheider University, Biskra. (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Batna 2).

- Daguiani, M., & Chelli, S. (2020). Dogme ELT: Oral expression teachers' perceptions. *Psychological & Educational Studies*, 13(3), 373–383. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/125614>
- Dewi, G. P. R., & Santosa, M. H. (2022). Students' perception on the facilitation strategies provided by teachers in asynchronous online discussion. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 25(1), 160-170. <https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v25i1.3579>
- Erika, H. J. (2022). Comparative study of think-pair-share technique and small group discussion technique in writing descriptive text. *Jurnal Inspiratif Pendidikan*, 11(1), 78–84. <https://doi.org/10.24252/ip.v11i1.27909>
- Febriani, T. N. (2022). Writing is challenging: Factors contributing to undergraduate students' difficulties in writing English essays. *Erudita: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.28918/erudita.v2i1.5441>
- Ghodrati, N., & Gruba, P. (2011). The role of asynchronous discussion forums in the development of collaborative critical thinking. *Proceedings of ASCILITE*, 437–451.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (2014). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Routledge.
- Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Fitzgerald, J. (2013). *Best practices in writing instruction*. Guilford Press.
- Hew, K. F., Cheung, W. S., & Ng, C. S. L. (2010). Student contribution in asynchronous online discussion: A review of the research and empirical exploration. *Instructional Science*, 38(6), 571–606. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9087-0>
- Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: An investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772>
- Hrastinski, S. (2008). Asynchronous and synchronous e-learning. *Educause Quarterly*, 31(4), 51–55. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2008/11/asynchronous-and-synchronous-elearning>
- Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition: a practical approach*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Jinot, B. L. (2020). The asynchronous online discussion forum as a learning strategy in a distance learning online course: A reflective narrative/le forum de discussion. *European Journal of Open Education and E-Learning Studies*, 5(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3859472>
- Karina, R. S. (2017). The effectiveness of using discussion method in teaching writing descriptive text at 10th administrasi perkantoran grade 1st semester in SMKN 1 Subang. *BIORMATIKA Jurnal Ilmiah FKIP Universitas Subang*, 4(2), 2461-2468. <https://ejournal.unsub.ac.id/index.php/FKIP/article/view/151>
- Mansour, N. (2024). Students' and facilitators' experiences with synchronous and asynchronous online dialogic discussions and e-facilitation in understanding the Nature of Science. In *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(12). Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12473-w>
- McMahan, E., Funk, R., Day, S. X., & Coleman, L. (2017). *Literature and the writing process (11th edition)* (11th ed.). Pearson.

- Miftah, Z. (2016). Increasing EFL students' writing abilities using peer response activities via Facebook. *Indonesian EFL Journal: Journal of ELT, Linguistics, and Literature*, 2(2), 1–27. <https://ejournal.uluwiyah.ac.id/index.php/efl/article/view/82>
- Mohammadi, M. O., Jabbari, A. A., & Fazilatfar, A. (2018). The impact of the asynchronous online discussion forum on the Iranian EFL students' writing ability and attitudes. *Applied Research on English Language*, 7(4), 457–486. <https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2018.112792.1351>
- Nataliia, F., & Anastasiia, M. (2024). The Dogme teaching approach: On the benefits of it. *Proceedings of the 13th International Scientific and Practical Conference*, 64–72.
- Olesova, L., & Oliveira, L. C. D. (2013). Learning about the literacy development of English language learners in asynchronous online discussions. *Journal of Education*, 193(2), 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002205741319300203>
- Omar, H., Embi, M. A., & Md Yunus, M. (2012). ESL learners' interaction in an online discussion via Facebook. *Asian Social Science*, 8(11), 67–74. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n11p67>
- Purnamasari, D., Hidayat, D. N., & Kurniawati, L. (2021). An analysis of students' writing skill on English descriptive text. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 14(1), 101-114. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v14i1.7943>
- Riwayatningsih, R., & Sulistyani, S. (2020). The implementation of synchronous and asynchronous e-language learning in EFL setting: A case study. *BASIS Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris*, 7(2), 309–318. <https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v7i2.2484>
- Rofi'i, A., & Herdiawan, R. D. (2024). The optimization of hybrid technology in synchronous and asynchronous speaking class. *Journal of Information System, Technology and Engineering*, 2(1), 142–152. <https://doi.org/10.61487/jiste.v2i1.59>
- Safarnejad, M., & Montashery, I. (2020). The effect of implementing panel discussion on speaking skill of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(4), 445–452. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1004.14>
- Sharma, N., Manjari N, P., & Joshi, H. (2024). Traditional vs modern English language teaching methods: Study based on a survey. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies Trends and Practices*, 14(1), 21–36. <https://doi.org/10.52634/mier/2024/v14/i1/2465>
- Syafrizal, S., Gailea, N., & Savira, A. (2021). Asynchronous online discussion for teaching students' EFL writing and speaking (Indonesian context). *NVEO-Natural Volatiles & Essential Oils Journal*, 8(6), 4949-4954. <https://www.nveo.org/index.php/journal/article/view/4368>
- Thornbury, S. (2005). Dogme: Dancing in the dark. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 7(2), 1-5. <http://www.scottthornbury.com/articles.html>
- Thornbury, S., & Meddings, L. (2009). *Teaching unplugged: Dogme in English language teaching*. Delta Publishing.
- Toba, R., & Noor, W. N. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57-73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>

- Tiene, D. (2000). Online discussions: A survey of advantages and disadvantages compared to face-to-face discussions. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 9(4), 369–382. <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/9551/>
- Toba, R., Noor, W. N., & Sanu, L. O. (2019). The current issues of Indonesian EFL students' writing skills: Ability, problem, and reason in writing comparison and contrast essay. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 19(1), 57–73. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v19i1.1506>
- Veranika, F. (2017). Asynchronous online discussion: Enhancing student participation. In *Proceedings International Conference on Teaching and Education (ICoTE)*, 1(1), 104-111.
- Wahyudin, A. Y. (2018). Maximizing outlining practice in teaching writing for EFL secondary students: A research perspective. *An Overview of Current Issues in Literature, Linguistics, and Language Teaching Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia*, 45(1), 45-50. [www.teknokrat.ac.id](http://www.teknokrat.ac.id)
- Westwood, P. (2008). *What teachers need to know about reading and writing*. ACER Press.
- Xerri, D. (2012). Experimenting with Dogme in a mainstream ESL context. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 59–65. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n9p59>
- Yanti, G. S. (2018). Dogme ELT: The possibility to use the approach to students in higher education. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Prospektif*, 3(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.26418/jpp.v3i1.34444>
- Yao, L. C. (1997). An overview of writing theory research: From cognitive to social-cognitive view. *Journal of Taichung Evening School*, 3(1), 183-202. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/41699256.pdf>