

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, W.R. 1996. *Think, read, react, plan, write, rewrite*. Forth Worth: Holt, Rinehard and Winston.
- Alhaisoni, Eid. 2012. *The Effect of Writing Proficiency on Writing Planning Strategy Use: A Case Study of Saudi Learners of English*. International journal of linguistic 2012 vol.4 no.3 retrieved on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2013
- Atherton J S.2011. *Learning and Teaching: Cognitive theories of learning* [On-line: UK] December, 6 2012
- Badger, R & White B. 2000. *A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing*. ELT Journal,54,153-160
- Barros, L.O. 2010. *Procedural vs. declarative knowledge*. From <http://www.luizotaviobarros.com/2010//09/procedural-vsdeclarative-knowledge.html> retrieved on February, 2nd 2013.
- Bizzell,P. 1986. *Composing Process: an overview. The Teaching of Writing*. Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education.
- Brown, H.D. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York : Pearson Education, Inc.
- Cahyaningati, D.T.2012. *The Effectiveness of CALLA Models on Improving Engineering Students' Communicative Competence*. UNIPDU article vol.1 No.1 2012
- Cahyono ,B at al. 2004. *The Tapestry of English Language Teaching and Learning* .Malang: State University of Malang.
- Callaghan, M & Rothery, J.1988. *Teaching Factual Writing: A Genre Based Approach*. Sydney: NSW Department of Education.
- Chamot, A.U. 2004. *Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching*. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching Vol.1, No.1, pp. 14-26. Retrieved on July 3<sup>rd</sup> ,2012. .
- Chamot, A.U.& Robbins,J. 2005. *The CALLA Model : Strategies for ELL Student Success*. From <http://calla.ws>. Retrieved on November 23<sup>th</sup> , 2012.

- Clouston, M. 1997. *Language Learning Strategies: An Overview for L2 Teachers* from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Lessard-CloustonStrategy.html> retrieved on February, 6<sup>th</sup>, 2013
- Cotton, Kathleen. 2001. *Teaching Composition: Research on Effective Practice* from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/2/topsyn2.html>. Retrieved on November, 23<sup>th</sup>, 2012.
- Dakun, W. 2006. *Learning Strategies and Implications for Second Language Teaching*. Indonesia Journal of English Language Teaching vol. 2 no. 1 retrieved on October, 3<sup>rd</sup> 2012.
- Dean, Deborah. 2010. *What works in writing instruction. Research and Practice*. USA: National Council of Teacher of English
- Derewianka, B. 1992. *Exploring How Text Work*. Australia : Primary English Teaching Association.
- Gay, L.R. 2006. *Educational Research*. Columbus, Ohio : Pearson
- Gebhard, J.G. 1996. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A self-development and Methodology guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gibson, Ken. 2007. *Unlock the Einstein Inside: Applying New Brain Science to Wake Up The Smart in Your Child* USA : LearningRx
- Grinder, Clint. 1993. *Foundation of Cognitive Theory: A concise Review* from [www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED372324.pdf](http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED372324.pdf) retrieved on February 20<sup>th</sup> 2013.
- Harwood, N. 2005. *The Sample Approach: Teaching Writing with Cambridge Examination Classes* from <http://privatewww.essex.ac.uk/~nharwood/sampapproach.htm>. Retrieved on November 23<sup>th</sup>, 2012.
- Hughes, Arthur. 2003. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Karbalei, Alireza. 2011. *Assessing Reading Strategy Training based on CALLA model in EFL and ESL context*. From <http://www.redalyc.org/src/inicio/ArtPdfRed.jsp?iCve=255019722006> retrieved on December, 21<sup>th</sup> 2012.

- Kihlstrom, J.F. 2011. *How Students Learn and How We Can Help Them*. From [http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~khillstrm/GSI\\_2011.htm](http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~khillstrm/GSI_2011.htm).
- Liu, J.2010. *Language Learning Strategies and Its Training Model*. Journal of International education studies vol.3, no.3 from [www.ccsenet.org/ies](http://www.ccsenet.org/ies) retrieved on December, 10th 2012.
- Lv, F& Chen, H. 2010. *A study of Metacognitive Strategies-Based Writing Instruction for Vocational College Students*. from [www.ccsenet.org/elt](http://www.ccsenet.org/elt) vol.3, no.3, September 2010. Retrieved on November,20 , 2012.
- Marimuthu et.al 2011. *Metacognitive Strategy training through the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) as a way to improve reading comprehension performance among students of an English Language Course at UiTM Penang*. Malaysia Journal of ELT Research Vol.7(1), 2011. Retrieved on December 21<sup>st</sup> ,2012
- Massi, M.P.2001. *Interactive Writing in the EFL Class: a repertoire of Task* from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Massi-WritingTasks.html>. Retrieved on December, 9 2012
- Miska, Amanda. 2004. Classroom Modeling: Scaffolding Learning or Stifling? An Inquiry from <http://www.ed.psu.edu/englishpds/inquiry/projects/miska04.htm> retrieved on February, 20th 2013.
- Mu, Congjun.2005. *A Taxonomy of ESL Writing Strategies*. In *proceedings redesigning pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice*, pages pp.1-10, Singapore from [https://eprints.qut.edu.au/secure/00000064/01/congjunmu\\_paper.doc](https://eprints.qut.edu.au/secure/00000064/01/congjunmu_paper.doc) retrieved on March, 10th, 2013
- Oxford, R. 1990. *Language Learning strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*.New York : . Newbury House Publishers.
- O'Malley, J and Chamot, A.U. 1994. *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach*. N.J: Addison Wesley, Reading MA. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Phelps, Louise W. 2000. *An Expanded Concept of writing: The Studio Environment* from

<http://www.syr.edu/pub/expandedconcept.html>. Retrieved on December, 9 2012

Setiyadi, Bambang. 2006. *Metode Penelitian untuk Pengajaran Bahasa Asing*. Yogyakarta : Graha Ilmu .

Short, Deborah. 1991. *Integrating Language And Content Instruction: Strategies And Techniques*. from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu> retrieved on March, 10<sup>th</sup> 2013.

Thompson, A. 2001. *"Don't Understand This!" Meeting the Academic Needs of ESL Students*. Retrieved on November 27<sup>th</sup> , 2012.

## Appendix 1

Name :

Class :

NIS :

**Angket**

A. Berilah tanda checklist (√) pada salah satu jawaban dari pertanyaan-pertanyaan di bawah ini. Jawablah dengan jujur dan sesuai dengan hati nurani tanpa paksaan dan pengaruh dari orang lain. Jawaban anda tidak akan berpengaruh pada nilai tulisan anda. Pilihlah satu dari lima pilihan jawaban yang tersedia sebagai berikut:

SS : Sangat setuju

S : Setuju

SM : Sulit menentukan

TS : Tidak setuju

STS :Sangat tidak setuju

No	Pernyataan	SS	S	SM	TS	STS
1.	Pelajaran menulis dalam bahasa inggris adalah pelajaran yang penting bagi saya					
2.	Saya tertarik jika Metode CALLA di terapkan di kelas pada pelajaran menulis					
3.	Penggunaan metode CALLA model Instruction membantu saya menulis dalam bahasa inggris					
4..	Penggunaan metode CALLA model instruction membantu meningkatkan kualitas tulisan saya					

5.	Saya lebih termotivasi untuk bisa menulis dalam bahasa inggris setelah belajar dengan menggunakan metode CALLA					
6.	Penggunaan metode CALLA sesuai dengan kemampuan bahasa inggris saya					

B. Jawablah pertanyaan - pertanyaan di bawah ini !

1. Bagaimana pendapat anda tentang metode CALLA model instruction dalam pelajaran bahasa inggris khususnya menulis?
2. Menurut anda, apakah metode CALLA model instruction sesuai jika digunakan di kelas anda?
3. Apakah anda tertarik belajar menulis dalam bahasa inggris dengan menggunakan metode CALLA model instruction?
4. Jika anda dapat memilih, apakah anda akan memilih pengajaran bahasa inggris khususnya menulis dengan menggunakan metode CALLA model instruction atau pengajaran dengan metode lain yang telah di ajarkan oleh guru sebelumnya? Apa alasan anda?
5. Tuliskan pesan dan kesan anda terhadap penggunaan metode CALLA model instruction di dalam kelas!

## Appendix 2

## The list of students' name for experimental group

No	Name	Group	Initial
1	LAODE MUAMAR KADAS HIDAYAT	Experimental	student A1
2	SARIATI	Experimental	student A2
3	IRIAMANA LIYASYARA	Experimental	student A3
4	AHMAD JUFRI SAMANDI	Experimental	student A4
5	WD.ST RAHAYU FATHANAH	Experimental	student A5
6	NURASMAWATI	Experimental	student A6
7	WD.OKTAVIA	Experimental	student A7
8	SUMARDIN	Experimental	student A8
9	RRIN WAHYUNI	Experimental	student A9
10	WILDA LESTARI	Experimental	student A10
11	SRI IIT PARASWATI NUR ANISSA	Experimental	student A11
12	MARLIN	Experimental	student A12
13	HENDRIAWAN	Experimental	student A13
14	WD MIMI	Experimental	student A14
15	LM ASRI MUNANDAR	Experimental	student A15
16	SAMSIDARWATI	Experimental	student A16
17	NINA SULARIDA	Experimental	student A17
18	L A ALI	Experimental	student A18
19	WA OBA	Experimental	student A19
20	BOGEIMANSYAH	Experimental	student A20
21	WD MULIANA	Experimental	student A21
22	M.SURIONO	Experimental	student A22
23	MARLIBI	Experimental	student A23
24	ANDI SYAMSIDAR	Experimental	student A24
25	LIFIN SAPUTRA	Experimental	student A25
26	ZAEMBARA MATOMBOY	Experimental	student A26
27	SARTINA	Experimental	student A27
28	DENI RAHMAT NURHIDAYAT	Experimental	student A28
29	HADIS ALI MANUSA	Experimental	student A29
30	UMAR MARZUKI	Experimental	student A30

The list of students name for control group.

No	Name	Group	Initial
1	SUSI KARTIKA	control	student B1
2	LA ODE YADI	control	student B2
3	NINIS ILMI OKTASARI	control	student B3
4	SUKRI	control	student B4
5	VIVI NOVITALIA	control	student B5
6	EVA ASNA	control	student B6
7	WA ODE SITI NUR ANISA	control	student B7
8	ROSMINI	control	student B8
9	MUSTAUFAN DWI WIBOWO	control	student B9
10	RITA ANJARIN	control	student B10
11	RAHMASARI	control	student B11
12	RUKMAN	control	student B12
13	NENONG SYAHPUTRA	control	student B13
14	AJI ISRAL	control	student B14
15	SUMARNI	control	student B15
16	WA ODE RATNA	control	student B16
17	HARTATI	control	student B17
18	YUSFINA SARI	control	student B18
19	NURLISA HANDAYANI	control	student B19
20	SITTI SARNIDA	control	student B20
21	ASRIANI	control	student B21
22	ANGGUN SYAFITRI	control	student B22
23	SARI MAYA	control	student B23
24	SYAHRIN ARIS MANTO	control	student B24
25	RATNAWATI	control	student B25
26	AFRIANTO KURNIAWAN	control	student B26
27	LISNA	control	student B27
28	IRMAWATI	control	student B28
29	WA ODE INTAN	control	student B29
30	AHMAD ASRI	control	student B30





## Appendix 4

TEACHING WRITING BY USING CALLA MODEL INSTRUCTION  
LESSON PLAN

## 1. Objectives

In the end of the lesson, it is expected that students will be able to write a recount text (personal recount)

## 2. Activities

## a. Preparation

- ❖ Greet the students
- ❖ Ask the students if they have ever written a diary. What topic they usually write on their diary and how they did it? What specific strategy that they usually use?
- ❖ Ask students to share their strategies in pairs.
- ❖ Ask one or two students to tell the whole class about his/ her strategy in writing particularly in writing their experience in the past time. Teacher makes a list of students' strategies that they mentioned.

## b. Presentation

Teacher introduces the new concept or language skill. Then, she informs the students about the new strategy. Teacher names the strategy, explains how to use it, tells when to use it, models it and explain its importance.

## c. Practice

Students are asked to practice the new strategy into their writing text.

## d. Evaluation

Students are asked to do self-evaluation through class discussion.

## e. Expansion

Students are asked to relate and transfer strategy use to other task, subject area and aspects of their lives. Teacher will tell them an example of this stage before asking students to do it.

3. Closing activity
  - a. Motivating students
  - b. Greetings.

## Appendix 5

## TEACHING WRITING BY USING CONVENTIONAL WAY

## LESSON PLAN

## 1. Objectives

In the end of the lesson, it is expected that students will be able to write a recount text (personal recount)

## 2. Activities

a. Greet the students

b. Introduce students about recount text

c. Give chance to students to address questions related the text explained

d. Ask students to write the text individually

## 3. Closing activity

a. Motivating students

b. Greetings.



## Appendix 7

## Plan of teaching schedule

No	Meeting	Topic of writing	Activities
1	1	Experience in the first time at SMA	Researcher introduces herself Informing the objective of the activity Dividing the classes into two groups Administering pre-test
2	2	Experience in the last holiday	Implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self evaluation Expansion
3	3	Experience in last Lebaran/ Christmas	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self evaluation Expansion
4	4	The saddest experience	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self evaluation Expansion
5	5	The funny experience	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self evaluation Expansion
6	6	The most scare experience	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self evaluation Expansion
7	7	experience when visiting Napabale beach	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice

			Self evaluation Expansion
8	8	experience in joining a competition	implementing CALLA model Preparation Presentation Practice Self-evaluation Expansion
9	9	Experience of your first time in SMA	Administering post-test
10	10		administering questionnaire conducting interview

## Appendix 8

### Model of recount text

#### My Day

I had a terrible day yesterday. First, I woke up an hour late because my alarm clock didn't go off. Then, I was in such hurry that I burned my hand when I was making breakfast. After breakfast, I got dressed so quickly that I forgot to wear socks.

Next, I ran out of the house trying to get the 9.30 bus, but of course I missed it. I wanted to take a taxi, but I didn't have enough money.

Finally, I walked the three miles to my school only to discover that it was Sunday! I hope I never have a day as the one I had yesterday.

Taken from Developing English Competencies for Grade X



## Appendix 9

## Expanding Jacobs et. al Writing Scale

(Jacobs et al. (1981) as cited in Hughes, 2003, p. 104)

## Content

ASPECT	SCORE	LEVEL/ CRITERIA
CONTENT	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to the topic, but lacks detail
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate

30(excellent) : present a clear understanding about the subject,substantive, main points related to the topic are discussed, both major and minor details are clearly illustrated and without any extraneous materials.

29 (excellent) : presents a clear understanding about the subject, substantive, main points related to the topic are discussed, major details are clearly (thoroughly) illustrated, missing 1-2 (not more than 3) minor details that do not affect the overall content, no extraneous materials.

- 28 (very Good) : presents a clear understanding about the subject, mostly substantive, main points related to the topic are discussed, major details are presented but missing some minor details(more than 3) yet the whole content was not affected, no extraneous materials.
- 27(very good) : presents a clear understanding about the subject, mostly substantive, some main points related to the topic are presented, major details are complete but missing several minor details,no extraneous materials.
- 26 (good) : presents some knowledge of the subject, presents adequate range of main points, development of thesis are complete but limited, mostly relevant to subject, major details are discussed but lacks in minor detail, there are some extraneous materials
- 25 (good) : presents some knowledge of the subject, presents adequate range of the main points, development of thesis are complete but limited, major details are discussed, few minor details are missing, there are some extraneous materials
- 24 (average) : presents some knowledge of the subject, presents adequate range of main points, development of thesis are complete but limited, only major details are discussed, less minor details, there are some extraneous materials
- 23 (average) : presents some knowledge of the subject, presents less ranged main points, development of thesis are complete but limited, only major details are discussed, most minor details are missing, there are some extraneous materials
- 22 (average) :presents some knowledge of the subject,presents less ranged main points, development of thesis are complete but limited, only major details are discussed (limitedly) with less minor details, there are some extraneous materials
- 21 (fair) : limited knowledge of the subject, little substance, only few main points are discussed, inadequate development of topic

- that does not convey the sense of completeness, missing 1 major detail with little minor details, shows communication breakdown
- 20 (fair) : limited knowledge of the subject, only few main points are discussed, inadequate development of thesis that does not convey the sense of completeness, missing 1-2 major details with less minor details, shows communication breakdown
- 19 (fair) : limited knowledge of the subject, only few main points are discussed, inadequate development of thesis that does not convey the sense of completeness, missing some major details with the absence of minor details, shows communication breakdown
- 18 (Poor) : less understanding of the subjects, less main points discussed, inadequate development of thesis that does not convey the sense of completeness, missing some major details with the absence of minor details, shows communication breakdown
- 17 (Poor) : less understanding of the subject, less main point discussed, inadequate development of thesis that does not convey the sense of completeness, missing some major details with the absence of minor details, shows communication breakdown.
- 16 (very poor) : does not show knowledge of the subject, non substantive, not pertinent (not relevance to the subject), shows communication break down
- 15 (very poor) : does not show knowledge of the subject, non substantive that makes it hard to find the main point of the discussion, not pertinent, shows severe communication break down
- 14 (very poor) : does not show any knowledge of the subject, not substantive or does not present the main point of the discussion, not pertinent, shows severe communication break down
- 13 (very poor) : does not show any knowledge of the subject, Not enough to evaluate.

## Organization

ORGANIZATION	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate

20 (excellent) : fluent expression (the ideas flows smoothly and are building one another), ideas are clearly stated and supported, all ideas are directed concisely to the central focus of the subject, well-organized (there are beginning, middle and end of paragraph), presents logical sequencing and supported by the correct use of transitional markers, cohesive.

19(very good) : fluent expression, ideas are clearly stated and supported, most ideas are directed concisely to the central focus of the subject, well-organized, presents some logical sequencing, cohesive.

18 (very good) : the flow of ideas are clear (not quite smoothly but clear), ideas are clearly stated and but not all ideas are well-supported, well-organized, presents some logical sequencing, cohesive.

17 (good) : shows flow of ideas but sometimes choppy (wavy, or talk about something different for a while), loosely organized but main ideas stand out, ideas are clearly stated but limitedly supported, logical but incomplete sequencing.

- 16 (good) : shows flow of ideas but sometimes choppy (wavy, or talk about something different for a while), loosely organized but main ideas stand out, ideas are sometimes not directed to the central focus of the paper and are limitedly supported, logical but incomplete sequencing.
- 15 (average) : limited development of ideas, sometimes choppy, organization is unclear but main ideas still stated, limited of introductory, body and conclusion, the logical sequencing of the points are limitedly developed,
- 14 (average) : limited development of ideas, mostly choppy, organization is unclear but main ideas are still stated, very limited of introductory, body and conclusion, the logical sequencing of the points are limitedly developed
- 13 (fair) : non-fluent (the flow of ideas are not clear), development of ideas are limited, some ideas are confused or disconnected, and lacks logical sequencing,
- 12 (fair) : non-fluent, development of ideas are limited, some ideas are confused and disconnected, few logical sequencing.
- 11 (Poor) : ideas are hardly fluent, limited development of ideas, most of ideas are disconnected or confused, very little logical sequencing.
- 10 (poor) : ideas are mostly not developed, confusing and disconnected, no logical sequencing.
- 9 (very poor) : ideas presented does not communicate, no organization
- 8 (very poor) : very limited ideas presented are disconnected, no organization
- 7 (very poor) : not enough to evaluate

## Vocabulary

VOCABULARY	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/ idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/ idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	9-7	VERY POOR: essential translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate

20 (excellent) : sophisticated range, effective word/idiom choice and usage, shows word form mastery, shows appropriate register.

19 (very good) : used wide range variety of words, effective word/idiom choice and usage, shows word form mastery and appropriate register.

18 (very good) : illustrate some range variety of words, some miss-used of word/idiom choice and usage (not more than 2), shows word form mastery, shows appropriate register.

17 (good) :adequate range variety of words, occasional errors on words/idioms form, choice and usage but meaning are not obscured.

16 (good) : adequate range of variety of words, occasional errors (more than 3) on words/idioms form, choice and usage but meaning are not obscured.

- 15 (average) : some range of words are provided, some erroneous on words/idioms form, choice and usage but doesn't obscure meaning.
- 14 (average) : some range of words are provided with some erroneous on words/ idioms form, choice and usage but meaning are not obscured yet the percentage of the errors are bigger than point (15)
- 13 (Fair) : limited range of words, frequent errors of words/idiom form, choice and usage that cause meaning to be confused or obscured.
- 12 (Fair) : limited range of words, dominated by errors of words/idiom form, choice and usage that leads to confused or obscured meaning.
- 11 (poor) : words are hardly ranged, dominated by errors of words/idioms form, choice and usage that leads to confused or obscured meaning
- 10 (poor) : words are not ranged at all, mostly erroneous of words/idioms form, choice and usage that make the meaning confused and obscured.
- 9 (very poor) : essentially translation, little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, and word form
- 8 (very poor) : essentially translation shows very limited knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms and word form
- 7(very poor) :Not enough to evaluate.

### Language Use

LANGUAGE USE	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions <i>but meaning seldom obscured</i>
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/ complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/ function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/ or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate.

- 25 (excellent) : show effective complex construction, few errors on agreement, tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition (only 10-11 errors on all these combined, e.g, 2 errors in agreement, 2 in tense, 1 in pronouns and 1 in preposition and so on)
- 24 (excellent) : effective complex construction, several errors on agreement, tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition (14-15 errors combined).
- 23 (very good) : show affective complex construction (but few flawed), several errors on agreement, tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition (16-20 errors combined),



22 (very good) : show affective complex construction (but few flawed), several errors on agreement, tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition 21-26 errors combined).

All errors in this section are still around 5-25% of the overall paper)

21 (Good) : effective but simple construction, minor problems in complex constructions, several errors of agreement tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition ( about 27-30 errors combined).

20 (good) : effective in simple construction but few major problems appear in complex construction, several errors of agreement tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition ( about 31-34 errors combined).

19 (average) : hardly presentseffective complex constructions (the complex constructions produced were ineffective), shows several problems in simple construction, several errors of agreement tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition ( about 31-35 errors combined) and meaning seldom confused or obscured.

18 (average) : mostly simple construction with some minor problems, hardly presents any complex constructions, neither effective (the complex constructions produced were ineffective), shows some few problems in simple construction, several errors of agreement tense, number, word/order function, articles, pronouns and preposition ( about 34-40 errors combined) and meaning seldom confused or obscured.

(All errors in this section are still around 25-50% of the overall paper)

17 (fair) : major problems in simple/complex construction, frequent errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 50-55% of the overall paper)

- 16 (fair) : major problems in simple/complex construction, frequent errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 55-60% of the overall paper)
- 15 (fair) : major problems in simple/complex construction, frequent errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 60-65% of the overall paper)
- 14 (fair) : major problems in simple/complex construction, mostly errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 65-70% of the overall paper)
- 13 (poor) : only present simple construction with some major problems, mostly errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 70-75% of the overall paper)
- 12 (poor) : only present simple construction with some major problems, mostly errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 75-80% of the overall paper)
- 11 (poor) : only present simple construction with some major problems, mostly errors in negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, preposition, and or fragments, run-ons, deletions, meaning confused or obscured. (Errors are around 80-85% of the overall paper)
- 10 (very poor) : virtually no mastery of sentence constructions rules, dominated by errors, (85-90 % of the paper are dominated by errors)

- 9 (very poor) : virtually no mastery of sentence constructions rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate
- 8 (very poor) : virtually no mastery of sentence constructions rules, dominated by errors, does not communicate at all (the sentences constructed are hardly recognizable)
- 7 (very poor) : virtually no mastery of sentence constructions rules, mostly errors on paper, the meaning can hardly be recognized)
- 6 (very poor) : the length of the paper is not much (still enough but mostly errors)
- 5 (very poor) : not enough to evaluate

### Mechanics

MECHANICS	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i>
	3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate

## Appendix 10

Example of student's writing of experimental group for pre-test

NAMA: ENI, RAHMAT, NURHIDAYAT      No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date: X / 0

The first time I join senior High School I kabawo. I am very happy because finally I can at senior-High School I kabawo. when that I did not like mos because boy were mos if ordered to razor then bak I like mos if conford agenda when mos and when PBB agenda my friend david fight with a manager to teach we PBB and my friend david under at office but he is not in office at. the mad because He is not guilty.

At the time finish mos next day we lift free chair and table to seat us.

Example of student's writing of experimental group for post-test

Nama : Dani Rahmad M. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Kelas : XB Date : \_\_\_\_\_

My first experience in JMA  
The first time I joined in SMA Negeri 1 Kabaro, I was very happy because finally I could be a student in that school.

One agenda for new students was joining MOS (Masa orientasi siswa). I did not like MOS because my senior asked us to do things that my friends and I did not like it.

One time, one of my friends had a fight with a senior who taught us about PBB (Peraturan Baris Berbaris). Then, he was brought in to school office. Fortunately, he was not guilty and back to us.

That was my experience in the first time in JMA 1 Kabaro. I would not forget that experience.

## Appendix 11

Example of student's writing of control group for pre-test

Name: MUSTAFAH Dwi Wibawa  
Egl: 26-03-2013 Date:

Match new friend

In the first time 'enter in SMA N  
1 Kabaro. I am very happy because I can  
find many new friend there is. Except  
that, I am very happy because I can  
enter class XA. From formerly, I wish  
~~go to~~ enter class XA because my  
follow class XA is class cleaver and  
diligent. My friends in class XA very  
good to me. Except that, ~~my friends to~~  
~~class~~ they is beautiful and handsome.  
Although like that, I also a little sad  
because my good friend be in class other.  
He is there is class XAF. From SMP,  
~~he is my good friend~~ he is my good  
friend and we always together with.

Example of student's writing of control group for post-test

Nama : MUSEADIFAH DEWI KARBOWO  
Kelas : XI

No

" My Experience when it came to SMAN"  
 1 Kabawa

The first time into the SMAN 1  
 Kabawa, I am very happy because  
 I can met new faces here. Many  
 students who come here, and after  
 that we were gave a form to fill  
 out our data. After filled my data,  
 I also put the form into the map.  
 But I am very trouble in did so.  
 I scared Later ~~to~~ corrupted forms.  
 fortunately there are my friends  
 who want to helped.

After that we were gave our form  
 to the teacher in charge. After that,  
 I was waited for the number of  
 participants and after a number of  
 participants, I was came back to  
 home.

So, that was my experience when  
 I first got into SMAN 1 Kabawa.

## Appendix 12

## Student's self evaluation note

Wa Ode Siti Rahayu Jathannah

XB

1. Pendapat saya tentang strategi modelling dalam menulis yaitu strategi modeling dapat membantu saya dalam menulis karena dengan strategi modeling saya dapat mengetahui tata cara urutan dalam menulis sebuah cerita dalam bahasa Inggris yang di setuju oleh orang Inggris asli. Yang awalnya saya tidak mengetahui strategi modelling dan saya kesusahan dalam menulis. Setelah saya mengetahui strategi modelling, saya tidak kesusahan lagi dalam menulis karena saya sudah mengetahui tata urutannya.

2. Tanpa strategi modeling tulisan saya kurang baik karena saya tidak dapat membedakan di paragraf mana saya harus menyebutkan tempat, waktu dan waktu kejadian tsb / pengalaman saya. Saya juga tidak mengetahui di paragraf mana saya harus mengemukakan harapan dan komentar. Namun setelah mengetahui strategi modeling, saya dapat mengetahui di paragraf mana saya harus menempatkan tempat dan waktu kejadian, serta komentar dan harapan saya.



## Appendix 13

## Raters' reliability

## A. Try out of raters' scoring

Sample	Raters		
	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Student A	65	75	60
Student B	43	50	52
Student C	80	75	90
Student D	65	55	60
Student E	85	78	80

**Intraclass Correlation Coefficient**

	Intraclass Correlation <sup>a</sup>	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.841 <sup>b</sup>	.428	.981	14.004	4	8	.001
Average Measures	.941	.692	.993	14.004	4	8	.001

The intraclass correlation coefficient of three raters is 0,941

## B. Raters' scoring after try out

Sample	Raters		
	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Student A	61	65	65
Student B	46	48	56
Student C	89	82	85
Student D	55	50	57
Student E	86	89	87

**Intraclass Correlation Coefficient**

	Intraclass Correlation <sup>a</sup>	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	.961 <sup>b</sup>	.839	.995	78.201	4	8	.000
Average Measures	.987	.940	.998	78.201	4	8	.000

The intraclass correlation coefficient of three raters is 0,987 (high correlation)

# t Table

cum. prob	$t_{.50}$	$t_{.75}$	$t_{.80}$	$t_{.85}$	$t_{.90}$	$t_{.95}$	$t_{.975}$	$t_{.99}$	$t_{.995}$	$t_{.999}$	$t_{.9995}$
one-tail	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.25</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.025</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.0005</b>
two-tails	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.40</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.001</b>
df											
1	0.000	1.000	1.376	1.963	3.078	6.314	12.71	31.82	63.66	318.31	636.62
2	0.000	0.816	1.061	1.386	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925	22.327	31.599
3	0.000	0.765	0.978	1.250	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841	10.215	12.924
4	0.000	0.741	0.941	1.190	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604	7.173	8.610
5	0.000	0.727	0.920	1.156	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032	5.893	6.869
6	0.000	0.718	0.906	1.134	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707	5.208	5.959
7	0.000	0.711	0.896	1.119	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499	4.785	5.408
8	0.000	0.706	0.889	1.108	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355	4.501	5.041
9	0.000	0.703	0.883	1.100	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250	4.297	4.781
10	0.000	0.700	0.879	1.093	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169	4.144	4.587
11	0.000	0.697	0.876	1.088	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106	4.025	4.437
12	0.000	0.695	0.873	1.083	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055	3.930	4.318
13	0.000	0.694	0.870	1.079	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012	3.852	4.221
14	0.000	0.692	0.868	1.076	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977	3.787	4.140
15	0.000	0.691	0.866	1.074	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947	3.733	4.073
16	0.000	0.690	0.865	1.071	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921	3.686	4.015
17	0.000	0.689	0.863	1.069	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898	3.646	3.965
18	0.000	0.688	0.862	1.067	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878	3.610	3.922
19	0.000	0.688	0.861	1.066	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861	3.579	3.883
20	0.000	0.687	0.860	1.064	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.528	2.845	3.552	3.850
21	0.000	0.686	0.859	1.063	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831	3.527	3.819
22	0.000	0.686	0.858	1.061	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819	3.505	3.792
23	0.000	0.685	0.858	1.060	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807	3.485	3.768
24	0.000	0.685	0.857	1.059	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797	3.467	3.745
25	0.000	0.684	0.856	1.058	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787	3.450	3.725
26	0.000	0.684	0.856	1.058	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779	3.435	3.707
27	0.000	0.684	0.855	1.057	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771	3.421	3.690
28	0.000	0.683	0.855	1.056	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763	3.408	3.674
29	0.000	0.683	0.854	1.055	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756	3.396	3.659
30	0.000	0.683	0.854	1.055	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750	3.385	3.646
40	0.000	0.681	0.851	1.050	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704	3.307	3.551
60	0.000	0.679	0.848	1.045	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660	3.232	3.460
80	0.000	0.678	0.846	1.043	1.292	1.664	1.990	2.374	2.639	3.195	3.416
100	0.000	0.677	0.845	1.042	1.290	1.660	1.984	2.364	2.626	3.174	3.390
1000	0.000	0.675	0.842	1.037	1.282	1.646	1.962	2.330	2.581	3.098	3.300
<b>Z</b>	0.000	0.674	0.842	1.036	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576	3.090	3.291
	0%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	95%	98%	99%	99.8%	99.9%
	<b>Confidence Level</b>										

## Appendix 15

Pictures of teaching process in control group



## Appendix 15

Pictures of teaching process in experimental group



Appendix 16 Students' Score For Experimental and Control Group  
Experimental Class for Pre-test

No	name	Content				organization				vocabulary				language use				mechanics				OVERALL
		rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	SCORE
1	student A1	20	25	23	22.67	13	15	14	14.00	11	10	12	11.00	14	12	13	13.00	3	3	3	3.00	63.67
2	student A2	18	17	19	18.00	8	9	10	9.00	9	10	12	10.33	9	10	12	10.33	2	2	3	2.33	50.00
3	student A3	28	25	26	26.33	19	18	17	18.00	17	17	18	17.33	21	18	20	19.67	4	4	4	4.00	85.33
4	student A4	16	17	18	17.00	12	9	11	10.67	11	11	13	11.67	13	11	12	12.00	3	2	3	2.67	54.00
5	student A5	24	26	26	25.33	18	18	19	18.33	18	18	18	18.00	22	23	21	22.00	4	4	3	3.67	87.33
6	student A6	23	22	20	21.67	14	15	12	13.67	13	12	12	12.33	14	13	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	64.00
7	student A7	17	19	20	18.67	17	16	15	16.00	13	11	12	12.00	11	13	14	12.67	2	2	2	2.00	61.33
8	student A8	17	18	19	18.00	14	11	13	12.67	10	9	11	10.00	9	11	9	9.67	2	2	2	2.00	52.33
9	student A9	18	18	20	18.67	12	11	13	12.00	14	14	15	14.33	13	13	15	13.67	3	3	3	3.00	61.67
10	student A10	24	23	25	24.00	13	13	15	13.67	14	15	16	15.00	18	18	20	18.67	3	4	4	3.67	75.00
11	student A11	14	15	15	14.67	9	8	8	8.33	8	6	7	7.00	7	6	7	6.67	2	2	3	2.33	39.00
12	student A12	22	20	21	21.00	13	12	12	12.33	13	13	13	13.00	16	17	15	16.00	3	3	3	3.00	65.33
13	student A13	16	15	17	16.00	7	8	8	7.67	10	10	11	10.33	9	7	8	8.00	3	2	2	2.33	44.33
14	student A14	13	13	13	13.00	7	7	7	7.00	7	8	7	7.33	6	5	6	5.67	2	2	2	2.00	35.00
15	student A15	17	15	16	16.00	8	8	9	8.33	10	11	12	11.00	9	7	8	8.00	3	2	2	2.33	45.67
16	student A16	19	18	20	19.00	9	9	10	9.33	11	13	12	12.00	7	8	8	7.67	2	3	2	2.33	50.33
17	student A17	26	27	27	26.67	17	16	17	16.67	16	15	16	15.67	19	20	20	19.67	3	4	4	3.67	82.33
18	student A18	16	17	19	17.33	10	8	9	9.00	10	13	12	11.67	7	8	8	7.67	2	3	2	2.33	48.00
19	student A19	15	13	13	13.67	7	7	9	7.67	7	7	7	7.00	5	5	5	5.00	2	2	2	2.00	35.33
20	student A20	13	13	15	13.67	10	10	11	10.33	12	13	12	12.33	11	11	10	10.67	3	2	2	2.33	49.33
21	student A21	13	13	13	13.00	7	7	7	7.00	7	7	7	7.00	5	5	6	5.33	2	2	2	2.00	34.33
22	student A22	12	13	15	13.33	10	10	11	10.33	11	13	13	12.33	7	9	8	8.00	2	3	3	2.67	46.67
23	student A23	18	19	20	19.00	10	11	10	10.33	14	14	15	14.33	12	13	14	13.00	3	3	3	3.00	59.67
24	student A24	23	24	23	23.33	17	16	17	16.67	14	13	15	14.00	16	17	17	16.67	3	4	4	3.67	74.33
25	student A25	22	21	23	22.00	13	14	13	13.33	11	11	12	11.33	12	13	14	13.00	2	3	3	2.67	62.33
26	student A26	22	21	23	22.00	11	11	12	11.33	12	11	13	12.00	12	12	14	12.67	3	3	3	3.00	61.00
27	student A27	15	18	16	16.33	12	11	12	11.67	10	10	12	10.67	7	8	10	8.33	2	2	2	2.00	49.00
28	student A28	22	21	23	22.00	16	16	15	15.67	12	12	11	11.67	13	12	11	12.00	4	3	3	3.33	64.67
29	student A29	21	23	22	22.00	16	18	17	17.00	14	17	16	15.67	14	17	16	15.67	3	3	3	3.00	73.33
30	student A30	20	21	19	20.00	13	15	13	13.67	13	12	13	12.67	14	16	13	14.33	2	2	2	2.00	62.67

## Experimental Class Score for Post-test

No	name	Content				organization				vocabulary				language use				mechanics				Overall Score
		rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	
1	student A1	23	21	24	22.67	14	15	15	14.67	14	13	14	13.67	14	15	14	14.33	4	4	3	3.67	69.00
2	student A2	21	19	19	19.67	11	10	10	10.33	11	13	12	12.00	12	11		11.50	3	3	3	3.00	56.50
3	student A3	29	28	28	28.33	17	19	19	18.33	17	18	19	18.00	21	20	23	21.33	4	4	4	4.00	90.00
4	student A4	17	19	17	17.67	12	10	12	11.33	12	13	13	12.67	12	13	13	12.67	4	3	3	3.33	57.67
5	student A5	28	29	30	29.00	20	19	19	19.33	19	19	20	19.33	23	22	23	22.67	4	5	4	4.33	94.67
6	student A6	25	23	22	23.33	14	14	15	14.33	13	15	15	14.33	15	12	14	13.67	4	3	3	3.33	69.00
7	student A7	20	21	22	21.00	18	17	17	17.33	13	14	15	14.00	12	14	15	13.67	3	3	3	3.00	69.00
8	student A8	22	20	20	20.67	13	15	14	14.00	12	12	13	12.33	10	12	13	11.67	3	3	4	3.33	62.00
9	student A9	20	19	21	20.00	13	14	13	13.33	15	17	17	16.33	15	14	16	15.00	4	3	3	3.33	68.00
10	student A10	29	27	29	28.33	19	19	19	19.00	20	19	18	19.00	20	22	21	21.00	4	4	4	4.00	91.33
11	student A11	20	18	18	18.67	14	13	15	14.00	13	15	13	13.67	15	17	16	16.00	4	4	3	3.67	66.00
12	student A12	22	23	24	23.00	14	15	12	13.67	14	13	14	13.67	15	15	16	15.33	3	3	3	3.00	68.67
13	student A13	21	20	20	20.33	14	13	13	13.33	13	11	11	11.67	10	11	13	11.33	3	2	2	2.33	59.00
14	student A14	17	18	16	17.00	9	12	11	10.67	9	10	9	9.33	8	9	9	8.67	3	3	3	3.00	48.67
15	student A15	19	22	20	20.33	12	11	11	11.33	11	13	13	12.33	10	12	10	10.67	3	3	2	2.67	57.33
16	student A16	21	22	23	22.00	13	12	12	12.33	17	16	15	16.00	15	13	13	13.67	4	3	3	3.33	67.33
17	student A17	29	28	30	29.00	19	18	20	19.00	18	19	19	18.67	23	24	23	23.33	5	4	4	4.33	94.33
18	student A18	18	18	20	18.67	12	13	12	12.33	14	13	14	13.67	12	13	12	12.33	2	2	3	2.33	59.33
19	student A19	14	16	16	15.33	11	9	11	10.33	8	10	9	9.00	7	7	7	7.00	3	2	2	2.33	44.00
20	student A20	18	20	20	19.33	15	13	13	13.67	17	15	15	15.67	15	13	14	14.00	3	3	4	3.33	66.00
21	student A21	23	22	23	22.67	12	15	13	13.33	15	14	15	14.67	17	16	16	16.33	3	3	3	3.00	70.00
22	student A22	18	20	18	18.67	14	15	13	14.00	12	13	13	12.67	12	11	12	11.67	3	3	3	3.00	60.00
23	student A23	29	28	29	28.67	20	17	19	18.67	20	19	20	19.67	22	23	22	22.33	5	4	4	4.33	93.67
24	student A24	24	24	25	24.33	17	16	18	17.00	15	16	18	16.33	18	17	17	17.33	4	3	3	3.33	78.33
25	student A25	23	24	25	24.00	14	15	14	14.33	12	13	11	12.00	12	13	14	13.00	4	3	3	3.33	66.67
26	student A26	23	24	25	24.00	12	14	15	13.67	12	14	15	13.67	13	14	15	14.00	3	3	3	3.00	68.33
27	student A27	27	25	27	26.33	17	19	18	18.00	17	17	19	17.67	22	22	21	21.67	3	3	4	3.33	87.00
28	student A28	28	27	27	27.33	19	18	18	18.33	17	16	18	17.00	23	21	21	21.67	4	3	4	3.67	88.00
29	student A29	28	27	28	27.67	18	19	19	18.67	18	17	18	17.67	23	20	22	21.67	4	3	4	3.67	89.33
30	student A30	27	26	27	26.67	17	18	18	17.67	16	16	18	16.67	21	22	22	21.67	4	3	3	3.33	86.00

## Control Class Score For Pre-test

	name	Content				organization				vocabulary				language use				mechanics				OVERALL
		rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	SCORE
1	student B1	22	20	21	21.00	12	13	12	12.33	13	16	14	14.33	16	17	17	16.67	3	3	3	3.00	67.33
2	student B2	23	22	23	22.67	12	14	13	13.00	13	14	14	13.67	12	11	13	12.00	3	3	3	3.00	64.33
3	student B3	27	27	27	27.00	17	18	19	18.00	18	18	18	18.00	20	21	20	20.33	4	4	4	4.00	87.33
4	student B4	22	20	22	21.33	15	15	16	15.33	13	15	16	14.67	10	9	9	9.33	3	3	3	3.00	63.67
5	student B5	23	24	23	23.33	16	18	17	17.00	16	15	15	15.33	13	12	13	12.67	3	3	3	3.00	71.33
6	student B6	21	22	21	21.33	14	12	15	13.67	13	12	15	13.33	10	9	11	10.00	3	3	3	3.00	61.33
7	student B7	22	23	21	22.00	12	13	12	12.33	12	14	13	13.00	13	10	12	11.67	3	3	3	3.00	62.00
8	student B8	21	23	22	22.00	14	13	14	13.67	12	11	13	12.00	10	9	11	10.00	3	3	3	3.00	60.67
9	student B9	20	21	20	20.33	14	13	15	14.00	13	11	14	12.67	11	10	10	10.33	3	3	3	3.00	60.33
10	student B10	13	14	13	13.33	8	7	8	7.67	8	7	7	7.33	5	6	6	5.67	2	2	2	2.00	36.00
11	student B11	14	17	15	15.33	9	10	8	9.00	11	12	12	11.67	9	10	9	9.33	2	3	2	2.33	47.67
12	student B12	17	18	17	17.33	11	14	12	12.33	11	12	12	11.67	9	8	10	9.00	3	3	2	2.67	53.00
13	student B13	20	22	21	21.00	17	17	15	16.33	13	11	12	12.00	13	14	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	65.67
14	student B14	20	22	21	21.00	17	17	15	16.33	13	11	12	12.00	13	14	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	65.67
15	student B15	14	13	13	13.33	7	7	7	7.00	11	12	10	11.00	9	10	8	9.00	2	2	2	2.00	42.33
16	student B16	22	20	21	21.00	12	14	13	13.00	17	16	16	16.33	12	13	12	12.33	3	3	2	2.67	65.33
17	student B17	14	16	15	15.00	13	12	12	12.33	18	17	16	17.00	11	8	10	9.67	3	3	3	3.00	57.00
18	student B18	26	24	26	25.33	17	19	19	18.33	17	19	19	18.33	22	23	21	22.00	4	4	4	4.00	88.00
19	student B19	13	14	15	14.00	9	11	10	10.00	13	14	12	13.00	9	10	10	9.67	2	2	3	2.33	49.00
20	student B20	14	16	15	15.00	14	15	14	14.33	13	14	12	13.00	11	13	11	11.67	3	3	2	2.67	56.67
21	student B21	16	14	15	15.00	11	9	10	10.00	9	13	11	11.00	8	8	8	8.00	3	3	2	2.67	46.67
22	student B22	23	22	20	21.67	14	15	12	13.67	13	12	12	12.33	14	13	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	64.00
23	student B23	24	26	25	25.00	17	17	16	16.67	16	15	13	14.67	13	12	12	12.33	3	3	3	3.00	71.67
24	student B24	13	13	13	13.00	7	8	7	7.33	8	7	7	7.33	7	7	8	7.33	2	2	2	2.00	37.00
25	student B25	13	13	13	13.00	7	7	8	7.33	7	7	8	7.33	9	8	8	8.33	2	2	2	2.00	38.00
26	student B26	26	27	27	26.67	17	16	17	16.67	16	15	16	15.67	19	20	20	19.67	3	4	4	3.67	82.33
27	student B27	13	13	13	13.00	7	7	7	7.00	7	8	7	7.33	8	9	6	7.67	2	2	2	2.00	37.00
28	student B28	16	15	15	15.33	11	12	11	11.33	11	13	12	12.00	11	9	10	10.00	2	3	2	2.33	51.00
29	student B29	23	21	20	21.33	16	18	16	16.67	16	15	17	16.00	18	17	15	16.67	3	3	2	2.67	73.33
30	student B30	15	16	18	16.33	14	13	14	13.67	11	10	12	11.00	8	8	9	8.33	2	2	2	2.00	51.33



## Control Class Score for Post-test

No	name	Content				organization				vocabulary				language use				mechanics				Overall Score
		rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	rater A	rater b	rater c	mean	
1	student B1	22	21	20	21.00	12	12	13	12.33	14	14	16	14.67	16	17	17	16.67	3	3	3	3.00	67.67
2	student B2	24	22	23	23.00	13	14	13	13.33	14	14	13	13.67	12	11	13	12.00	3	3	3	3.00	65.00
3	student B3	27	28	28	27.67	17	18	19	18.00	18	18	19	18.33	20	21	20	20.33	4	4	4	4.00	88.33
4	student B4	21	21	20	20.67	16	14	15	15.00	14	13	15	14.00	14	12	15	13.67	3	3	3	3.00	66.33
5	student B5	24	24	23	23.67	18	18	16	17.33	16	16	15	15.67	13	13	12	12.67	3	3	3	3.00	72.33
6	student B6	25	23	25	24.33	16	15	17	16.00	14	14	13	13.67	14	14	14	14.00	3	4	3	3.33	71.33
7	student B7	20	23	23	22.00	11	13	13	12.33	12	13	14	13.00	10	12	13	11.67	3	3	2	2.67	61.67
8	student B8	23	22	18	21.00	13	13	11	12.33	10	12	10	10.67	13	12	14	13.00	3	3	3	3.00	60.00
9	student B9	23	24	24	23.67	17	17	17	17.00	15	12	13	13.33	15	13	16	14.67	4	4	3	3.67	72.33
10	student B10	15	16	17	16.00	10	8	7	8.33	9	8	7	8.00	7	7	6	6.67	2	2	2	2.00	41.00
11	student B11	14	16	16	15.33	9	10	9	9.33	11	12	12	11.67	9	9	10	9.33	2	3	2	2.33	48.00
12	student B12	18	18	17	17.67	12	13	14	13.00	11	13	13	12.33	10	9	10	9.67	3	3	2	2.67	55.33
13	student B13	21	21	20	20.67	18	15	15	16.00	10	12	10	10.67	13	13	12	12.67	3	3	3	3.00	63.00
14	student B14	21	21	20	20.67	17	17	16	16.67	12	11	12	11.67	13	14	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	65.33
15	student B15	14	13	14	13.67	7	7	7	7.00	10	11	12	11.00	9	10	8	9.00	2	2	2	2.00	42.67
16	student B16	21	21	20	20.67	12	14	13	13.00	17	17	16	16.67	13	13	12	12.67	2	2	2	2.00	65.00
17	student B17	14	16	18	16.00	13	13	12	12.67	18	17	17	17.33	9	8	11	9.33	3	3	3	3.00	58.33
18	student B18	26	24	26	25.33	18	19	19	18.67	18	19	19	18.67	22	23	21	22.00	4	4	4	4.00	88.67
19	student B19	13	14	14	13.67	9	10	10	9.67	12	13	14	13.00	9	11	10	10.00	2	2	2	2.00	48.33
20	student B20	14	15	16	15.00	14	14	15	14.33	12	13	14	13.00	11	13	11	11.67	3	2	2	2.33	56.33
21	student B21	16	16	15	15.67	11	9	10	10.00	11	12	11	11.33	8	8	8	8.00	3	3	2	2.67	47.67
22	student B22	23	22	20	21.67	14	15	13	14.00	13	12	12	12.33	14	13	13	13.33	3	3	3	3.00	64.33
23	student B23	24	25	25	24.67	17	17	17	17.00	17	15	14	15.33	12	12	12	12.00	3	3	3	3.00	72.00
24	student B24	14	14	15	14.33	7	7	8	7.33	7	8	7	7.33	6	9	7	7.33	2	2	3	2.33	38.67
25	student B25	14	15	15	14.67	7	7	8	7.33	7	8	7	7.33	8	9	8	8.33	2	2	3	2.33	40.00
26	student B26	26	27	27	26.67	17	16	17	16.67	14	15	16	15.00	19	18	20	19.00	3	4	4	3.67	81.00
27	student B27	13	15	13	13.67	7	8	7	7.33	7	8	7	7.33	8	9	6	7.67	2	2	2	2.00	38.00
28	student B28	16	16	15	15.67	12	11	11	11.33	13	13	11	12.33	10	11	9	10.00	2	3	2	2.33	51.67
29	student B29	23	21	20	21.33	16	18	16	16.67	16	15	17	16.00	15	17	17	16.33	3	3	3	3.00	73.33
30	student B30	15	16	18	16.33	14	13	14	13.67	11	10	12	11.00	8	8	9	8.33	2	2	2	2.00	51.33



