

REFERENCES

- Ade I., Ninuk L. & Emzir (2020). EFL Students' and Lecturer's Perceptions on Collaborative writing. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 7 (11).
- Ahmadi S. (2020) Academic Self-Esteem, Academic Self-Efficacy and Academic Achievement. *A Path Analysis. J Foren Psy.* 5:155.
- Alawaji, N. N. M. (2020). Students' Perceptions of Collaborative Summary Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 10 (6) 700-707.
- Aryana, M. (2010). Relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement amongst pre-university students. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 10, 2474-2477.
- Ashman R. & Gillies, R. (2005). *Cooperative learning: The social and intellectual outcomes of learning in groups*. London: Routledge.
- Bassett, C. & Mcollaborative writinghirter, J. J. & Kitzmiller, K. (1999). Teacher implementation of cooperative learning groups. *Contemporary Education*, 71 (1), 46-50.
- Bhatt, S. & Bahadur, A. (2018). Role of self esteem & self efficacy in achievement motivation among college students. *The international journal of indian psychology* 6 (2).
- Bruffee, K. (1995). Sharing our toys: Cooperative learning versus collaborative learning. *Change*, 27(1), 12-18.
- Bruffee, K. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence and the authority of knowledge (2nd)*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Boggs, J., Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2012). Collaborative writing among second language learners in academic Web-Based Projects. *Language Learning & Technology*. 16, 91-109.
- Boughey, C. (1997). Learning to Write by writing to learn: a group-work approach. *ELT journal*, 51, 126-134.
- Byrne, B.M. (1996). Academic self-concept: its structure, measurement and relation to academic achievement. In: B.A. Bracken (Ed.) *Handbook of self-concept* (pp. 287–316). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Chen, Y. & Hoshower L. B. (2003). Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness. *Assessment of Student Perception and Motivation*. 28 (1).
- Chisholm, R. M. (1990). Coping with the problem of cooperative writing. *Writing Across the Curriculum*. 91-108.
- Clawson, S. (1993). The impact of collaborative writing on the individual. *Teaching & Change*, 1, 55-70.
- Colen, K. & Petelin, R. (2004). Challenges in collaborative writing in the contemporary corporation. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. 9 (2), 136-145.
- Colina, A. A. & Mayo, M. P. (2007) Attention to form across collaborative tasks by low-proficiency learners in an EFL setting. In: García Mayo, M. P. (ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 91–116.
- Conrad, R. (2009). Assessing collaborative learning. In P. L. Rogers, G. A. Berg, J. V. Boettecher, C. Howard, L. Justice, & K. Schenk (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning, Second Edition* 2nd ed., 89-93. Hershey PA: Information Science Reference.
- Creswell, J. W. & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed). London: Sage.
- Darus, et al. (2015). collaborative writing: A review of definitions from past studies. *SOLLs. INTEC 2015 Proceedings*. 138-149.
- Dale, H. (1994). Collaborative writing interactions in ninth-grade classroom. *Journal of Educational Research*, 87, 334-345.
- Demuth, A. (2013). *Perception Theories*. Trnava: Comenius University in Bratislava.
- Dobao, A., F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of second language writing*. 21(1) 40-58.
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Groupdynamics and motivation. *The Modern Language*

- Journal*, 81,482-493. Edward, V. (2000). Using group work in writing. *The Journal of English Language Teaching (India)*, 35,14-20.
- Eccles, J.S. (1993). School and family effects on the ontogeny of children's interests, self perceptions, and activity choices. In: J.E. Jacobs (Ed.), *Developmental perspectives on motivation* (pp. 145–208). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press).
- Ede, L. & Lunsford, A., (1990). *Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing*. Carbondale & Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Farkas, D. K. (1991). Collaborative writing, software development, and the universe of collaborative activity. In M. M. Lay & W. M. Karis (Eds.), *Collaborative writing in industry: Investigations in theory and practice* (pp. 13-30). Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Co.
- Fathi-Asthiani, A. et, al. (2007). Relationship Between Self-Concept, Self-esteem, Anxiety, Depression and Academic Achievement in Adolescents. *Journal of Applied Science*, 7 (7).
- Ferradás, M. D. M. et al. (2020). The Mediating and Moderating Role of Defensive Pessimism. *Sustainability*, 12, 7531.
- Frankie, S., Norseha, U., & Nor, H. (2020). Self-Esteem and Academic Achievement: The Relationship and Gender differences of Malaysian University Undergraduates. *AFOR Journal of Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences*. 6 (1).
- Everlove, S., Fisher, D. & Frey, N. (2009). Building Interpersonal and Small-Group Skills. *Productive Group Work*. (pp. 82-83). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Gabriel, M. & Leeuwen, C., A. (2007). Beginning to write with word processing: Integrating writing process and technology in a primary classroom. *The reading teacher*. 60 (5) 420-429.
- Garofalo, R. & Mulligan, C. (2011). A collaborative writing approach: Methodology and student assessment. *The language teacher*. jalt-publications.org.

- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E. & Airasian, P. W. (2006). *Competencies for analysis and application*, 10th ed. New York: Pearson.
- Gere, A. R. (1987). *Writing groups*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ghaith, G. (2003) Effects of the Learning Together Model of Cooperative Learning on English as a Foreign Language Reading Achievement, Academic Self-Esteem, and Feelings of School Alienation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27, 451-474.
- Ghani, S. A. (1986). Group writing: A technique that fosters creativity. *English Teaching Forum*, 24, 36-37.
- Grami, G. M. A. (2010). *The Effects of Integrating Peer Feedback into University-Level ESL Writing Curriculum: A Comparative Study in a Saudi Context*. Doctoral dissertation submitted to Newcastle University, School of Education, Communication and Language Sciences.
- Grief, S. et, al. (2007). *Teaching and learning writing: A review of research and practice*. London: NRDC Institute of Education
- Gillies, R.M., Adrian, A., & Jan, T. (2008). *The teacher's role in implementing cooperative learning in the classroom*. New York: Springer.
- Hadjerrouit, S. (2011). A Collaborative writing Approach to Wikis: Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*. 8, 431-449.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1991). Scoring procedures for ESL Contexts. In L. Hamp-Lyons (ed.), *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Contexts*, (pp. 241-276). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hatch, E. & Farhadi, H. (1982). *Research design and statistic*. Los Angeles: Newbury House.
- Hattie, J. (1992). *Self-concept*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.

- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language test*. New York: Longman.
- Hedgecock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(2), 255–276.
- Hirvela, A. (1999). Collaborative writing instruction and communities of readers and writers. *TESOL Journal*, 8, 7-13.
- Holopainen, L., et al. (2020). The Relationship between Students' Self-esteem, Schoolwork Difficulties and Subjective School Well-being in Finnish Upper-secondary Education. *International Journal of Educational Research*. 104.
- Horwitz, E., Bresslau, B. , Dryden, M. , Mclendon, M. , Yu, J. (1997). A graduate course focusing on the second language learner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 518-526.
- Harris, S. L. (2009). *The relationship between self-esteem and academic success among African American students in the minority engineering program at a research extensive university in the southern part of the United States*. A Dissertation submitted to Louisiana State University in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. pp 1-99.
- Hunzer, K. M. (2012). *Collaborative learning and writing : essays on using small groups in teaching English and composition*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Iannacone, V. (2003). Something to Break the Routine: A Collaborative writing Activity. *Tesol Journal*. 12, 35-36.
- Ike, N. J. (1989). Fostering creativity in essay writing through group work. *English Teaching Forum*, 27, 45-47.
- Ingram, A., & Hathorn, L. (2004). Methods for analysing collaboration in online communications. In T. Roberts (Ed.), *Online collaborative learning: Theory and practice*. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Inc.
- Jain, P. M. & Patel M.F. (2008). *English language teaching: Methods, tools, and technique*. Jaipur: Sunrise Publishers & Distributors.

- Jalleh, C., & Mahfoodh, O.H.A. (2021). Chinese-speaking ESL pre-university students' perceptions of the effectiveness of collaborative planning in an academic writing course. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(Special Issue 2), 1174-1189.
- James, W. (1890). *The principle of psychology*. New York: Holt.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2003). Student motivation in co-operative groups: Social interdependence theory. In R. Gillies & A. Ashman (Eds.), *Cooperative learning: The social and intellectual outcomes of learning in groups* (pp. 136-176). London: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2005). Cooperative learning. In S. Lee (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of school psychology* (pp. 117-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jubhari, R. (2009). Academic writing as discourse practice in Australian and Indonesian Universities: A Critical Review. *Educationist*, 3, 67-81.
- Kagan, M. & Kagan, S. (2009). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente: Kagan Publishing.
- Kelly, et al. (2004). *Teaching and learning writing: a review of research and practice*. London: NRDC.
- Keltikankas-Jarvinen, L. (1992). Self-esteem as a predictor of future school achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 7, 123–130.
- Khatib, M. & Mehami, H. (2015). Languaging and writing skills: The effect of collaborative writing on EFL Students' writing performance. *Advance in language and literary*. 6(1) 203-211.
- King, N. & Horrock, C. (2010). *Interview n qualitative research*. London: Sage
- Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73-93.
- Kumar, V., Sharir, J., Aizan, H. T.,etal. (2009) Self-esteem, gender and academic achievement of undergraduate students. *American journal of scientific research*, 3, 26-37.

- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Sage: Thousand Oaks.
- Larson, J. , Maier, M. (2000). Co-authoring classroom texts: Shifting participant roles in writing activity. *Research in the Teaching English*, 34, 468-497.
- Lee, D., Woo, J., & Mackenzie, A. E. (2002). A review of older people's experiences with residential care placement. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 37, 19–27.
- Lawrence, D. (2006). *Enhancing self-esteem in the classroom*.3rd Ed. London: Sage Publication Company.
- Leki, I. (1993). Reciprocal themes in reading and writing. In J. Carson, & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: second language perspectives* (pp. 9–33). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Linn, R.L. (1989). *Educational measurement*. London: Macmillan Publisher Company.
- Littleton, K., & Hakkinen, P. (1999). Learning Together: Understanding the process of computer based collaborative learning. In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational approaches* (Pp. 20-30) Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lo, J., & Hyland, F. (2007). Enhancing Students' Engagement and Motivation in Writing: The Case of Primary Students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 219-237.
- Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C. & Spence, J. C. (2000). Effects of within-class grouping on student achievement: An exploratory model. *Journal of Educational Research*,94, 101-112.
- Louth, R., McAllister, C., & McAllister, H. A. (1993). The effects of collaborative writing techniques on freshman writing and attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 61(3), 215-224.
- Lowry, et, al. (2004). Creating Hybrid Distributed Learning Environments by Implementing Distributed Collaborative writing in Traditional Educational Settings. *IEEE transactions on professional communication*, 47, 171-189.

- Marsh, H.W. (1990). Causal ordering of academic self-concept and academic achievement: a multiwave, longitudinal panel analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 646–656.
- Martins, A. & Peixoto, F. (2000). Self-esteem, Social Identity and school achievement in adolescence. *The journal of the Hellenic psychological society*, 7, 278-289.
- Martin, A. (2002). Is Laughter the Best Medicine? Humor, Laughter, and Physical Health. *Current direction in psychological science*. 11 (6).
- McDonald, J. & Kirby, E. (2009). *Engage every student: Motivation tools for teachers and parents*. Minneapolis: Search Institute Press.
- Miller, M. B. (2008). *Measurement and teaching*. New York: Patrick W. Miller & Associates.
- Mruk, C. J. (2006). *Self-esteem, research, theory and practice*. New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Murray, D. E. (1992). Collaborative Learning as Literacy Event: Implications for ESL instruction. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 100 117). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Naseri, N. & Soureshjani, K. H. (2011). An investigation into the relationship between self-esteem, proficiency level, and the reading ability of Iranian EFL language learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2, 1312-1319.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Nelson, G., & Carson, J. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response Groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 113–132.
- Nelson, G. L., & Murphy, J. M. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 135–141.

- Nixon, R., M. (2007). *Collaborative and independent writing among adult Thai EFL learners: Verbal interactions, compositions, and attitudes*. A dissertation, Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Norman, J. (2002). Two visual systems and two theories of perception: an attempt to reconcile the constructivist and ecological approaches. *Journal of Psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ortiz, O. P. Q. & Luna, A. M. R (2013). Collaborative writing to Enhance Academic Writing Development Through Project Work. *HOW, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English*. : 20, 130-148
- Osgood, C.E., Suci, G., & Tannenbaum, P. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Ou Kiong (2017). A brief introduction to Perception. *Studies in literature and language*. 15 (4).
- Oxford, R. L. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 443-456.
- Oxford, R. L. (1997). Interaction, collaboration and cooperation: Learning languages and preparing language teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 440-442.
- Parks, S. (2000). Professional writing and the role of incidental collaboration: Evidence from a medical setting. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 101-12.
- Paulus, Trena M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289.
- Peixoto, F. & Almeida, L. S. (2018). Self-concept, self-esteem, and academic achievement strategies for maintaining self-esteem in students experiencing academic failure. *European Journal of Psychology*, 25 (2):157-175.
- Phe, G. D. (1997). *Handbook of classroom assessment: Learning achievement and learning adjustment*. New York: Academic Press.

- Piers, E. V. & Harris, D. B (1969). The Piers-Harris children's self-concept scale, Nashville, *Tenn: counselor Recording and Test*, Acklen Station.
- Plummer, D. (2005). *Helping adolescents and adults to build self-esteem*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Powell, B. J. (1984). A comparison of students' attitudes and success in writing. *Journal of Negro Education*, 53, 114-123.
- Redenbach, S. (199). *Self-Esteem, the Necessary Ingredient for Success*. USA: Esteem Seminar Programs and Publications.
- Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robbins, S. P. (2002). *Organization behavior*. New York: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Robert, R. (2002). *Self-esteem and early learning*. 2nd Ed. London: Sage Publication Ltd.
- Rogers, C., (1970). *Carl Rogers on encounter groups*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Rouse, M., Hawkins, K. B., & Florian, L. (2007). *Achievement and inclusion in schools*. London: Routledge.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & Stefani, L. A. (2000). *Communication between cultures* (3rd ed.). Beijing: Foreign language Teaching and Research Press.
- Sandra, L. H. (2009). *The relationship between self-esteem and academic success among African American students in the minority engineering program at a research extensive university in the southern portion of the United States*, The School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development, US.
- Savile-Troike.M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Seliger, H. W. & Shohamy, E. (1989) *Second language research methods*, Oxford University Press.
- Sharples, M. (1993). *How we write*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). The effect and students' perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of second language writing*, 20, 286-305.
- Shi, L. (1998). Effects of prewriting discussions on adult ESL students' compositions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 319–345.
- Shunk, D.H. (1990). Self-concept and school achievement, in: C. Rogers & P. Kutnick (Eds.), *The social psychology of the primary school* (pp. 70–91), London, UK: Routledge.
- Singer, M. (1987). *Intercultural communication: A perceptual approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Slavin, R. E. (2006). *Educational psychology: theory and practice (8th edition)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Slavin, R. E. (2011). Instruction based on cooperative learning. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of research on learning and instruction*. New York: Routledge.
- Stacey, E. (2005). A Constructivist Framework for Online Collaborative Learning: Adult Learning and Collaborative Learning Theory. In T. Roberts (Ed.), *Computer-supported collaborative learning in higher education*. 140-161 Hershey PA: Idea Group Publishing.
- Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 16.0 software.
- Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System*, 27, 363–374.
- Storch, N. (2001). How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research*, 5, 29-53.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflection. *Journal of second language writing*, 14(3), 153-173.
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 275-288.

- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2007). *Writing tasks: Comparing individual and collaborative writing*. In M. P. Garcí'a Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 157–177). London: Multilingual Matters.
- Sturm, A. (2016). Observing writing processes of struggling adult writers with collaborative writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 8(2), 301-344.
- Suwaed, H., et al. (2019). EFL students' perceptions of collaborative writing in small groups: the case of Libyan undergraduate third year students. *European journal of english language teaching*, 4(4).
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2006a). Languaging, agency and collaboration in advanced language proficiency. In H. *generalizability in applied linguistics: Multiple research perspectives* (pp. 97–113). John Benjamins.
- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171–185.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320–337. 157
- Swain, M., & Watanabe, Y. (2013). Languaging: Collaborative dialogue as a source of second language learning. In A. Ohta (Vol. Ed.), *Social, dynamic and complexity theory approaches to second language acquisition*, C. Chapelle (Series Ed.), *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. London: Sage.
- Tashakkori A. and Creswell, J. (2008). Mixed methodology across disciplines. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2, 2-3.
- Taylor, G. R. and Trumbull, M. (2005). *Developing a multi faced research design/ paradigm*. In: G. R. Taylor (ed), *Integrating quantitative and qualitative methods in research* (2nd ed). University press of America.

- Ur, P. (2009). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdes, G. & Dvorak, T. (1989). *Composición: Proceso y síntesis*. Chicago: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Vanderbug, R., M. (2006). Reviewing research on teaching writing based on Vgotsky's theories: What we can learn. *Reading and writing quarterly*. 22(4)375-393.
- Vasconcellos, J., Smelser, N.J., & Mecca, M.(1989). *The social importance of self-esteem*. California: University of California Press.
- Veiga, F.H. (1987). Autoridade paterna, auto-conceito e rendimento escolar. In: J.F. Cruz, R.A. Gonç,alves & P.P. Machado (Eds.), *Psicologia e educac,ã—investigac,ã e intervenc,ã*, (pp. 257–266). Porto, Portugal: Associac,ã dos Psico´logos Portugueses.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and society: The development of higher mental processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walter, W. W. (2003). *The reevaluation of the relationships among academic performances, academic achievement, social acceptance and self-esteem of third and six grade students*. Dissertation Abstr. Int, 64:8-10.
- Watanabe, Y. (2014). *Collaborative and independent writing: Japanese university English learners' processes, text and opinions*. A dissertation, Toronto: Toronto University.
- Wilhelm, K. H. (1997). Sometimes kicking and screaming: Language teachers-in-training react to a collaborative learning model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, 527-54.
- Willig, C. & Rogers, S (2008). *Qualitative research in psychology*. London: Sage.
- Yang, L. (2014). Examining the mediational means in collaborative writing: Case studies of undergraduate ESL students in business courses. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 23, 74-89.
- Yanghee, K. & Jiyoung, K. (2005). Teaching Korean University Writing Class: Balancing the process and the genre-approach. *Asian EFL Journal*. 7, 1-15.

Appendices

Appendix 1

The Specification of the Self-esteem Questionnaire by Dimensions, Indicators, and Items

Dimensions	Indicators	Items	
		Positive	Negative
Competence	There is a feeling of competence.	2,27	6,12,14,18,21
Worthiness	There is a feeling to be respected.	1, 5	7,9,15,16,17
	There is a feeling to be loved.		20,22
	There is a feeling to have a chance for success.	29	3,8,19,28
	There is a feeling of confidence.	10,26,13	4, 11,17,23,25

Adapted from Mruk (2006), Vasconcellos, Smelser & Mecca (1989)

Appendix 2**Student Self-Esteem Questionnaire****A. Identity****Name:****Class:****B. Introduction**

1. This questionnaire is distributed to you for the purpose of obtaining information in accordance with the research on student Self-esteem.
2. The information obtained from you is very useful in order to know the overall of students' Self-Esteem in learning English.
3. The data obtained is solely for research purposes. Thus, you don't need to hesitate to fill out this questionnaire.
4. Your participation provides the information we really hope for.
5. Thank you for your participation.

C. Instructions for completing

1. Before filling out the following statements, we ask your willingness to read the instructions first.
2. Choose one of the answers that best suits your situation for each statement.
3. Write your answer choices by putting a checklist (√) in one of the available columns
SA = Strongly agree
A = Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly disagree
4. Thank you for your willingness to fill out this questionnaire.

D. List of Statements

	Statements	SA	A	D	SD
1.	I feel that I am important in the class, at least the same as others.				
2.	I feel that I have a lot of quality in learning English.				
3.	Overall, I felt like I was failing in learning English.				
4.	I feel that there is nothing I can be proud of.				
5.	I hope I have more respect for myself in learning English.				
6.	Sometimes I feel that I am very lacking in everything related to English.				
7.	I sometimes cannot accept when someone criticizes me.				
8.	I tend to exaggerate mistakes and degrade success in learning English.				
9.	When someone cheats and denounces me with my English skills, I sometimes think of replying to his treatment.				
10.	I really care about my English skills.				
11.	I am afraid of making mistakes especially when seeing by other classmates in learning English.				
12.	I often feel depressed when I make a mistake in saying something in English.				
13.	I tend to think that I am better than others in English knowledge.				
14.	I often compare my English with other people.				

	Statements	SA	A	D	SD
15.	At night, I always think about what I have done and said, or what my classmates have said and done to me.				
16.	I feel that my classmates and other people do not respect to the English language skills that I have.				
17.	I often refrain from sharing opinions, ideas, and abilities in the classroom.				
18.	I feel afraid to say and do things in English that will make me look stupid and unprofessional.				
29.	I have no inspirations about what to do with my English.				
20.	I feel that I am not loved by teachers and classmates.				
21.	My abilities are worse than other students in English in class.				
22.	I felt that the teacher was paying more attention to other friends than myself.				
23.	I do not trust myself, my feelings and abilities, I believe in the ability of friends to answer questions raised by friends and English teachers.				
24.	When learning English, I feel like just as a complement, there is no contribution that I can give.				
25.	I feel that I cannot be a good friend and cannot socialize with my classmates.				
26.	I can do something similar even better in English than my classmates.				
27.	I have good understanding in English.				
28.	I feel hopeless with my future.				
29.	I feel that I will succeed with the English I have.				

Thank you

Appendix 3

Validity of the Students' Self-esteem Questionnaire

Direction to the self-esteem questionnaire validator's: Attached is a copy of self-esteem specification and its items constructed for investigating the real self-esteem of English Department students of State Islamic University Mataram. Please check each item against the theory, indicator, and the items to ensure that the instrument measure the accuracy of the students' self-esteem. Other comments and or corrections are welcomed.

Self-esteem questionnaire Validator's background and experience
Name :
Subject Area Taught :
Academic Preparation :
Years of Teaching :
Self-esteem questionnaire Validator's Comments about the Instrument
Reasearcher's Comment and Change Made as a Result of Validator's Feedback

(Adapted from Miller, 2008)

_____2019

Validator

Appendix 5

Validity Test of Self-esteem Questionnaire Instrument Using Bivariate Pearson in SPSS

Item Number	r-test	r-table	Status
B1	0.652	0.361	Valid
B2	0.648	0.361	Valid
B3	0.539	0.361	Valid
B4	0.617	0.361	Valid
B5	0.582	0.361	Valid
B6	0.603	0.361	Valid
B7	0.513	0.361	Valid
B8	0.475	0.361	Valid
B9	0.473	0.361	Valid
B10	0.712	0.361	Valid
B11	0.527	0.361	Valid
B12	0.500	0.361	Valid
B13	0.619	0.361	Valid
B14	0.648	0.361	Valid
B15	0.453	0.361	Valid
B16	0.596	0.361	Valid
B17	0.532	0.361	Valid
B18	0.626	0.361	Valid
B19	0.594	0.361	Valid
B20	0.504	0.361	Valid
B21	0.560	0.361	Valid
B22	0.554	0.361	Valid
B23	0.478	0.361	Valid
B24	0.518	0.361	Valid
B25	0.674	0.361	Valid
B26	0.654	0.361	Valid
B27	0.479	0.361	Valid
B28	0.513	0.361	Valid
B29	0.637	0.361	Valid
B30	0.412	0.361	Valid

Appendix 6

Reliability test Result of Self-Esteem Questionnaire Instrument using SPSS

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.747	31

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
b1	174.73	897.513	.636	.738
b2	174.87	900.464	.633	.739
b3	174.97	900.378	.516	.740
b4	174.93	900.547	.600	.739
b5	174.60	900.938	.563	.740
b6	174.70	899.597	.585	.739
b7	174.83	903.937	.491	.741
b8	174.90	903.059	.449	.741
b9	174.80	907.821	.451	.742
b10	174.97	891.757	.697	.737
b11	174.77	903.357	.505	.740
b12	174.90	906.990	.480	.741

b13	175.07	901.237	.603	.740
b14	175.00	899.310	.632	.739
b15	174.87	911.016	.434	.743
b16	175.00	900.483	.577	.739
b17	175.00	897.310	.506	.739
b18	175.27	892.478	.604	.737
b19	174.87	900.189	.575	.739
b20	175.00	899.103	.477	.739
b21	175.07	894.754	.535	.738
b22	175.43	895.909	.529	.738
b23	174.97	907.068	.457	.741
b24	174.93	900.961	.494	.740
b25	174.70	894.286	.657	.737
b26	174.77	899.633	.638	.739
b27	174.87	907.430	.458	.742
b28	174.87	900.189	.488	.740
b29	174.77	898.875	.620	.739
b30	174.67	907.747	.386	.742
Total	88.93	232.754	1.000	.924

Appendix 7

Interview Questions Related to the Application of Collaborative writing

- 1) Have you done a similar activity of writing in a group before?
- 2) How do you feel and what do you think about your writing after being taught by using collaborative writing strategy?
- 3) Do you prefer to write in a group or individually?
- 4) What are positive aspects of collaborative writing do you get?
- 5) What are negative aspects of Collaborative writing do you get?
- 6) How do you contribute in your group when working collaboratively?
- 7) What kind of difficulties do you encounter when you start writing?

Appendix 8

Validity of the Students' Writing Task for Collaborative and Individual Writing

Direction to the Students' writing task validator's: Attached is a copy of writing task and its topics constructed for investigating the real students' essay writing of English Department students of State Islamic University Mataram. Please check the instruction and its topics against the syllabus and curriculum to ensure that the students' writing task is appropriate to use. Other commend and or corrections are welcomed.

Validator's background and experience
Name :
Subject Area Taught :
Academic Preparation :
Years of Teaching :
Validator's Comments about the Instrument
Reasearcher's Comment and Change Made as a Result of Validator's Feedback

(Adapted from Miller, 2008)

_____ 2019

Validator

Appendix 9

Writing Instruction and Tasks for Collaborative and Individual Writing

Instructions for a collaborative writing task	The writing task for each meeting for collaborative writing
<p>Now I would like you to work in group to write one essay based on a writing topic that I will give you in a second. You can use the scratch paper on the desk and your dictionary if you want to. You have 60 minutes to write. I will leave the recorder here and will be sitting over there (back corner of the room). If you encounter any problems during the session, just ask me. Do you have any questions? Here is the writing topic.</p>	<p>Day 1 Discuss the advantage and disadvantages of having a car</p> <p>Day 2 People remember the special gifts or presents that they receive</p> <p>Day 3 A university should accept male and female students equally</p> <p>Day 4 Television is a very useful tool when it comes to education</p> <p>Day 5 Compare the advantages and disadvantages of living in the city to living in the country side</p> <p>Day 6 Nowadays we are producing more and more rubbish</p>
Instructions for an individual writing task	The writing task for each meeting for Individual Writing
<p>Now I would like you to write an essay based on a writing topic that I will give you in a second. You can use the scratch paper on the desk and your dictionary if you want to.</p>	<p>Day 1 Discuss the advantage and disadvantages of having a car</p> <p>Day 2</p>

<p>You have 60 minutes to write. Each of you may look up dictionary to help you to finish your task. However, if you have any problems or questions over the process of writing, please ask me, don't ask your friends. Any questions? Here is the writing topic.</p>	<p>People remember the special gifts or presents that they receive</p> <p>Day 3</p> <p>A university should accept male and female students equally</p> <p>Day 4</p> <p>Television is a very useful tool when it comes to education</p> <p>Day 5</p> <p>Compare the advantages and disadvantages of living in the city to living in the country side</p> <p>Day 6</p> <p>Nowadays we are producing more and more rubbish</p>
---	---

Appendix 10

Writing Prompts Pre-test and Post-test

Write in English about the following topic. You will have only 60 minutes to finish your writing. You may facilitate your-self with a dictionary. Some vocabularies will be provided to help you to complete your essay successfully.

The advantages and disadvantages of tourism industry for local people in West Nusa Tenggara

The following words may help you in writing your essay:

Income, moral value, travel, career, information, competitive, job, opportunities, experience, local wisdom, western culture, English language, foreign people, tourist, hotel, handcraft, knowledge.

Appendix 11

Essay-scoring Rubric (Paulus, 1999)

	Organization	Development	Cohesion	Structure	Vocabulary	Mechanics
1	No organization evident; ideas random, related to each other but not to task; no paragraphing; no thesis; no unity	No development	Not coherent; no relationship of ideas evident	Attempted simple sentences; serious, recurring, unsystematic grammatical errors obliterate meaning; nonEnglish patterns predominate	Meaning obliterated; extremely limited range; incorrect/unsystematic inflectional, derivational morpheme use; little to no knowledge of appropriate word use regarding meaning and syntax	Little or no command of spelling, punctuation, paragraphing capitalization
2	Suggestion of organization; no clear thesis; ideas listed or numbered, often not in sentence form; no paragraphing/grouping; no unity	Development severely limited; examples random, if given.	Not coherent; ideas random/unconnected; attempt at transitions may be present, but ineffective; few or unclear referential ties; reader is lost.	Uses simple sentences; some attempts at various verb tenses; serious unsystematic errors, occasional clarity; possibly uses coordination; meaning often obliterated; unsuccessful attempts at embedding may be	Meaning severely inhibited; very limited range; relies on repetition of common words; inflectional/derivational morphemes incorrect, unsystematic; very limited command of common words; seldom idiomatic; reader greatly distracted	Some evidence of command of basic mechanical features; error-ridden and unsystematic Organization Development Cohesion Structure Vocabulary Mechanics

				evident		
3	Some organization ; relationship between ideas not evident; attempted thesis, but unclear; no paragraphing/ grouping; no hierarchy of ideas; suggestion of unity of ideas	Lacks content at abstract and concrete levels; few examples	Partially coherent; attempt at relationship, relevancy and progression of some ideas, but inconsistent or ineffective; limited use of transitions; relationship within and between ideas unclear/nonexistent; may occasionally use appropriate simple referential ties such as coordinating conjunctions	Meaning not impeded by use of simple sentences, despite errors; attempts at complicated sentences inhibit meaning; possibly uses coordination successfully; embedding may be evident; non-English patterns evident; non-parallel and inconsistent structures	Meaning inhibited; limited range; some patterns of errors may be evident; limited command of usage; much repetition; reader distracted at times	Evidence of developing command of basic mechanical features; frequent, unsystematic errors
4	Organization present; ideas show grouping; may have general thesis, though not for persuasion; beginning of hierarchy of ideas; lacks overall persuasive	Underdeveloped; lacks concreteness; examples may be inappropriate, too general; may use main points as support for each other.	Partially coherent, main purpose somewhat clear to reader; relationship, relevancy, and progression of ideas may be apparent; may begin to use logical connectors between/ within ideas/paragraphs	Relies on simple structures ; limited command of morpho-syntactic system; attempts at embedding may be evident in simple	Meaning inhibited by somewhat limited range and variety; often uses inappropriately informal lexical items; systematic errors in morpheme usage; somewhat limited command of word usage; occasionally idiomatic;	

	focus and unity		hs effectively; relationship between/ within ideas not evident; personal pronoun references exist, may be clear, but lacks command of demonstrative pronouns and other referential ties; repetition of key vocabulary not used successfully	structures without consistent success; nonEnglish patterns evident	frequent use of circumlocution; reader distracted	
5	Possible attempted introduction, body, conclusion; obvious, general thesis with some attempt to follow it; ideas grouped appropriately; some persuasive focus, unclear at times; hierarchy of ideas may exist, without reflecting importance; some unity	Underdeveloped; some sections may have concreteness; some may be supported while others are not; some examples may be appropriate supporting evidence for a persuasive essay, others may be logical fallacies, unsupported generalizations	Partially coherent; shows attempt to relate ideas, still ineffective at times; some effective use of logical connectors between/within groups of ideas/paragraphs; command of personal pronoun reference; partial command of demonstratives, deictics, determiners	Systematic consistent grammatical errors; some successful attempts at complex structures, but limited variety; clause construction occasionally successful, meaning occasionally disrupted by use of complex or non-English patterns; some nonparallel	Meaning occasionally inhibited; some range and variety; morpheme usage generally under control; command awkward or uneven; sometimes informal, unidiomatic, distracting; some use of circumlocution.	Paragraph format evident; basic punctuation, simple spelling, capitalization, formatting under control; systematic errors

				el, inconsiste nt structures		
6	Clear introduction, body, conclusion; beginning control over essay format, focused topic sentences; narrowed thesis approaching position statement; some supporting evidence, yet ineffective at times; hierarchy of ideas present without always reflecting idea importance; may digress from topic.	Partially underdeveloped, concreteness present, but inconsistent; logic flaws may be evident; some supporting proof and evidence used to develop thesis; some sections still under supported and generalized.	Basically coherent in purpose and focus; mostly effective use of logical connectors, used to progress ideas; pronoun references mostly clear; referential/anaphoric reference may be present; command of demonstratives; beginning appropriate use of transitions	Some variety of complex structures evident, limited pattern of error; meaning usually clear; clause construction and placement somewhat under control; finer distinction in morpho-syntactic system evident; non-English patterns may occasionally inhibit meaning	Meaning seldom inhibited; adequate range, variety; appropriately academic, formal in lexical choices; successfully avoids the first person; infrequent errors in morpheme usage; beginning to use some idiomatic expressions successfully; general command of usage; rarely distracting	Basic mechanics under control; sometimes successful attempts at sophistication, such as semi-colons, colons
7	Essay format under control; appropriate paragraphing and topic sentences; hierarchy of ideas present; main points include	Acceptable level of development; concreteness present and somewhat consistent; logic evident, makes sense,	Mostly coherent in persuasive focus and purpose, progression of ideas facilitates reader understanding; successful attempts to use logical connectors, lexical	Meaning generally clear; increasing distinction in morpho-syntactic system; sentence variety evident;	Meaning not inhibited; adequate range, variety; basically idiomatic; infrequent errors in usage; some attention to style; mistakes rarely distracting; little use of circumlocution	Occasional mistakes in basic mechanics; increasingly successful attempts at sophisticated

	<p>persuasive evidence; position statement/thesis narrowed and directs essay; may occasionally digress from topic; basically unified; follows standard persuasive organizational patterns</p>	<p>mostly adequate supporting proof; may be repetitive</p>	<p>repetition, synonyms, collocation; cohesive devices may still be inconsistent/ineffective at times; may show creativity; possibly still some irrelevancy</p>	<p>frequent successful attempts at complex structures; non-English patterns do not inhibit meaning; parallel and consistent structures used</p>		<p>punctuation; may have systematic spelling errors</p>
8	<p>Definite control of organization; may show some creativity; may attempt implied thesis; content clearly relevant, convincing; unified; sophisticated; uses organizational control to further express ideas; conclusion may serve specific function</p>	<p>Each point clearly developed with a variety of convincing types of supporting evidence; ideas supported effectively; may show originality in presentation of support; clear logical and persuasive/convincing progression of ideas</p>	<p>Coherent; clear persuasive purpose and focus; ideas relevant to topic; consistency and sophistication in use of transitions/referential ties; effective use of lexical repetition, derivations, synonyms; transitional devices appropriate/effective; cohesive devices used to further the progression of ideas in a manner clearly relevant to the overall meaning.</p>	<p>Manipulates syntax with attention to style; generally error-free sentence variety; meaning clear; non-English patterns rarely evident</p>	<p>Meaning clear; fairly sophisticated range and variety; word usage under control; occasionally unidiomatic; attempts at original, appropriate choices; may use some language nuance</p>	<p>Uses mechanical devices to further meaning; generally error-free</p>

9	Highly effective organizational pattern for convincing, persuasive essay; unified with clear position statement; content relevant and effective	Well-developed with concrete, logical, appropriate supporting examples, evidence and details; highly effective/convincing; possibly creative use of support	Coherent and convincing to reader; uses transitional devices/referential ties/logical connectors to create and further a particular style	Mostly error-free; frequent success in using language to stylistic advantage; idiomatic syntax; nonEnglish patterns not evident	Meaning clear; sophisticated range, variety; often idiomatic; often original, appropriate choices; may have distinctions in nuance for accuracy, clarity	Uses mechanical devices for stylistic purposes; may be errorfree
10	Appropriate native-like standard written English	Appropriate native-like standard written English	Appropriate native-like standard written English	Appropriate native-like standard written English	Appropriate native-like standard written English	Appropriate native-like standard written English

Appendix 12

Photograph. 1
The Students are Filling Out the Self-Esteem Instrument for the Shake of its Validity and Reliability



Appendix 13

Students' Writing Pre-Test Score of Experimental and Control Groups

	Exp. Group	Cont. Group
No	Pre-Test	Pre-Test
1	5.75	5.75
2	6.33	6.50
3	6.08	6.50
4	5.67	5.42
5	7.75	7.50
6	6.00	5.83
7	6.92	5.83
8	5.50	5.67
9	6.50	6.25
10	7.00	6.75
11	5.17	5.08
12	5.75	6.17
13	6.42	5.92
14	5.08	5.42
15	6.25	5.67
16	7.75	6.83
17	6.00	5.25
18	6.50	6.08
19	4.83	4.75
20	5.92	6.00
21	6.83	7.00
22	5.50	5.58
23	7.67	6.83
24	6.25	5.67
25	7.00	7.00
26	7.00	6.75
27	6.42	5.58
28	5.83	6.17
29	7.67	6.25
30	7.83	6.67
31	6.42	6.50
32	5.83	5.75
Total	203.41	194.91
Mean	6.35	6.091

Appendix 14

Students' Writing Post-Test Score of Experimental and Control Groups

	Exp. Group	Cont. Group
No	Post-Test	Post-Test
1	6.83	6.25
2	7.08	6.75
3	6.92	6.83
4	6.67	5.58
5	8.08	7.67
6	6.67	6.08
7	7.75	6.17
8	6.58	6.25
9	7.33	6.42
10	7.50	6.92
11	5.83	5.50
12	6.83	6.67
13	6.83	6.33
14	6.25	6.08
15	7.25	6.33
16	8.08	6.92
17	7.33	5.58
18	7.17	6.50
19	6.33	5.58
20	6.92	6.50
21	7.58	7.25
22	6.67	6.08
23	8.00	7.00
24	7.25	6.08
25	7.67	7.25
26	7.50	7.08
27	7.08	6.08
28	6.83	6.58
29	7.92	6.67
30	8.08	7.08
31	7.17	6.67
32	6.58	6.00
Total	228.58	206.75
Mean	7.14	6.46

Appendix 15

Students' Writing Test Score of Pre and Post Tests of Experimental Group

No	Students' Number	Students' Initial	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	170107002	WIR	5.75	6.83
2	170107003	SRH	6.33	7.08
3	170107004	AID	6.08	6.92
4	170107005	TRA	5.67	6.67
5	170107006	UAP	7.75	8.08
6	170107007	SGW	6.00	6.67
7	170107008	WID	6.92	7.75
8	170107009	HER	5.50	6.58
9	170107010	ARN	6.50	7.33
10	170107011	LAL	7.00	7.50
11	170107012	NLA	5.17	5.83
12	170107013	ZEL	5.75	6.83
13	170107014	NNI	6.42	6.83
14	170107015	BUN	5.08	6.25
15	170107016	INN	6.25	7.25
16	170107017	MZA	7.75	8.08
17	170107018	MHI	6.00	7.33
18	170107019	SIM	6.50	7.17
19	170107020	WAL	4.83	6.33
20	170107021	MHH	5.92	6.92
21	170107022	QUR	6.83	7.58
22	170107023	RDI	5.50	6.67
23	170107024	FIH	7.67	8.00
24	170107025	RAO	6.25	7.25
25	170107026	ERL	7.00	7.67
26	170107027	LHH.	7.00	7.50
27	170107028	AKJ	6.42	7.08
28	170107029	FDH	5.83	6.83
29	170107030	MSR	7.67	7.92
30	170107031	HID	7.83	8.08
31	170107032	MAF	6.42	7.17
32	170107033	IKS	5.83	6.58
	Total Score		203.41	228.58
	Mean Score		6.35	7.14

Appendix 16

Students' Writing Test Score of Pre and Post Tests of Control Group

No	Students' Number	Students' Initial	Pre-Test	Post-Test
1	170107034	AYS	5.75	6.25
2	170107035	APR	6.50	6.75
3	170107036	ARD	6.50	6.83
4	170107037	BNA	5.42	5.58
5	170107038	BQS	7.50	7.67
6	170107039	YUR	5.83	6.08
7	170107040	DEK	5.83	6.17
8	170107041	WWK	5.67	6.25
9	170107042	BQZ	6.25	6.42
10	170107043	JAT	6.75	6.92
11	170107044	BDI	5.08	5.50
12	170107045	FAA	6.17	6.67
13	170107046	LUR	5.92	6.33
14	170107047	FES	5.42	6.08
15	170107048	WRK	5.67	6.33
16	170107049	SRF	6.83	6.92
17	170107050	RMS	5.25	5.58
18	170107051	MST	6.08	6.50
19	170107052	MAB	4.75	5.58
20	170107053	RHA	6.00	6.50
21	170107054	HRA	7.00	7.25
22	170107055	HDS	5.58	6.08
23	170107056	PIH	6.83	7.00
24	170107057	ARS	5.67	6.08
25	170107058	AND	7.00	7.25
26	170107059	JNA	6.75	7.08
27	170107060	MFT	5.58	6.08
28	170107061	ISR	6.17	6.58
29	170107062	BQA	6.25	6.67
30	170107062	LKM	6.67	7.08
31	170107063	MNI	6.50	6.67
32	170107064	MLI	5.75	6.00
		Total Score	194.91	206.75
		Mean Score	6.091	6.46

Appendix 17

Students' Writing Scores of Pre-Test of Two Test Raters

Pre-test of Exp. Group of two Test Raters				
No.	Pre - test	Pre-test	Total	Mean
1	35	34	69	34.5
2	38	38	76	38
3	36	37	73	36.5
4	31	37	68	34
5	46	47	93	46.5
6	37	35	72	36
7	42	41	83	41.5
8	32	34	66	33
9	39	39	78	39
10	42	42	84	42
11	28	34	62	31
12	36	33	69	34.5
13	39	38	77	38.5
14	28	33	61	30.5
15	36	39	75	37.5
16	47	46	93	46.5
17	36	36	72	36
18	38	40	78	39
19	26	32	58	29
20	36	35	71	35.5
21	43	39	82	41
22	33	33	66	33
23	48	44	92	46
24	36	39	75	37.5
25	42	42	84	42
26	42	42	84	42
27	38	39	77	38.5
28	36	34	70	35

Pre-test of Cont. Group of two Test Raters				
No.	Pre-test	Pre-test	Total	Mean
1	34	35	69	34.5
2	40	38	78	39
3	42	36	78	39
4	34	31	65	32.5
5	44	46	90	45
6	33	37	70	35
7	28	42	70	35
8	36	32	68	34
9	36	39	75	37.5
10	39	42	81	40.5
11	33	28	61	30.5
12	38	36	74	37
13	32	39	71	35.5
14	37	28	65	32.5
15	32	36	68	34
16	35	47	82	41
17	27	36	63	31.5
18	35	38	73	36.5
19	31	26	57	28.5
20	36	36	72	36
21	41	43	84	42
22	34	33	67	33.5
23	35	47	82	41
24	32	36	68	34
25	42	42	84	42
26	39	42	81	40.5
27	29	38	67	33.5
28	38	36	74	37

29	46	46	92	46
30	48	46	94	47
31	38	39	77	38.5
32	34	36	70	35
Total	1212	1229	2441	1220.5
Mean	37.875	38.40625	76.28125	38.14063

29	29	46	75	37.5
30	35	45	80	40
31	40	38	78	39
32	35	34	69	34.5
Total	1131	1208	2339	1169.5
Mean	35.34375	37.75	73.09375	36.546875

Appendix 18

Students' Writing Post-Test Scores of Two Test Raters

Post-test of Exp. Group of two Test Raters

No.	Post-test	Post-test	Total	Mean
1	40	42	82	41
2	41	44	85	42.5
3	42	41	83	41.5
4	38	42	80	40
5	48	49	97	48.5
6	40	40	80	40
7	45	48	93	46.5
8	37	42	79	39.5
9	44	44	88	44
10	45	45	90	45
11	33	37	70	35
12	41	41	82	41
13	39	43	82	41
14	39	36	75	37.5
15	42	45	87	43.5
16	49	48	97	48.5
17	45	43	88	44
18	43	43	86	43
19	36	40	76	38

Post-test of Cont. Group of two Test Raters

No.	Post-test	Post-test	Total	Mean
1	37	38	75	37.5
2	42	39	81	40.5
3	43	39	82	41
4	34	33	67	33.5
5	45	47	92	46
6	34	39	73	36.5
7	32	42	74	37
8	39	36	75	37.5
9	36	41	77	38.5
10	40	43	83	41.5
11	34	32	66	33
12	40	40	80	40
13	35	41	76	38
14	39	34	73	36.5
15	37	39	76	38
16	35	48	83	41.5
17	31	36	67	33.5
18	38	40	78	39
19	36	31	67	33.5

20	42	41	83	41.5
21	47	44	91	45.5
22	38	42	80	40
23	49	47	96	48
24	41	46	87	43.5
25	46	46	92	46
26	45	45	90	45
27	44	41	85	42.5
28	42	40	82	41
29	48	47	95	47.5
30	49	48	97	48.5
31	43	43	86	43
32	39	40	79	39.5
Total	1360	1383	2743	1371.5
Mean	42.5	43.218 75	85.718 75	42.859 38

20	40	38	78	39
21	42	45	87	43.5
22	36	37	73	36.5
23	36	48	84	42
24	33	40	73	36.5
25	43	44	87	43.5
26	41	44	85	42.5
27	32	41	73	36.5
28	40	39	79	39.5
29	34	46	80	40
30	37	48	85	42.5
31	40	40	80	40
32	36	36	72	36
Total	1197	1284	2481	1240.5
Mean	37.40 625	40.12 5	77.531 25	38.765 63

Appendix 19

The Conversion of the Post Test Scores of the Two Groups

Post-Test of Two Groups				
No.	Exp. Class	Score	Control Class	Score
1	41.00	6.83	37.50	6.25
2	42.50	7.08	40.50	6.75
3	41.50	6.92	41.00	6.83
4	40.00	6.67	33.50	5.58
5	48.50	8.08	46.00	7.67
6	40.00	6.67	36.50	6.08
7	46.50	7.75	37.00	6.17
8	39.50	6.58	37.50	6.25
9	44.00	7.33	38.50	6.42
10	45.00	7.50	41.50	6.92
11	35.00	5.83	33.00	5.50
12	41.00	6.83	40.00	6.67
13	41.00	6.83	38.00	6.33
14	37.50	6.25	36.50	6.08
15	43.50	7.25	38.00	6.33
16	48.50	8.08	41.50	6.92
17	44.00	7.33	33.50	5.58
18	43.00	7.17	39.00	6.50
19	38.00	6.33	33.50	5.58
20	41.50	6.92	39.00	6.50
21	45.50	7.58	43.50	7.25
22	40.00	6.67	36.50	6.08
23	48.00	8.00	42.00	7.00
24	43.50	7.25	36.50	6.08
25	46.00	7.67	43.50	7.25
26	45.00	7.50	42.50	7.08
27	42.50	7.08	36.50	6.08
28	41.00	6.83	39.50	6.58
29	47.50	7.92	40.00	6.67
30	48.50	8.08	42.50	7.08
31	43.00	7.17	40.00	6.67

Post-test of Two Groups				
No.	Exp. Class	Score	Control Class	Score
1	34.50	5.75	34.50	5.75
2	38.00	6.33	39.00	6.50
3	36.50	6.08	39.00	6.50
4	34.00	5.67	32.50	5.42
5	46.50	7.75	45.00	7.50
6	36.00	6.00	35.00	5.83
7	41.50	6.92	35.00	5.83
8	33.00	5.50	34.00	5.67
9	39.00	6.50	37.50	6.25
10	42.00	7.00	40.50	6.75
11	31.00	5.17	30.50	5.08
12	34.50	5.75	37.00	6.17
13	38.50	6.42	35.50	5.92
14	30.50	5.08	32.50	5.42
15	37.50	6.25	34.00	5.67
16	46.50	7.75	41.00	6.83
17	36.00	6.00	31.50	5.25
18	39.00	6.50	36.50	6.08
19	29.00	4.83	28.50	4.75
20	35.50	5.92	36.00	6.00
21	41.00	6.83	42.00	7.00
22	33.00	5.50	33.50	5.58
23	46.00	7.67	41.00	6.83
24	37.50	6.25	34.00	5.67
25	42.00	7.00	42.00	7.00
26	42.00	7.00	40.50	6.75
27	38.50	6.42	33.50	5.58
28	35.00	5.83	37.00	6.17
29	46.00	7.67	37.50	6.25
30	47.00	7.83	40.00	6.67
31	38.50	6.42	39.00	6.50

32	39.50	6.58	36.00	6.00
T o t a l	1371.50	228. 58	1240.50	206. 75
M e a n	42.86	7.14	38.77	6.46

32	35.00	5.83	34.50	5.75
Tot al	1371.5 0	203. 42	1240.50	194. 92
Me an	42.86	6.36	38.77	6.09

Appendix 20

Descriptive Statistics of the Total and the Componential Scores in the Pre-test of Writing

	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Pre-test				Pre-test			
	Max Score	M	SD	Min Score	Max Score	M	SD	Min Score
Organization	8.00	6.2656	.91567	4.50	8.00	6.0938	.80760	4.00
Developmental	8.00	6.3750	.85194	4.50	7.50	6.1250	.67202	5.00
Cohesion	8.00	6.3906	.96499	5.00	8.00	6.1250	.88900	4.00
Structure	8.00	6.3594	.90013	4.50	7.50	6.0312	.76134	5.00
Vocabulary	8.00	6.4063	.95409	4.50	7.50	6.1406	.72105	4.50
Mechanics	8.00	6.3437	.83702	4.50	7.50	6.0313	.75067	5.00

Descriptive Statistics of the Total and the Componential Scores in the Post-test of Writing

	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Post-test				Post-test			
	Max Score	M	SD	Min Score	Max Score	M	SD	Min Score
Organization	8	7.20	0.620346	6	8	6.71	0.694883	5
Developmental	8.5	7.10	0.78014	4.5	7.5	6.34	0.614837	5.5
Cohesion	8	7.10	0.737633	5.5	8	6.45	0.699762	5
Structure	8.5	7.17	0.799288	5	8	6.43	0.820602	5
Vocabulary	8	7	0.672022	5.5	7.5	6.42	0.730768	5

Mechanics	9	7.26	0.695427	6	8	6.39	0.680777	5
-----------	---	------	----------	---	---	------	----------	---

Appendix 21

T-Test and Independent Sample Test of Essay Writing Pre Test for Exp .and Contol Groups

Group Statistics

Class	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Essay Writing Score Experimental Group	32	65.2500	9.16867	1.62081
Control Group	32	66.4062	6.51974	1.15254

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Essay Writing Score	4.610	.036	-.581	62	.563	-1.15625	1.98881	-5.13182	2.81932	
Equal variances assumed										
Equal variances not assumed			-.581	55.967	.563	-1.15625	1.98881	-5.14037	2.82787	

Appendix 22

T-Test and Independent Sample Test of Essay Writing Post Test for Exp .and Contol Groups

Group Statistics

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
score	Experimental Group	32	7.1432	.57198	.10111
	Control Group	32	6.4609	.53631	.09481

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
score Equal variances assumed	.108	.743	4.922	62	.000	.68229	.13861	.40522	.95937
Equal variances not assumed			4.922	61.745	.000	.68229	.13861	.40519	.95939

Appendix 23

Students' Self-Esteem Pre-Test Score of Experimental and Control Groups

No	Exp. Group Pre-Test	Cont. Group Pre-Test
1	50	55
2	55	50
3	56	66
4	68	69
5	72	70
6	60	67
7	64	54
8	67	77
9	68	66
10	80	70
11	80	75
12	69	68
13	60	70
14	76	66
15	66	76
16	65	65
17	64	60
18	56	66
19	53	63
20	67	62
21	75	75
22	50	66
23	60	62
24	69	65
25	75	74
26	69	70
27	79	75
28	52	62
29	55	57
30	60	66
31	66	68
32	82	70
Total	2088	2125
Mean	65.25	66.40

Appendix 23

Students' Self-Esteem Post-Test Score of Experimental and Control Groups

No	Exp. Group Post-Test	Cont. Group Post-Test
1	64	60
2	79	66
3	76	72
4	76	73
5	81	71
6	77	77
7	80	60
8	74	80
9	89	72
10	87	75
11	90	82
12	80	75
13	74	73
14	97	78
15	78	79
16	86	66
17	75	65
18	76	68
19	68	64
20	76	72
21	100	77
22	78	74
23	82	66
24	73	70
25	81	77
26	82	72
27	85	80
28	85	64
29	68	61
30	74	68
31	81	70
32	84	73
Total	2803	2803
Mean	79.87	71.25

Appendix 24

Students' Self-esteem of Experimental Group

No.	Students' Initial	Pre-test Score	Post Test Score
1	WIR	50	64
2	SRH	55	79
3	AID	56	76
4	TRA	68	76
5	UAP	72	81
6	SGW	60	77
7	WID	64	80
8	HER	67	74
9	ARN	68	89
10	LAL	80	87
11	NLA	80	90
12	ZEL	69	80
13	NNI	60	74
14	BUN	76	97
15	INN	66	78
16	MZA	65	86
17	MHI	64	75
18	SIM	56	76

19	WAL	53	68
20	MHH	67	76
21	QUR	75	100
22	RDI	50	78
23	FIH	60	82
24	RAO	69	73
25	ERL	75	81
26	LHH.	69	82
27	AKJ	79	85
28	FDH	52	85
29	MSR	55	68
30	HID	60	74
31	MAF	66	81
32	IKS	82	84
The total Score		2088	2803
The mean score		65.25	79.875

Appendix 25

Students' Self-esteem of Control Group

No.	Students' Initial	Pre-test Score	Post Test Score
1	AYS	55	60
2	APR	50	66
3	ARD	66	72
4	BNA	69	73
5	BQS	70	71
6	YUR	67	77
7	DEK	54	60
8	WWK	77	80
9	BQZ	66	72
10	JAT	70	75
11	BDI	75	82
12	FAA	68	75
13	LUR	70	73
14	FES	66	78
15	WRK	76	79
16	SRF	65	66
17	RMS	60	65
18	MST	66	68
19	MAB	63	64

20	RHA	62	72
21	HRA	75	77
22	HDS	66	74
23	PIH	62	66
24	ARS	65	70
25	AND	74	77
26	JNA	70	72
27	MFT	75	80
28	ISR	62	64
29	BQA	57	61
30	LKM	66	68
31	MNI	68	70
32	MLI	70	73
The total Score		2125	2803
The mean score		66.40625	71.25

Appendix 26

Pre-test of Five Components of Self-Esteem for Experimental Group

No.	Students' Initial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	F C	8	9	10	11	12	13	F R	14	15	16	F L	17	18	19	20	21	F S	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	F C	Total Score			
1	WIR	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	5	1	2	2	1	2	8	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	4	50	
2	SRH	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	5	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	55
3	AID	2	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	6	1	2	2	2	2	9	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	1	6	56		
4	TRA	4	1	3	2	2	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	4	4	1	2	3	2	7	2	4	2	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	3	2	4	2	1	8	68		
5	UAP	3	2	4	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	8	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	4	2	1	9	72	
6	SGW	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	6	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	7	60
7	WID	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	7	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	7	64	
8	HER	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	1	2	3	2	2	4	2	1	2	3	7	2	2	3	2	1	0	2	2	3	2	2	4	1	1	1	1	7	67		
9	ARN	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	1	4	2	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	7	3	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	2	1	3	2	3	2	1	7	68			
10	LAL	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	1	4	2	2	4	2	3	1	3	3	3	9	3	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	80	
11	NLA	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	1	4	2	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	4	1	3	2	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	3	2	3	4	1	2	80		
12	ZEL	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	8	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	1	7	69		
13	NNI	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	3	7	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	60	

14	BUN	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	7	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	4	3	2	3	8	4	2	4	2	3	1	5	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	76	
15	INN	2	4	2	3	4	2	2	1	9	4	2	2	2	2	2	1	4	2	2	2	6	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	66
16	MZA	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	5	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	3	8	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	7	65	
17	MHI	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	2	2	7	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	7	64	
18	SIM	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	5	2	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	7	1	2	1	2	2	8	2	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	4	56		
19	WAL	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	5	2	2	1	2	2	9	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	7	53		
20	MHH	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	5	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	4	2	4	2	8	2	3	2	2	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	1	9	67		
21	QUR	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	8	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	5	3	4	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	2	3	2	4	2	2	0	75		
22	RDI	2	3	3	2	3	2	1	1	6	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	9	2	1	2	5	1	1	2	1	2	7	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	50		
23	FIH	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	5	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	4	3	2	2	7	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	60		
24	RAO	3	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	6	3	2	3	1	3	2	1	4	2	2	3	7	4	2	1	4	2	3	4	2	1	3	1	3	3	2	1	9	69		
25	ERL	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	1	7	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	9	3	2	2	3	3	1	3	4	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	1	75		
26	LHH.	3	1	1	2	2	3	2	1	4	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	3	4	3	1	3	2	3	3	1	2	3	1	3	3	2	3	4	1	2	69			
27	AKJ	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	7	4	2	2	4	3	2	1	7	3	3	3	9	3	2	3	3	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	2	4	1	2	2	79		
28	FDH	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	9	2	2	2	6	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	6	52	

29	MSR	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	4	2	1	2	1	2	1	9	2	2	2	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	3	2	1	2	3	1	2	6	55
30	HID	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	1	3	1	2	3	6	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	6	60
31	MAF	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	7	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	3	8	2	3	2	1	2	0	3	2	1	2	4	2	2	1	7	66	
32	IKS	4	3	2	3	2	4	2	2	0	3	2	3	2	4	3	1	7	4	4	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	4	1	82
The total Score		7	7	6	7	6	7	6	5	0	7	6	6	7	7	6	4	2	7	7	8	3	7	6	7	7	7	6	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	6	6	5	2088
The mean score		2.5	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.6	2.9	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.1	3.7	2.5	2.4	2.5	3.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.6	65.25	
Strongly Agree		2	1	1	0	1	1	2	8	5	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	1	7	3	1	1	1	2	8	3	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	7	56	
Agree		1	3	8	6	1	4	4	8	6	5	9	7	7	5	8	8	5	4	1	3	5	0	5	7	0	8	4	5	9	6	6	1	3	7	7	4	5	7
Disagree		1	5	9	1	2	1	7	4	2	8	1	3	6	8	9	4	7	2	3	1	2	4	8	3	3	1	2	9	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	5	3
Strongly Disagree		2	4	4	1	3	1	6	2	1	2	6	2	5	0	3	8	3	2	1	6	5	2	3	3	2	5	4	1	7	6	2	4	4	5	0	2	10	
Total		3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	9	3	3	3	9	3	3	3	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	5	2	6

Appendix 27

Post-test of Five Components of Self-Esteem for Experimental Group

N o.	Students' Initial	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	F C	8	9	0	1	1	1	1	F R	1	1	1	F L	1	1	1	2	2	F S	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	F C	Tot al Score
		1	2	3	2	3	2	1	4	2	3	1	2	2	3	13	2	2	3	7	3	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	18		
1	WIR	1	2	3	2	3	2	1	14	2	3	1	2	2	3	13	2	2	3	7	3	2	3	1	3	12	3	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	18	64	
2	SRH	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	16	1	3	3	3	3	2	15	3	4	3	10	3	2	2	3	4	14	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	24	79	
3	AID	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	19	3	3	3	2	2	3	16	3	2	3	8	3	2	3	2	3	13	2	2	4	3	3	3	2	1	20	76			
4	TRA	4	2	3	3	2	3	2	19	2	2	3	2	3	2	14	3	3	3	9	3	4	2	3	1	13	3	2	3	1	3	3	4	2	21	76			
5	UAP	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	19	3	3	2	3	2	2	15	3	3	3	9	4	3	2	3	3	15	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	2	23	81			
6	SGW	4	2	3	3	2	3	3	20	2	3	2	3	3	3	16	3	2	3	8	3	2	3	2	3	13	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	20	77			
7	WID	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	19	4	3	3	3	2	2	17	3	4	4	11	3	3	2	3	2	13	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	20	80			
8	HER	3	3	2	3	3	2	4	20	2	3	2	3	4	2	16	3	2	3	8	2	2	3	2	3	12	2	3	3	2	2	4	1	1	18	74			
9	ARN	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	20	3	3	2	3	2	3	16	4	4	3	11	3	3	4	3	4	17	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	25	89			
10	LAL	3	2	3	3	3	3	4	21	4	3	2	4	3	3	19	3	3	3	9	3	3	3	3	3	15	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	23	87			

11	NLA	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	2	1	4	2	4	2	3	3	18	4	3	4	1	1	3	4	3	3	3	1	6	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	24	90	
12	ZEL	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	1	8	3	4	2	2	2	3	16	3	3	3	9	3	3	3	4	3	1	6	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	21	80	
13	NNI	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	1	8	3	2	3	2	2	2	14	3	3	2	8	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	4	2	3	3	3	3	22	74	
14	BUN	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	4	19	4	4	4	1	2	4	3	4	3	3	1	7	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	26	97	
15	INN	3	4	3	2	4	2	3	2	1	3	3	2	2	3	3	16	3	3	2	8	3	2	3	2	3	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	20	78
16	MZA	3	2	3	3	2	2	4	1	9	2	3	4	3	3	3	18	3	4	4	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	24	86
17	MHI	3	3	3	2	2	3	2	1	8	3	3	2	3	2	2	15	3	3	3	9	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	21	75	
18	SIM	3	2	3	2	3	3	2	1	8	3	3	2	3	3	2	16	4	3	2	9	1	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	21	76	
19	WAL	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	15	3	3	2	8	3	2	2	2	3	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	19	68	
20	MHH	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	9	2	3	3	2	3	3	16	3	4	2	9	2	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	2	20	76	
21	QUR	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	2	21	4	4	4	1	2	4	4	4	4	3	1	9	4	3	3	2	3	3	4	4	26	100	
22	RDI	3	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	8	3	1	3	2	2	1	12	3	3	4	1	0	2	4	3	3	2	1	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	4	24	78	
23	FIH	4	2	3	3	3	2	2	1	9	2	3	2	3	3	3	16	3	4	3	1	0	3	3	3	3	2	1	4	2	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	20	82	
24	RAO	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	0	3	2	3	3	2	2	15	2	3	3	8	3	2	1	4	2	1	2	3	2	1	3	1	3	3	2	18	73		
25	ERL	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	1	9	4	2	3	3	3	2	17	4	3	3	1	0	3	3	2	3	3	1	4	3	4	1	2	3	3	2	3	21	81	

Appendix 28

Photograph 2
The Lecturer is Scaffolding Students of how to Use Collaborative Writing Strategy



Photograph 3
The Students' Activity in Using Collaborative writing Strategy



DAFTAR RIWAYAT HIDUP

Identitas Pribadi

Nama	: Ika Rama Suhandra
NIP	: 197808222007101001
TTL	: Kawo, Lombok Tengah, 22 Agustus 1978
Pangkat/Gol. Pekerjaan	: Lektor/IIIc Dosen Tetap Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram NTB
Alamat Lengkap	: Gg. Kelapa Gading, Muhajirin, Narmada, Lombok Barat, NTB
Email	: ikamasuhandra@gmail.com
Nama Istri	: Nur Isnaini, S. Pd.I
Nama Anak	1. Yan Rais Suhandra 2. Ufaira Klnara Afifa 3. Adyatma Mano Pradipta
Orang Tua	Ayah : H. Baharudin, A. Ma Ibu : Almarhumah Hj. Nurjani
Hp	: 087864430923

Riwayat Pendidikan Formal

SDN 1 Kawo	1984-1990
SMPN 2 Pujut	1990-1993
SMA Korpri Praya	1993-1996
Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP Mataram	1999-2003
Pascasarjana S2 Linguistik Terapan Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta	2009-2011
Pascasarjana S3 Linguistik Universitas Hasanudin	2017-sekarang

Riwayat Pendidikan Non- Formal

Pondok Pesantren Wali Songo Ngabar Ponorogo	1994
Mengikuti Workshop on Higher Education Course Design kerjasama ISDB UIN Mataram dan Marmara University di Turki	2014

Pengalaman Organisasi

Pengurus Komisariat HMI FIIS IKIP

Mataram	2001-2003
Ketua BEM Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni IKIP Mataram	2001-2002
Anggota Komite Independen Pemantau Pemilu	1999
Anggota Ikatan LInguistik Terapan	2018-sekarang

Riwayat Pekerjaan

1. Guru Bahasa Inggris di SMKN 5 Mataram	2014-2017
2. Dosen Luar Biasa IKIP Mataram	2004-2010
3. Staf Pengajar di BIMBEL AL- Fikri Mataram	2003-2017
4. Sekretaris LPPM IKIP Mataram	2004-2007
5. Dosen tetap Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram	2007-sekarang
6. Sekretaris Jurusan Tadris/Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris UIN Mataram	2015-2017

Karya Tulis Ilmiah

Pemanfaatan media gambar berseri untuk memperkaya kemampuan menulis naratif bahasa inggris siswa kelas IX MTS NW Nurul Wathon Pengembur Lombok Tengah	Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat 'Transformasi" UIN Mataram (2018)
Studi Komparatif Makna Konotasi Warna dalam Budaya Masyarakat Barat dan Masyarakat Suku Sasak Lombok Indonesia	Jurnal Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya 'Cordoba' UIN Mataram (2019)
Hubungan Bahasa, sastra, dan Ideologi	Jurnal Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya 'Cordoba' UIN Mataram (2019)
Sapaan dan Honorifik dalam Masyarakat Sasak	Jurnal Pendidikan IPS-Ekonomi 'Soceity' UIN Mataram (2017)
Collaborative and Individual Writing Strategies for EFL Writing Instruction: Outcomes and Perceptions	International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS) (2021)