The Impact Of Collaborative Learning On Students' Writing Ability And Their Motivation In Writing At MTs Negeri 1 Konawe

Wahyudi Daud (wahyudibv@gmail.com)
Hilaluddin Hanafi
Ader Laepe

1Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
Key words: *Collaborative Learning; Students' Writing Ability; Motivation in Writing* *DOI:*	This study investigated the The Impact of Collaborative Learning on Students' Writing Ability and Their Motivation in Writing At Mts Negeri 1 Konawe. The researcher employed Quantitative Rearch Method to conduct this study. Two instruments were employed in this study, those are Achievement Test and Motivation Questionnaire. Population of this study is all the seventh grade students of MTS Negeri 1 Konawe comprised of 2 classes, consist of 42 students were taken as the sample of this study. The data was analyzed by using SPSS16 to measure the the impact of collaborative learning on students' writing ability and their motivation in writing at Mts Negeri 1 Konawe. The result of this study shows that: (1) There is significant difference of collaborative learning on students' writing ability. (2) There is positif correlation between motivation in learning and the value of writing students.

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning and teaching another language is a long and a complicated process. Various numbers of question may be appearing during the process. For example, what is the better aspect to make sure that we are in the right direction to teach and learn? Some may think that certain thing can be pushed aside and prioritized the other. However, we may overlook the most important aspect and focusing on things we think important in the process. In the early stage, we choose to prioritize on

things like grammar, vocabulary mastery, reading and speaking. In result, we pay less attention on things like writing.

According to white and arndt, writing involves complicated and multifaceted activities such as generating ideas, drafting, revising, editing texts, and correcting errors. It can be seen that writing is a long and continuous process. In the process, we draw something in other people's mind by using only words . It is undeniably true that the process in writing is complicated. Oftentimes, the created idea is different from what is expressed in the paper.

We cannot deny that in writing, it is important to have such skills. To be able to write effectively and fluently. It is supported by Raimes (1987), states that the pedagogical purposes of writing range from improving, training, and practicing language in the early stages of learning to communicating fluently and accurately at intermediate and more advanced levels. The students are unwilling to write once they are running out of ideas sometimes. Instead of thinking harder, students choose to stop. It seems like that they need accompanion to brainstorming, finding the new idea. It can be done using one of varieties of active learning to enhance student to student interaction.

Many students find it difficult on improving their ability in writing. The reason is that vocabulary mastery, selecting the perfect vocabularies and expressing their idea into their writing is matters. Writing ability is one of components in English to make students become a good writer because they can practice and reinforce their own English for creating feeling, ideas, argue and opinion to describe something. Harmer (2004) states that writing is used as an aided memoire or practice tool to help students practice and work with language they have been studying. However, the phenomenon that happends base on the researchers' teaching experience as their English Teacher, at MTS Negeri 1 Konawe, many of students became passive when they were faced with a writing task. This influences the students' writing ability achievement and as a consequence not all junior high school students' scores were good in writing. It can be seen on their writing score that almost half of the students got score under 70. As the result, their average score of writing was low. Their writing achievement was below the expectation. It makes the researcher as their teacher want to increase the students' writing ability by Collaborative Learning.

Collaborative Learning introduced as one variety of active learning which structures students into groupswith defined roles for each student and a task for the group to accomplish (Keyser, 2000). The purpose is to enhance their cognitive and social skill. Collaborative learning requires the students to work in group to achieve the same goal. Different with the traditional one, which goal is for individual goal. In collaborative learning, all members in a group will have to expressed their idea whether they have something in mind or not. Every member is expected to boost another member to think. By working in a group, the developed idea is likely to be more fully and more creative. Peter Elbow explains, Two heads are better than one because two heads can make conflicting material integrate better than one head can. It's why brainstorming works.

However, collaborative learning may not works sometimes. Several factors can come in the way and bring unexpected outcomes. As aforementioned before that

such problem in writing can be solved by working in a group, but it is important to remember that there is still limitation on the process. To make many heads to think and work as a unit is not an easy thing. Conflict may arises, such as personality conflict. Some members may be hard to work with or unreliable. Despite it is not happening in many cases, it is still problematic. Brumberger (1999) mentions that collaborative writing does not seem to consistently result in a better product, nor does it necessarily result in visibly improved writing skills.

It has been said that students can learn best in a more learner-centered, collaborative learning context compared with individualistic and competitive learning settings (D. W. Johnson & R. T. Johnson, 1994). Learners participate actively in a collaborative learning context and construct their linguistic knowledge through interacting with other learners. It also influence the way students learn. Furthermore, it can substitute the teacher's role and make the students becoming more independent.

This led us to this study, since the use of collaborative learning on teaching writing has been widely used. The idea to determine what impact that collaborative learning gives as a result is considered to be the case including in MTS Negeri 1 Konawe. Some thinks that it will be easier and will give a direct feedback on their achievement when working in a group, but not every student have the same learning style. Some may feel uncomfortable when dealing with others. Therefore, it is important to investigate the impact as a consideration.

Having a positive impact towards the use of a technique, collaborative learning in particular, will help for students better achievement. Besides, it will be affecting teachers and students interest to utilize these kind of technique in the teaching and learning process. It means that knowing the impact and how do the collaborative learning impact their writing ability should be investigated. This study will be conducted at SMP Negeri MTS Negeri 1 Konawe. This is inspired by the fact that the use of collaborative learning may have been applied some schools.

Therefore, this study believes that the result of this study can be used as reference in the upcoming teaching and learning process.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The study adopted the quantitative research method. The one-group time series design was employed for the quantitative research method since it involved ongoing measurement and the group experienced experimental treatment within a period of time. This study was conducted at seventh grade of MTS Negeri 1 Konawe. Based on the target content and the syllabus in this school, this study was conducted on May 2018. The data were drawn from two form one classes of intermediate level in an urban government school. The classes had approximately 42 students of mostly intermediate proficiency level in English Language in MTS Negeri 1 Konawe. VII A class is a control group that received no collaborative learning activities and VII B class an experimental group that received collaborative learning activities. In experimental group, the sample consisted of 32 females and 10 males who had never experienced cooperative learning before the treatment.

This study involved two variables, they are independent and dependent variables. The independent variable in this research is collaborative learning;

meanwhile the dependent variable is writing ability and students' motivations in writing. Therefore, this study will examine the impact of independent variable (writing ability and students' motivations in writing) towards dependent variables (collaborative). This research was conducted on the cooperative learning group using a quasi experimental design. The data was analyzed using pre-test and post-test. The researcher conducted the research for eleven weeks. One week was used to administer the pre-test for the narrative essay. The researcher give pre-test to the subjects prior to the research. From the result of the pre-test, the researcher could prepare the material before giving the treatment and also determine the post-test. Two weeks were then allocated to brief the students on cooperative learning approaches which were Learning Together by Johnson and Johnson (2000) and Kagan Structures by Kagan (1994). Six weeks were then allotted for the execution of the cooperative learning lesson plans. Finally, after the treatment, the final two weeks were used to administer the post-test. The researchers conducted a post-test in the form of a written test in the end of meeting to measure the impact of collaborative learning towards the treatment being implemented for writing ability in the classroom. The writing test will be selected from students' writing book which will be used both as the pretest of study and posttest at the end. After that, researcher gave them a Motivation Questionnaire to find out students' motivations in writing.

In order to collect the data, the following instruments will be employed in the research were Achievement Test and Motivation Questionnaire. The writing text will be measure by Jacob Writing Scale (Appendix 1). To find out the for the impact of collaborative learning on students' writing ability, the reseach will analyze the data use Independent Sample T test an for correlation between students' motivation and their achievement in writing will analyzed by using corelation analisis in SPSS.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
3.1. Findings
Regarding the significant impact of collaborative learning on students' writing ability, this section presents the result of the pre-test and pos-test of class control and pre-test and pos-test of class experiment. Moreover, this section also described the corellation between students' motivation and their achievement in writing. The data obtained from class control and class experiment and also the questionnaire that were descriptively analyzed and presented in terms of frequencies.

Is there any significant impact of collaborative learning on students' writing ability?

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pretest	65.52	42	9.630	1.486
	Postest	79.38	42	5.468	.844

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pretest & Postest	42	-.125	.429

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
					Lower	Upper		
Pair 1	Pretest - Postest	-13.857	11.655	1.798	-17.489	-10.225	-7.705	41	.000

The correlation between these two variables is 0.426, it means that the relationship is strong and positive. While, the level of significance of the relationship is 0,000, which means that the significant is at the 0.01 level. The p value is 0,000. Means, there is a difference between before and after treatment. Cause: p value > 0.05 (95% confidence). Mean is -13.857 with Negative Value: This means that there is no tendency to increase students' writing ability after treatment. The average decrease is -13.857.

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
Class	Equal variances assumed	2.167	.145	-17.43	82	.000	-.37981	.02179	-.4232	-.3365
	Equal variances not assumed			-17.43	75.60	.000	-.37981	.02179	-.4232	-.3364

Based on the above table, it can be seen that the value of significance with equal variance assumed is 0.145 higher than 0.05 then it can be stated that the data is homogeneous. The score of P Value is 0.000 lower than value a = 0.05. It means that Ho is rejected and H1 is accepted, so it can be concluded that there is significant difference of collaborative learning on students' writing ability.

Is there any correlation between students' motivation and their achievement in writing?

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Motivation	107.19	13.777	42
Score	79.38	5.468	42

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the mean score of Students' Motivation is 107.19 with a standard deviation is 13.777 and total data is 42. The mean score of Students' Writing Score is 79.38 with a standard deviation is 5.468 and total data is 42.

Correlations

		Motivation	Score
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.524**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	42	42
Score	Pearson Correlation	.524**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	42	42

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The output shows that the correlation between Motivation in writing and Students' writing score is 0.154. This number means that the two variables have a very weak correlation because it is under 0.5. Then it can be concluded that, based on the table of correlation analysis above, there is no correlation between motivation in learning and the value of writing students.

3.2. Discussion
Significant Impact of Collaborative Learning On Students' Writing Ability
The analysis of the findings of the pre-test and post-test of the narrative genre using descriptive statistics showed that the students performed better in the post-tests compared to the pre-tests. This proved that the incorporation of collaborative learning had culminated positive outcomes in enhancing the students' writing performance. The students not only performed better in the composite scores but they also showed enhanced performance in the five components of writing which were content, vocabulary, organization, grammar and mechanics. The analysis based on inferential statistics revealed that there was a significant difference between students' pre-test score and post-test score in narrative writing in terms of the composite scores and the scores for the five writing components which were content, vocabulary, organization, grammar and mechanics.

The findings indicated that students obtained significantly higher post-test scores than pre-test scores in narrative essay writing. This proved that the inclusion of collaborative in the writing lessons had positive effects of all the five writing components which were important components in producing quality essays and for

essay assessment. The effects of collaborative learning in enhancing students‟ performance which had been proven in various studies had also been proven in this study. The elements and effects of collaborative learning had made it feasible for the students to perform better in their writing after they had experienced collaborative learning in the writing lessons.

The increase in the students' writing performance for the composite scores could be due to the fact that collaborative learning provided a shared cognitive set between students (Johnson, Johnson & Smith 1991). When students discuss examples and viewpoints on a common issue, they are able to grasp what their peers think and understand the issue better. Besides, collaborative learning provides the opportunity for students to learn the material. When peer interaction is incorporated in learning writing, the students generate ideas, understand sentences and provide assistance.

This effect concurs with the findings of many previous studies: for example, Waring and Evans (2014) stated that students must engage with each other, especially on long-term tasks, in order to gain more knowledge and share ideas, which will make them learn better than they would if working individually. It also supports Gulbahar and Alper's (2011) finding that most learners have different learning styles based on their individual characteristics, and thus prefer to choose facilitating and learning situations and interactions individually, especially in asynchronous learning activities (like the poster task in this study).

However, Gulbahar and Alper (2011) also found that learners prefer collaborative learning in synchronous learning activities such as exercises and exams, but the present findings do not support this. Moreover, this study agreed with Lee and Kim (2014), who found that Korean students prefer individual learning to collaborative learning styles. It also found that most students prefer diverging and assimilating learning styles to converging and accommodating styles. Moreover, Shen, Hiltz and Bieber (2008) found a significant relationship between collaborative learning and students' exam scores, as their collaborative class achieved higher exam scores than the individual class, and this was agreed with by with the current study. In addition, Adas and Bakir (2013) found a significant difference in students' achievement scores, with the experimental class performing better than their peers in the control class. The experimental students stated that they enjoyed relating inside instructions and illustrations to outside activities using technology. Additionally, Frey and Kaff (2014), in a study focusing on a comprehensive school, found a positive effect of course content and teaching in collaborative learning on the post-course knowledge of students in terms of awareness of the school's practice for students with disabilities and enhancing their knowledge.

However, the present findings disagree with the results reported by Hassan, Fong and Idrus (2011), which showed a significant difference on post-test skills between students who followed collaborative learning and students who followed individual learning in a blended learning environment. In contrast, Yang (2012) found a positive significant effect in the experimental class (collaborative students using a digital game- based learning strategy) in terms of improvement in their problem-solving skills. There was no significant improvement in the control class C using traditional instruction. The experimental class also had higher learning motivation than the control class C. The present findings also disagree with

Hassan and Fook (2014), who found that scores on Arabic language achievement for students using collaborative learning were significantly higher than those of students without collaborative learning in a blended learning environment.

Moreover, Zhu (2012) indicated that collaborative learning might improve not only the total individual performance, but also class performance, through raising the quality of tasks completed, such as improving the formulation of ideas and opinions. Zhu also found that collaborative learning increased the learning activities for knowledge construction by class interaction. In addition, Cash (2013) showed that students undertaking collaborative learning scored significantly better than those engaged in individual learning in the performance of high-risk reading taught with the Reciprocal Mapping intervention.

The present findings also disagree with Essaid et al. (2011), who found a significant difference in post-test scores between students using collaborative and non- collaborative learning, with those engaged in collaborative learning achieving higher scores. They also found a significant difference between learning achievement and performance. Additionally, Rosen and Rimor (2009) found a significant relationship between students' achievements and different learning styles. Collaborative students scored better in the collective standards of knowledge building than did individual students, while individual students achieved higher scores in the personal standard of knowledge construction (arguing and debating theoretical considerations to verify their performance) than did collaborative students. Collaborative students had more collective knowledge than did individual students. Similarly, Boström and Hallin (2013) found a significant difference between collaborative students and individual students in admission scores. All the students in their study preferred collaborative learning. They found that nursing students preferred a converging and accommodating learning style. On the other hand, one-third of the students in their second and third years preferred a diverging and assimilating learning style.

Maesin et al. (2009) found that all the undergraduate students in their study preferred collaborative learning in English lessons. Moreover, Azani (2010) found a positive relationship between cooperative learning and students' achievement in face-to- face and online environments. They stated that collaborative learning enabled students with low abilities to improve their knowledge of tasks, which led them to increase their grades in tests. In addition, Azani (2010) indicated that all students in their study believed that collaborative learning would improve their achievements better than individual learning. Furthermore, Khan (2013) indicated that collaborative learning improves students' empowerment in a blended learning environment.

The present findings supported those reported by Al-Saai et al. (2011), who found no significant difference in students' pre- and post-achievement scores between individual learning and collaborative learning in a blended learning environment. However, they disagree with the significant difference in the scores gained by students undertaking individual and collaborative learning, with higher scores for those using collaborative learning. In addition, Cooley, Holland, Cumming, Novakovic and Burns (2014) found that some students stated that the collaborative learning develops and improves their interpersonal skills, while others

showed negative attitudes towards collaborative learning because they did not have enough ability to collaborate well in groups without direct intervention. A positive significant difference was also found in pre- and post-course scores between the collaborative group and individual learners, with the collaborative group scoring higher through evaluation of continuation of collaborative learning when returning to university, as well as perceived group supportiveness and effectiveness.

Based on the descriptive analysis, it can be concluded the incorporation of collaborative learning can enhance students' writing performance in narrative writing. The elements and effects of collaborative learning can provide an avenue for the students to excel themselves in the writing classes for the narrative genre. The findings proved that the incorporation of collaborative learning in the writing classes for narrative genre produced significantly positive outcome. Students showed a significant improvement in the post-test compared to the pre-test. This proved that students performed better in the composite scores and the five writing components after the inclusion of collaborative learning in the writing lessons. Thus the null hypothesis was rejected.

The enhancement of the students' writing performance for the composite score and the five writing components could be due to the fact that collaborative learning provides a platform for students to analyze and synthesize ideas which could lead to a higher level thinking and understanding (Kaur 2000). Besides, collaborative learning had helped them in terms of generating ideas and realizing their own errors when writing (Mariam & Napisah 2005). They also enjoyed themselves working with friends in exchanging ideas, interacting and getting to know their friends better.

Correlation Between Students' Motivation and Their Achievement in Writing

The main finding of this research was whether there is significant correlation between the students' motivation and their writing ability. Based on the table of correlation between the students' motivation and their writing ability, it showed that motivation influenced writing ability. From those tables, it could be seen that the first variable (motivation) rises and the second variable (writing ability) also rises. It means that two variable correlate each other. In relation to the studies above, it was clear that motivation correlated significantly with writing ability. The result of the research which was done by the researcher also showed that there was a significant correlation between the students' motivation and their writing ability. By looking at the result the researcher assumed that motivation influenced the students' writing ability and the students who had higher motivation tended to have better writing ability.

The external factor had close relationship to the writing ability test and also the teacher. They were related to one another. The students' achievement in writing depended on the level of the difficulty of the text. Thus, it could influence the students' achievement if the text given was not at the right level of the difficulty of the writer. The teacher should have been careful in choosing topic for the text and giving the tasks because they were related to the students' writing ability or the students. However, motivation itself could not be ignored in teaching learning process. Motivation played a role in decision to write. From the analysis of result it showed that motivation was one of factors influencing writing ability improvement.

References

Alderman, k (2004). *Motivation for Achievement: Possibilities for Teaching and Learning*. 2nd d. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Akron University.

Amatayakul, I. (1992). [A study of grade twelve students' essay writing ability in education region 1 of the department of general education]. Unpublished master's thesis, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand.

Arend, R. I. (1994). *Learning to teach*. (2nd Ed). NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bennett, Rolheiser-Bennett and Stevahn,1991, *Collaborative Language Learning and Affective Factor* . In Arnold, (1999) *Affect in Language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bassett, C. & McWhirter, J. J. & Kitzmiller, K. (1999). Teacher implementation of collaborative learning groups. Contemporary Education, 71 (1), 46-50.

Bejarano, Y. (1987). A collaborative small-group methodology in the language classroom. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 483-500.

Biria, R. and Jafari S.(2013). The Impact of Collaborative Writing on the Writing Fluency of Iranian EFL Learners. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4(1), pp. 164-175.

Brookes. A. Grundy. P. (1998). *Begining to Write: Writing Activities for Elementary and Intermediate Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the conversation of mankind. *College English*. 46(7), 635-652.

Brumberger, E.R. (1999). Collaborative projects in a technical writing class: A Cost Benefit Analysis. Teaching English in the two year college, 27(2), 194-203.

Brumfit, C. (1984). Communicative methodology in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Byrne, D. (1993). *Teaching writing skills*. Essex: Longman Group.

Cerbin, B. (2010). *Collaborative Learning Techniques Workshop:* Center for Advancing Teaching & Learning, UW-La Crosse

Cocks, R, & Watts, H (2004). "Relationships Among Perceived Competence, Intrinsic Value and Mastery Goal Orientation in English Maths." The Australian Educational Researcher. 31, 81-111.

Cohen, E., C. Brody, and M. Sapon-Shevin. 2004. Teaching collaborative learning: The challenge for teacher education. New York: SUNY Press.

Connery, B. A. , Vohs, J. L. , Davis, U. C. (1996). Group work and collaborative writing handbook. Retrieved Agustus 16, 2018 from http://www-honors.ucdavis.edu/vohs/toc.html.

Cook, S. (2005). Collaborative Learning in the Classroom. Nottingham: City of Nottingham Education Department.

Crandall. J. (1987) *Collaborative Language Learning and Affective Factors*. In Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in Language Learning* (pp 226-244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crandall, J. A. (1999). *Collaborative language learning and affective factors*. In J. Arnold (Ed.), Affective factors in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dekeyser. R. M. (edit) (2007). *Practice in a Second Language: Perspectives from Applied Linguistics and Cognitive Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

DOOLY, M. (2008). Constructing Knowledge Together. In M. Dooly (Ed.). Telecollaborative Language Learning. A guidebook to moderating intercultural collaboration online (pp. 21-34). Bern: Peter Lang.

Dörnyei, Z. (1997). Psychological processes in collaborative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. The Modern Language Journal, 81,482-493.

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1990). *Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Edward, V. (2000). Using group work in writing. The Journal of English Language Teaching (India), 35,14-20.

Farris, C. R. (1987). *Current composition: Beyond process vs. product. The English journal*, *76*(6), 28-34 .

Flower, L. & Hayes, J. (1987). On the structure of the writing process. *Topics in Language Disorder, 7*(4), 19-30.

Galko, D.F. (2001). *Better Writing Right Now*: *Using Words to Your Advantage*. (p. 10) 1st ed. New York: Learning Express.

Gere, A. R. (1987). Writing groups. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illionis University Press.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. 1996. Theory and practice of writing. Harlow: Longman.

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2010). Writing to read: Evidence for how writing can improve reading. A Carnegie Corporation Time to Act Report. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Hairston, M. (1982). The wind of changes: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College composition and communication*. *33*(1), 76-88.

Harris, J. (1993). *Introducing writing*. (pp.16-63). London: Penguin.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2006). *The practice of English language teaching.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

Henschen, B. M. , Sidlow, E. I. (1990). Collaborative writing. College Teaching, 39, 29-32. [On-line] Available: Bilkent University Library OPAC.

Hirvela, A. (1999). Collaborative writing instruction and communities of readers and writers. TESOL Journal, 8, 7-13.

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.

Horwitz E, Chiarizia, Dietz LM, et al. (1997) DIPEX: a new extraction chromatographic material for the separation and Pre-concentration of actinides from aqueous solution. React Func Polym, 3:25-36.

Ismail, S., & Maasum, T. (2009). *The effects of collaborative learning in enhancing writing performance*. Retrieved Agustus 16, 2018, from http://pkukmweb.ukm.my/~solls09/Proceeding/PDF/Shafini.pdf.

Jacobs, G. M., & Goh, C. C. M. (2007). *Collaborative learning in the language classroom*. Singapore: SEMEO Regional Language Centre.

Jeansonne, J. (1995). *Discovering the pedagogical paradigm shift in technical writing*. Retrieved Agustus 16, 2018 from http://www.stc.org/confproceed/1995/PDFs/PG9194.PDF

Johnson and Johnson, 1994 Johnson, R.T., & Johnson, D.W. (1994). An overview of collaborative learning, In J., Thousand, A., Villa, & A., Nevin (Eds.), Creativity and Collaborative Learning. Baltimore, Maryland, USA: Brookes Publishing.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. & Holubec, E. J. (1987). *Structuring collaborativelearning: Lesson plans for teachers.* Minnesota: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1991). *Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1992). *Advanced collaborative learning* (2nd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1993). *Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Jones, E.M. & Carrasquillo, A.L. 1998. Developing English writing proficiency in limited English proficient college students through collaborative language strategies. ERIC Document Reproduction No ED 423 668.

Kagan, S. (1994). *Collaborative Learning*. San Juan Capistrano.

Kagan, S. (1992). *Collaborative Learning Techniques and Activities.* In McCafferty, S. G, Jacobs, G. M and DaSilva, A. I. (2006).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kagan, S. & High, J. Kagan structures for English Language Learners. ESL Magazine, July/August, 2002, 5(4), 10-12.

Kane, T. S. (2000). *The Oxford Essential Guide to Writing*. New York: Berkley.

Keyser, W. M. (2000). Active learning and collaborative learning: Understanding the differences and using both styles effectively. Research strategies, 17, 35-44. James C. Jernigan Library, Texas A& M university- Kingsville; TX, USA.

Klein, J. D. & Schnackenberg, H. L. (2000). Brief research report: impacts of informal collaborative learning and the affiliation motive on achievement, attitude and student interactions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25, 332-341.

Krashen, S. (1982*). Collaborative Language Learning and Affective Factors*. In Arnold (1999) *Affect in Language learning.* Cambridge University Press.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching an ESL/EFL writing course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3 (pp.219-232). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Legenhausen, L. & Wolff, D.1990. CALL in use - use of CALL: Evaluating CALL software, System 18(1), 1-13.

Larrivee, B (2005). Authentic Classroom Management: Creating A Learning Community and Building Reflective Practice. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Larson, J. , Maier, M. (2000). Co-authoring classroom texts: Shifting participant roles in writing activity. Research in the Teaching English, 34, 468-497.

Lou, Y. , Abrami, P. C. & Spence, J. C. (2000). Impacts of within-class grouping on student achievement: An exploratory model. Journal of Educational Research, 94, 101-112.

Lyman, F. T. (1981). *The responsive classroom discussion: The inclusion of all students*. In A. Anderson (Ed.), Mainstreaming Digest (pp. 109-113). College Park: University of Maryland Press.

MacInnerney, J., and T. Roberts. 2004. Collaborative or collaborative learning? In Online collaborative learning: Theory and practice, ed. T. Roberts, 203–14. Hershey, PA: Information Science.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Stevens, R. J. (1986). *Collaborative integrated reading and comparison: Teacher's manual*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Mariam Mohamed Nor and Napisah Kepol. 2005. The use of collaborative tasks in ESL composition by form one ESL writing students. Teaching and Learning of English in a Second Language. Tanjung Malim: Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris.

Murray, D. M. (1978). *Internal revision: a Process of Discovery*. C.R. Cooper and L. Odell (Eds), Research on Composing: Points of Departure. (pp. 5-103).

Murray, N. and G. Hughes. (2008). *Writing Up Your University Assignments and Research Projects: A Practical Handbook*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Nunan. D. (1989). *Desining Tasks for the Communicative Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D.1991. Language Teaching Methodology. London: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2000*). Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers.* Malysia: Longman.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task- Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parks, S. (2000). Professional writing and the role of incidental collaboration: Evidence from a medical setting. Journal of Second Language Writing, 9, 101-12.

Peyton, J. K. , Jones, C. , Vincent, A. , Greenblatt, L. (1994). Implementing writing workshop with ESOL students: Visions and realities. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 469-486.

Phonkamjad, W. (2008). *The design of an electronic lesson on formal paragraph writing.* Unpublished master's project, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand.

Powell, B. J. (1984). A comparison of students' attitudes and success in writing. Journal of Negro Education, 53, 114-123.

Raimes, 1987 Raimes, A. (1987). Language Proficiency, Writing Ability, and Composing Strategies: A Study of ESL College Student Writers*. Language Learning, 37(3), 439-468.

Reid, G. (2007). *Motivating Learners in the Classroom: Ideas and Strategies.* London: PCP.

Rivers, W. M. (1987). Interactive language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharples, M. (1993). How we write. London and New York: Routledge.

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Collaborative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice.* 2nd Ed. Allyn and Bacon, USA.

Slavin, R. E (1983) and Sharan, S. et al.(1984). *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*. In Nunan, D. (1992). (p 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Collaborative Learning*. In Alderman, k (2004). *Motivation for Achievement: Possibilities for Teaching and Learning*. 2nd d. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Akron University.

Spring, M. (1997). Collaborative writing. [On-line] Retrieved Agustus 16, 2018 from http://www.sis.pitt.edu/-spring/cas/node31.html

Storch, N. (2001). How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. Language Teaching Research, 5, 29-53.

Starkey, L. (2004). *How to Write Great Essays*. 1st Ed. New York: Learning Express.

Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). *Integrated approaches to improve students writing skills for English major students*. *ABAC Journal*, *28*(2), 1-9.

Tierney, R. (1989). The effects of reading and writing upon thinking critically. *Reading Research Quarterly* 25: 136-137.

Tribble, C. (1990). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vetter, A. (2011). A writing assignment extended: An occasion for young people to construct writer identities. Changing English: Studies in Culture and Education, 18 (2), 187- 197.

Wang, F. and Burton, J. (2010). Collaborative Learning Problems and Identify Salience: a Mixed Methods Study. Journal of Education Technology Development and Exchange

Weller, M. (2002). Delivering Learning on the Net : the way. Who and how Online Education. Cambridge University Press

White, R and Arndt, V. (1991). Process Writing. Harlow: Longman.

Wilhelm, K. 1997. Sometimes kicking and screaming: Language teachers-in-training react to a collaborative learning model. Modern Language Journal 81: 527–43.

Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language classrooms.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Woolfolk, A. (2004). *Educational Psychology*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Writing motivation (2011). Retrieved from htt://en.