



## **IMPROVING STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING REPORT TEXT BY USING THE THINK TALK WRITE STRATEGY**

**Muhammad Hasyimsyah Batubara<sup>1</sup>, Umraini Bastari<sup>2</sup>, Nurmalina<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>STAIN Mandailing Natal, Sumut, Indonesia, <sup>2,3</sup>IAIN Takengon, Aceh, Indonesia

Email: muhammd.hasyimsyahbatubarama@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, umrainibastari@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, nurmalina125@gmail.com<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** This study intends to see the improvement of students' report text writing skills using the TTW strategy in Man 1 Central Aceh. The research design is experimental quantitative, while the data collection is by pre and post-test. The sample was taken from class XI IPA1 (20 students in an experimental class) and XI IPA2 (20 students in a control class). Before treatment, the writing ability of the experimental class students was low, with an average pre-test score of 34.65, while the control class students with an average score of 33.35. However, there was an increase after treatment in the experimental class, as seen from the average score results. The post-test average was 69.75, an increase of 35.1. The results of the t-test calculation, where the t-score value is greater than the t-table at a significance level of 0.05. It shows that (Ha) is accepted, and (H0) is rejected. It means that the TTW strategy contributes to improving student's writing skills in making report texts.

**Keywords:** Improve, Think-Talk-Write, Writing, Report Text

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini bermaksud untuk melihat peningkatan keterampilan menulis teks laporan siswa dengan menggunakan strategi TTW di MAN 1 Aceh Tengah. Desain penelitiannya adalah eksperimen kuantitatif, sedangkan pengumpulan datanya melalui pre dan post test. Sampel diambil dari kelas XI IPA1 (20 siswa sebagai kelas eksperimen) dan XI IPA2 (20 siswa sebagai kelas kontrol). Sebelum diberikan perlakuan, kemampuan menulis siswa kelas eksperimen rendah dengan rata-rata nilai pre-test sebesar 34,65, sedangkan siswa kelas kontrol dengan nilai rata-rata 33,35. Namun terjadi peningkatan setelah diberikan perlakuan pada kelas eksperimen, terlihat dari hasil skor rata-rata. Rata-rata post-test sebesar 69,75, meningkat sebesar 35,1. Hasil perhitungan uji t, dimana nilai t-score lebih besar dari t-tabel pada taraf signifikansi 0,05. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa (Ha) diterima, dan (H0) ditolak. Artinya strategi TTW berkontribusi dalam meningkatkan keterampilan menulis siswa dalam membuat teks laporan.

**Kata Kunci:** Peningkatan, Think-Talk-Write, Menuulis, Report Text

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.37249/assalam.v8i1.442>

**Received:** 11 September 2023; **Revised:** 06 June 2024; **Accepted:** 11 June 2024

**To cite this article:** Batubara, M. H., Bastari, U., & Nurmalina, N. (2024). IMPROVING STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING REPORT TEXT BY USING THE THINK TALK WRITE STRATEGY. *Jurnal As-Salam*, 8(1), 80–89. <https://doi.org/10.37249/assalam.v8i1.442>

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The essence of language is the human ability to communicate with others by using signs in words and gestures. In this hemisphere, there are many languages, such as Indonesian, English, and other foreign languages. In the global relationship in recent decades, English has become an international language whose use applies to many aspects of the life of the world's people, be it from a social, cultural, economic, political, religious, or educational perspective. Today, there is no denying that English is positioned as a universal language, so it is used as the language of instruction and choice in various fields, as mentioned above, including the field of science. According to Ramírez-Castañeda (2020), in addition to the socioeconomic level factor in scientific

success, proficiency in English also has an equally important influence on accessing knowledge and expatriation. Currently, the academic ecosystem positions English as a lingua franca in science. Almost 98 percent of scientific publications are published in English, particularly in the fields of basic science and natural knowledge (Gordin, 2015). The Indonesian education curriculum does not stand still, where English is taught from elementary school to university.

The prowess to listen, read, speak, and write is a skill to be achieved in teaching and learning English (Richards and Schmidt, 2002). Listening is the ability to hear other people talk (Mendelsohn, 1994). Speaking is an interactive action of composing meaning involving information processing, production, and reception (Brown, 2004). Reading is an operation of comprehending written texts and is an action to gain benefits such as new knowledge, vocabulary, and information (Brown, 2007). While writing ability is the ability to string words to become good language, in the end, the intention of writing, such as expressing ideas and conveying messages to readers, so this ability must be mastered in the academic world (Nunan, 1998; Brown, 2001; Nunan, 2013).

Writing is a complex process and activity to explore the author's thoughts and ideas so that they are presented and seen in a concrete form (Matsuda, 2003; Calkins, 1986; Poulsen, 1991; Hairston, 1992; Susser, 1994; Peregoy and Boyle, 1997; Atkinson, 2003; Mekheimer, 2005; Byrd, 2010; Dovey, 2010 in Zaid, 2011). Thus, writing activities encourage writers to think and learn, making communication more straightforward, and making the contents of the author's thoughts, expressions, and reflections accessible to others (Ghaith, 2004; Mekheimer, 2005). In learning English, writing is an essential skill for students; with good writing skills, students can easily do assignments in the future. In real life, it is easier to get a job. In fact, the learning activities show that writing material is one of the most challenging subjects in school (MacIntyre and Gardner, 1989; Shrewsbury, 1995; Kurt and Atay, 2007; Latif, 2007). Writing activities are skills that require special technical abilities involving cognitive-psychomotor (Paltridge, 2004). While Singer (2004), writing skills require cognitive, memory, motor, affective, and linguistic, each of which contributes. Meanwhile, Jahin and Idrees (2012) elucidate that writing requires coherency among content, vocabulary, spelling, organization, and mechanics. In responding to the difficulties in writing, Huff and Kline (1987) have stated that writing has three main steps (practicing, composing, and assessing), and it is necessary to have a writing curriculum that includes these three things to achieve that.

In the study of Cohen and Carson (2001); Casanave (2002); Griffiths (2007); Sasaki (2007); and Fenghua and Hongxin (2010), learning strategies and choosing teaching methods play a noteworthy role in determining the attitudes of learners and teachers towards writing activities. Furthermore, Griffiths (2007) stated that teachers play a role in encouraging positive learning techniques their students apply in writing classes. So the teacher's way of making students able to learn writing subjects quickly is very much needed in successful English teaching. Based on the experience of researchers during field practice. It was found that students had difficulty in English, and the researcher discovered that there were still more learners with poor writing skills, especially in writing report texts. Many students do not understand the language features and determine the general structure of the report text.

From a review of the existing high school curriculum, it is encouraged in the syllabus for learning and writing skills. It can be seen that the position of learners is required to write well in various categories, one of which is the report text model. It is a text that explains various natural, artificial, and environmental. In this study opportunity, the researcher tries to uncover ways to solve the problems of students' difficulties in writing report texts by using activities and methods suitable for students to rectify their writing dexterity. Researchers consider that problems in students' writing skills are essential to solving. The researcher only chose to solve the report text type to sharpen students' writing learning.

Ground the statement above, teachers are encouraged to use the Think Talk Write strategy to improve students' writing report text skills. The problems of the study are formulated as Does the TTW strategy improve the second-grade student's ability to write report text, and the purpose is to know how the TTW strategy can improve second-grade students' ability to write report text at MAN 1 Aceh Tengah.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Writing**

Writing is an aspect of English language learning and proficiency that learners must master. The students have to come up with much vocabulary to make an essay or a paper, and many learners are not fascinated by writing because English writing is complicated, tedious, and confusing coupled with the theory with everyday life. Writing skills are essential in mastering a language, especially when English is not sufficiently communicated to speak, but writing can accommodate more ideas and impressions when the students learn and apply the techniques for the correct writing (Pratiwi, 2010). Nunan (2013) stated that writing is the ability to respond to a given stimulus. Good writing pays more attention to the correctness of form than function, and the resulting writing shows that students have mastered good grammar rules about the material (Nunan, 2013).

Furthermore, Zhu (2004) cited in Zaid (2011), found that writing is one of the important productive skills, which can then be used to learn, hone, and quickly adapt to other productive skills. Meanwhile, Jahin and Idrees (2012) in Jabali (2018) state that writing requires content, vocabulary, spelling, organization, and mechanics coordination. Another opinion suggests that writing is an act of making up ideas for others, from spoken to written. Harmer (2001) suggests writing skills as an important language prowess, as important as the ability and mastery of listening, speaking, and reading aptitude.

To produce good writing, students must have steps such as planning, compiling, revising, and editing the writing that has been made (Hung and Young, 2015). Learners are encouraged to engage their critical thinking skills in the planning, compiling, revising, and editing writing process (Brock, Sanchez, and Sharpe, 2020 in Masuku and Mupawose, 2022). It can be concluded that writing is an exploration you start from nothing and learn as you go. A writer should know the purpose of their writing, and he needs to get information to start to write.

### **Report Text**

Report text is a text that explains the subject of various natural phenomena, living things, or inanimate objects. A reported text ordinarily contains facts and information concerning the subject, description, and aspects or features such as appearance, quality, behavioral habits, breeding methods, what was eaten, behavior, and quality (Gerot and Wignell, 1994; Anderson and Anderson, 1997).

### **Think Talk Write**

TTW is a communication development strategy by students to build patterns in thinking or conduct reflective dialogues with themselves to generate and share ideas in writing (Huinker and Laughlin, 1996; Pratiwi, 2010). The TTW strategy is a cooperative strategy that requires and encourages learners to be more active, so this strategy is suitable for being held in teaching and learning activities. Furthermore, the TTW strategy encourages students and gives them time for thinking and reflection, organizing ideas, and then testing these ideas before students put them in writing (Zulkarnain, 2011). From the explanation above, the TTW steps are arranged in three stages: 1) Thinking; At this stage, students are presented with topics related to basic competencies and materials in the RPP and are asked and encouraged to think about their ideas regarding the given topic. 2) Talk; After the students have thought about the topic, the students are divided into groups to carry out the next stage. The student is directed to share ideas built upon what they thought before, and other learners listen and respond to the ideas. After completion, the student concludes the results of the discussion in his group. 3) Writing; after the student discusses with his group, the student concludes and makes a sentence in his seat. The student performs the last step, which is to write it down. The teacher inquires the students to write the text using their own words. The previous steps' ideas and conclusions help the student complete the sentences in the text (Huinker and Laughlin, 1996; Zulkarnain, 2011; Pratiwi, 2010).

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This study focuses on improving students' writing skills, so the research strategy used is experimental research. It is a strategy used to discover the effect of treatment on others nether controlled conditions (Sugiono, 2014). The experimental class that uses the TTW strategy will be compared with the control class that does not use the TTW strategy. The second-grade students of MAN 1 Aceh Tengah for the 2020/2021 academic year are the population of this study. The sample in this study includes two classes (20 students of XI IPA1 as the experimental and 20 students of XI IPA2 as the control class). This research design uses a quantitative approach using experimental research. Pre-tests and post-tests are data collection techniques to see the improvement of the teaching and learning process in the experimental and control classes (Arikunto, 2002). A pre-test was given to students before treatment, both experimental class and control class, and this test was used to measure essential report text writing skills. Post-test was given to students to find out whether there was a difference in the skills of writing text reports after special treatment was given to the experimental class students and without special treatment to the control class.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. The Result Of The Test

#### a. The Score Of The Experimental Class

Table 1. The score of the experimental class X1 IPA 1

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y- X	d <sup>2</sup>	Deviation (Xd = (d- Md))	Deviation <sup>2</sup> = X <sup>2</sup> <sub>d</sub>
1	AL	37	66	29	841	-6,10	37,21
2	AF	35	75	40	1600	4,90	24,01
3	ACR	35	67	32	1024	-3,10	9,61
4	A	37	66	29	841	-6,10	37,21
5	ANM	31	70	39	1521	3,90	15,21
6	D	40	62	22	484	-13,10	171,61
7	FLF	34	71	37	1369	1,90	3,61
8	GA	36	74	38	1444	2,90	8,41
9	HA	35	70	35	1225	-0,10	0,01
10	HHA	34	67	33	1089	-2,10	4,41
11	IE	35	73	38	1444	2,90	8,41
12	ISR	32	70	38	1444	2,90	8,41
13	IR	33	70	37	1369	1,90	3,61
14	J	30	68	38	1444	2,90	8,41
15	K	35	69	34	1156	-1,10	1,21
16	NSL	35	71	36	1296	0,90	0,81
17	R	35	70	35	1225	-0,10	0,01
18	RF	32	70	38	1444	2,90	8,41
19	RG	32	66	34	1156	-1,10	1,21
20	RDS	40	80	40	1600	4,90	24,01
<b>Total</b>		693	1395	702	25016		375,80

From the table above, it can be concluded that the pre-test score from 20 students is 693, the minimum score in the pre-test is 30, and the maximum result score in the pre-test is 40. The post-test is 1395, the minimum score in the post-test is 62, and the maximum result score in the post-test is 80. The post-test score is higher than the pre-test score before doing the treatment.

#### b. The Score In The Control Class

Table 3. The score of control class X1 IPA 2

No	Name	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gain (d) = Y-X	d <sup>2</sup>	Deviation (Xd = (d- Md))	Deviation <sup>2</sup> = X <sup>2</sup> <sub>d</sub>
1	AF	34	39	5	25	-10,6	112,36
2	AWN	40	44	4	16	-11,6	134,56
3	AM	38	49	11	121	-4,6	21,16
4	AP	37	46	9	81	-6,6	43,56
5	DA	35	46	11	121	-4,6	21,16
6	E	37	52	15	225	-0,6	0,36
7	FA	30	49	19	361	3,4	11,56
8	FJ	31	51	20	400	4,4	19,36

9	GSP	31	50	19	361	3,4	11,56
10	HY	36	50	14	196	-1,6	2,56
11	IRJ	37	51	14	196	-1,6	2,56
12	IDP	32	51	19	361	3,4	11,56
13	KW	31	51	20	400	4,4	19,36
14	LA	33	52	19	361	3,4	11,56
15	MS	32	50	18	324	2,4	5,76
16	MS	32	54	22	484	6,4	40,96
17	MT	31	45	14	196	-1,6	2,56
18	MC	32	50	18	324	2,4	5,76
19	MY	33	53	20	400	4,4	19,36
20	TM	33	54	21	441	5,4	29,16
<b>Total</b>		675	987	312	5394		526,80

From the table above, it can be concluded that the pre-test score from 20 students is 675, the minimum score in the pre-test is 30, and the maximum result score in the pre-test is 40. The post-test is 987, the minimum score in the post-test is 39, and the maximum result score in the post-test is 54.

## DISCUSSION

This research was implemented on the student at second grade MAN 1 Aceh Tengah by using a quantitative research design. After the researcher implemented the four-square writing method in teaching writing report text, the researcher got the data. There were improvements in the student's understanding of writing report text. That can be seen from the student's score before and after the treatment. Before the treatment, the student's writing skills were low, with an average pre-test score is 34,65. After the treatment, the students' writing skills got better than theirs before the treatment, with a post-test average score is 69,75. Based on the score mean, it can be interpreted that the student's writing skills in report text taught using the TTW (Think Talk Write) strategy (experimental class) increased as much as 35,1.

The result of this research can be seen from the calculation of the t-test used by the researcher in this research, where the value  $t_{score}$  is higher than the  $t_{table}$  at the significance level 0,05. It shows that the research hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted, and the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected.

The calculation means the TTW strategy was giving a contribution to the students. It means that the TTW strategy effectively students' writing ability in writing report text in the second grade of MAN 1 Aceh Tengah.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the data obtained, it can be interpreted that the students' scores of writing ability in report text increased using the TTW strategy, it can be seen the students' scores of writing ability in report text increased as much as 35,1.

Finally,  $t_{score} > t_{table}$  (0,05) with a degree of freedom (df) = 35. It can be concluded that the  $t_{score}$  is higher than the  $t_{table}$  (3,5 > 1,9). Based on the calculation of the t-test, the value  $t_{score}$  is higher than  $t_{table}$  1,9 (0,05). It showed that ( $H_a$ ) is accepted, and ( $H_0$ ) is rejected. The TTW strategy improves students' writing ability in report text in the second

grade of MAN 1 Aceh Tengah. The student's increased writing score proves this improvement. Using graphic organizers in the TTW strategy can help the students brainstorm the ideas to write, including the words they need to express. The students could enrich their vocabulary using the TTW strategy. Moreover, the students can differentiate the generic strategy of report text. The numbered boxes in the graphic helped the students to remember the generic structure of the report text. Besides enriching the student's vocabulary, the TTW strategy also helped the students in ordering words into the correct forms. In brainstorming ideas, the students automatically learned how to order words into correct forms.

## REFERENCES

- Alim-Uysal BA, Goker-Kamali S, Machado R. (2022). Difficulties experienced by endodontics researchers in conducting studies and writing papers. *Restor Dent Endod*, 47(2), 1-14.  
<https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2022.47.e20>
- Anderson, Mark, and Kathy Anderson. (1997). *Text Types*. Australia: Macmillan Education.
- Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 writing in the post-process era: introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 3–15.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00123-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00123-6)
- Brock, C., Sanchez, N., & Sharpe, D.L. (2020). Pen as a bridge: Instructor perspectives on incorporating diversity and inclusion in writing-intensive courses. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(8), 992–1009.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1628733>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy, second Edition*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Principles Language Learning and Teaching, 5th Edition*. New York: Edison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Byrd, D. (2010). Framing, reflecting on and attending to a rationale of the teaching of writing in the second language classroom via journaling: a case study. *System*, 38(2), 200-210.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.002>
- Calkins, L.M. (1986). *The Art of Teaching Writing*. USA: Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.
- Casanave, C. (2002). *Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education*. USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Cohen, A., Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: students' strategies and their results. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 169 - 188.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00103>
- Dovey, T. (2010). Facilitating writing from sources: a focus on both process and product. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 45–60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2009.11.005>
- Fenghua, L., Hongxin, C. (2010). A study of metacognitive-strategies-based writing instruction for vocational college students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 136-144.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n3p136>
- Garod, Linda et.al . (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Australia: Geed.

- Ghaith, G. (2004). *Writing*. Beirut: The American University of Beirut. Available from: <http://ghaith.tsx.org>.
- Griffiths, C. (2007). Language learning strategies: students' and teachers' perceptions. *ELT Journal*, 61(2):91-99.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm001>
- Hairston, M. (1992). Diversity, ideology, and teaching writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 43(2), 179–193.  
<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/ccc/online-archive/v43-2>
- Harmer, Jeremy. (2001). *How to Teach English*. China: Pearson Education Limited.  
[https://www.thomastallisschool.com/uploads/2/2/8/7/2287089/guide\\_to\\_text\\_types\\_final-1.pdf](https://www.thomastallisschool.com/uploads/2/2/8/7/2287089/guide_to_text_types_final-1.pdf).
- Huff, R., Kline, C. (1987). *The Contemporary Writing Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hung, H.C., & Young, S.S.C. (2015). The effectiveness of adopting E-readers to facilitate EFL students' process-based academic writing. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(1), 250–263.  
<https://www.learntechlib.org/p/160834/>
- Huinker, D. & Laughlin, C. (1996). *Talk Your Way into Writing. Communication in Mathematics, K-12, and Beyond. 1996 Yearbook*. Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Jabali, Oqab. (2018). Students' attitudes towards EFL university writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine. *A Cell Press journal*, 4(11), 1-25.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00896>
- Jahin, H., Idrees, W. (2012). EFL Major Student Teachers' Writing Proficiency and Attitudes towards Learning English. *Journal of Taibah University, KSA*, 9-72.  
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/EFL-Major-Student-Teachers%27-Writing-Proficiency-and-Jahin-Idrees/a6ffb390e7bc971e13b8c9c944c8418d09826d37>
- Kurt, G., Atay, D. (2007). The effects of peer feedback on the writing anxiety of prospective Turkish teachers of EFL. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(1), 12-23.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26456070\\_The\\_Effects\\_of\\_Peer\\_Feedback\\_on\\_The\\_Writing\\_Anxiety\\_of\\_Prospective\\_Turkish\\_Teachers\\_of\\_EFL](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/26456070_The_Effects_of_Peer_Feedback_on_The_Writing_Anxiety_of_Prospective_Turkish_Teachers_of_EFL)
- Latif, M. (2007). The factors accounting for the Egyptian EFL university students' negative writing affect. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language & Linguistics* 9(2007), 57-82.  
<https://www.scribd.com/document/77002746/Egyptian-EFL-University-Students-Negative-Writing-Affect>
- MacIntyre, P., Gardner, R. (1989). Anxiety and second language learning: towards a theoretical clarification. *Language Learning*, 39(2), 251-275.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1989.tb00423.x>
- Masuku, K.P., & Mupawose, A. (2022). Students' experiences of using a writing-intense program to facilitate critical thinking skills on an online clinical training platform: A pilot study. *South African Journal of Communication Disorders*, 69(2), a919.  
<https://doi.org/10.4102/sajcd.v69i2.919>
- Matsuda, P.K. (2003). Process and post-process: a discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 65-83.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00127-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00127-3)
- Mekheimer, M. (2005). Effects of Internet-based Instruction, using Webquesting and Emailing on Developing Some Essay Writing Skills in Student Teachers. *Unpublished Ph.D.*, Cairo: Cairo University.



- Mendelsohn, D. J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second language learner*. San Diego: Dominie Press.
- Nunan, D. (1998). Approaches to Teaching Listening in the Language Classroom. Paper presented at the Korea TESOL Conference, Seoul. Proceedings of the 1997 Korea TESOL Conference, October 3-5, 1997, Kyoung-ju, South Korea  
Technology in Education: Communicating Beyond Traditional Networks.  
[https://koreatesol.org/sites/default/files/pdf\\_publications/KOTESOL-Proceeds1997web.pdf](https://koreatesol.org/sites/default/files/pdf_publications/KOTESOL-Proceeds1997web.pdf)
- Nunan, D. (2013). *Learner-centered English language education: The selected works of David Nunan*. New York: Routledge. Routledge World Library of Educationalists.
- Paltridge, B. (2004). Approaches to teaching second language writing. In: 17th Educational Conference Adelaide 2004, Retrieved September 20, 2010, Available from: <http://www.Englishaustralia.com.au/eaconference04/proceedings/pdf/Paltridge.pdf>.
- Peregoy, S.F., Boyle, O.F. (1997). *Reading, Writing, & Learning in ESL*. New York: Longman.
- Poulsen, E. (1991). Writing processes with word processing in teaching English as a foreign language. *Computers and Education*, 16(1), 77–81.  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED362069.pdf>
- Pratiwi, A. (2010). *How to Write English Correctly*. Bekasi: Laskar Askara.
- Ramírez-Castañeda V. (2020). Disadvantages in preparing and publishing scientific papers caused by the dominance of the English language in science: The case of Colombian researchers in biological sciences. *PLoS ONE* 15(9): e0238372.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238372>.
- Richards, J.C. & Richard, S. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistic, 3rd Edition*. London: Longman: person education.
- Sasaki, M. (2007). Effects of study-abroad experiences on EFL writers: a multiple data analysis. *Modern Language Journal*, 9(4), 602-620.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00625.x>
- Shrewsbury, M. (1995). The Effects of Collaborative Learning on Writing Quality, Writing Apprehension, and Writing Attitude of College Students in a Developmental English Program. *Unpublished Dissertation Abstract*. Morgantown/West Virginia: The College of Human Resources and Education of West Virginia University, Morgantown/West Virginia.
- Singer, B. (2004). Writing: Why Kids Struggle and what to Do about it. Article for Learning. LLC. Retrieved from <http://www.chinaelg.com>
- Suharsimi, A. (2002). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan. Revised Edition*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sugiono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Susser, B. (1994). Process approach in ESL/EFL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(1), 31–47.  
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(94\)90004-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90004-3)
- Wajsberg J. Michael D. Gordin. (2015). *Scientific Babel: how science was done before and after global English*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zaid, Mohammed A. (2011). Effects of web-based pre-writing activities on college EFL students' writing performance and their writing apprehension. *Journal of King Saud University - Languages and Translation*, 23(2), 77-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksult.2011.04.003>.

- Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(1), 29–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.004>.
- Zulkarnaini. (2011). Model Kooperatif Tipe Think Talk Write (TTW) Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Karangan Deskripsi dan Berpikir Kritis. *S2 thesis*, Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.