

**PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH TEACHER'S PERCEPTION ON COLLABORATIVE  
GENRE-BASED WRITING****Didik Rinan Sumekto<sup>1✉</sup>, Mursid Saleh<sup>2</sup>, Retmono<sup>3</sup>, Ahmad Sofwan<sup>4</sup>**<sup>1</sup>Widyadarma University Klaten, Indonesia<sup>2,3,4</sup>Postgraduate Program of Semarang State University, Indonesia**Article Info***Article History:*

Accepted October 2015

Approved October 2015

Published November  
2015*Keywords:**Collaborative Learning,  
Genre-Based Writing, Pre-  
Service English Teachers***Abstract**

This study was aimed at investigating the collaborative learning effectiveness and contribution toward pre-service English teachers' (PSETs') perception conveyed on genre-based writing lectures. The sample was 86 undergraduate pre-service English teachers (PSETs), Tidar University of Magelang (45 respondents) and Widya Dharma University of Klaten (41 respondents). This study used simple random sampling. Data were collected by means of questionnaire using 5-scaled Likert rating to obtain PSETs' perception, and then analyzed quantitatively by applying the SPSS program. The findings showed that the highest response toward each category in the perception referred to (1) 41.9% or 36 responses on *sometimes* toward lecturer's instruction method; 44.2% or 38 responses on *seldom* toward learning assessment process; 48.2 or 41 responses on *seldom* toward lecturer's assessment mechanism; and 53.5% or 46 responses on *sometimes* toward lecturer's instruction evaluation and reflection; and (2) there were 47.4% or 45 responses on *sometimes* which ranked to the highest response level on group's performance goals; 48.4% or 46 responses on *seldom* which engaged PSET's interpersonal competence; 48.4% or 46 responses on *frequent* which guided group maintenance; and 41.1% or 39 responses on *sometimes* toward classroom work.

© 2015 Semarang State University

✉Correspondence Address :

Unnes Bendan Ngisor Campus, Semarang, 50233

E-mail: pps@unnes.ac.id

ISSN 2085-4943

## INTRODUCTION

Collaborative learning was widely defined as a technique designed to make learning a lively and successful process. When engaging in collaborative learning, lecturer(s) was positioned as a guide to the learners towards the attainment of skills, such as initiating, managing, emphasizing, and achieving the learning process and progress (Brown, 2008). Robert (2003) stated that collaborative learning became an interdependence of individuals where the PSETs shared ideas and reached a conclusion. The constructive purposes of collaborative learning implementation, according to Osterholt and Barratt (2010) should ensure each member of a group had a role, so that all PSETs were actively engaged. The grouping of participative PSETs should change continually to ensure that each participant had the opportunity to work with all participants.

The activities involved mixed-ability groups tend to favour high- and low-ability participants (who contributed and achieved assistance respectively) over the middle-ability learners in lecturing. They performed equally well in all groups and when working individual as well (Gilles and Ashman, 2003). For some students who were fast learners, collaborative learning would be likely to gain a positive impact on their academic and social interaction achievement since it provided opportunity to give assistance to peers (Strickland, Ganske, and Monroe, 2006). Reflecting to this orientation, opportunities to work in small group might be accommodated to promote growths entirely semesters.

The collaborative learning proponents argued that active exchange of ideas within small groups increased interests among participants and promoted critical thinking for their own learning outputs (Brown, 2008). Meanwhile, Yazici (2005) found that collaborative learning supported the instructional use of small groups or teams where peer interaction played a key role in learning. In peer learning, according to Falchikov (2001) students learned with and from each other,

normally within the same class. Interaction with peers could result in the development of cognitive or intellectual skills or to an increase in knowledge and understanding among the members. Lambert and Lines (2000) pointed out that some collaborative learning activities could be regarded as mutually compatible, for example: a simple, reliable collaboration system designed to select the participants for those who might not enable to serve the purpose of providing valid diagnosis of collaborative learning difficulties and collaborative learning helped slow learners to be successful in promoting critical thinking (Gokhale, 1995).

The primary research questions of the study were intended to answer the following: (1) how did the undergraduate pre-service English teachers (PSETs) perceive on implementing genre-based writing engaged in the collaborative learning classroom?; and (2) what factors might contribute to the collaborative learning dimension among PSETs?

Genre-based writing was designed in the syllabus, both in English education department of Tidar university of Magelang and Widya Dharma university of Klaten. The syllabus mainly recorded 14 meetings in a semester excluded mid-terms and final exams. The meeting duration took 120 minutes in every session and genre topics discussed on recount, narrative, explanation, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition.

For the current view, genre was a term used for identifying different types of texts in writing and was believed to facilitate consciousness-raising for developing academic literacy, PSETs' self-efficacy, and writing performance (Lee, 2012), since each genre had its own features and structures to express the intended meaning (Sullivan, Zhang, and Zheng, 2012). It enabled to draw upon their experiences with such texts to read, understand and perhaps write them relatively easily (Hyland, 2008). Even sometimes the difficulty happened in understanding writing concerned with either needs for generating and organizing ideas using an appropriate choice of vocabulary, sentence

structure, and paragraph organization or turning such ideas into a readable text (Richards and Renandya, 2002; Widodo, 2006).

By using genre-based approach, a writing lecturer might be required to ask participants to produce a text or composition on the basis of purpose, organization and audience (Paltridge, 2001; Widodo, 2006). Genre approach enabled the PSETs discuss within the distinctive features of different purposeful texts (Swami, 2008; Ahn, 2012), produced their own genre examples more effectively and provided them with a concrete opportunity to acquire the conceptual and cultural frameworks of their L2 (Ahn, 2012). The instruction approach assisted the PSETs in developing strategies for all phases of the writing process by breaking down writing tasks and making the sub processes and skills much more explicit (Negari, 2011), where lecturer's best methods could be flexible and supporting to the specific instructional contexts in providing extensive encouragement in the form of meaningful contexts, peer involvement, prior texts, useful feedback and guidance in the writing process (Hyland, 2003). Furthermore, the orientation to writing instruction, according to Kern (2000) consisted of three approaches, namely: product-, process-, and genre-based approaches, in which finally readers would recognize and concisely understand to writer's products (Hyland, 2008).

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study used the quantitative survey to investigate the wholly perceptions from undergraduate pre-service English teachers (PSETs), Tidar University of Magelang and Widya Dharma University of Klaten taught in several genre-based writing themes, such as recount, narrative, explanation, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition paragraph. The number of sample size (N) obtained in this study was 86 or 52% respondents for their participation and they have been taken through the simple random sampling. Genre-based writing questionnaires had two sections. First, it

consisted of sixteen closed questions rated on a five-point's Likert scale. Responses in the perception and questionnaire were expressed in a Likert scale, starting from 5 to 1 (5=*always*, 4=*frequent*, 3=*sometimes*, 2=*seldom*, and 1=*never*) by crossing one of the numbers that corresponded to the notion of frequency (Dunn et al, 2004). The questionnaire type was developed by Nitko (1996). Second, questionnaire described seventeen closed questions rated on a five-point's Likert scale as well. It responded reference to agreement with statement and questions, where the scaling system began from 5=*always*, 4=*frequent*, 3=*sometimes*, 2=*seldom*, and 1=*never*. The questionnaire type was developed by Ferris and Hedgcock (2005).

Data was collected from genre-based writing experience on old semester conducted by both Tidar University and Widya Dharma University, which involved 45 respondents for Tidar University of Magelang samples and 41 respondents for Widya Dharma University of Klaten.

Data were collected from the returned quantitative surveys; descriptive and inferential statistics included item frequency, mean, and standard deviations as well. Means and standard deviations of all the survey items were used to answer the research question in accordance with the instruction evaluation, PSETs' perception toward the course content, and collaborative learning aspects. All quantitative data were analysed through the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program, version 17.0.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analysis output below underlined the descriptive analysis gained by undergraduate pre-service English teachers (PSETs) based on the instruction evaluation and reflection toward collaborative need identification questionnaire. There were three profiles highlighting the instruction, perception toward learning assessment, PSETs' involvement during assessment, and instruction evaluation and

reflection instrument. From the general perceptions upon the PSETs of Tidar University, the mean gained on the *instruction* was 3.9489 with the number of participants (N) was 45 and standard deviation was .63080, *perception toward learning assessment* was 3.6367 with the number of participants (N) was 45 and standard deviation was .49491, *students' involvement during assessment* were .52272 with the number of participants (N) were 45 and standard deviation was .52272, and *instruction evaluation and reflection* was 3.7552 with the number of participants (N) were 45 and standard deviation was .45705 (See table 1).

Through the general perception upon the PSETs of Widya Dharma University, the mean gained on the *instruction* was 3.7407 with the number of participants (N) was 41 and standard deviation was .65995, *perception toward learning assessment* was 3.5293 with the number of participants (N) was 41 and standard deviation was .54601, *students' involvement during assessment* was 3.3740 with the number of participants (N) was 41 and standard deviation was .64942, and *instruction evaluation and reflection* was 3.5601 with the number of participants (N) was 41 and standard deviation was .49705. Another review was displayed using table 2 to comprehend PSETs' perception.

From the descriptive analysis on instruction evaluation and reflection toward

collaboration need identification shown in table 2, there was only 1.2% or 1 response on *never* category, which indicated the lowest level of the lecturer's instruction method; 25.6% or 22 PSETs responded on *seldom* category, which indicated to the third level of the lecturer's instruction method; 41.9% or 36 PSETs responded on *sometimes* category, which indicated the first level of the lecturer's instruction method; 31.4% or 27 PSETs responded respondents on *frequent* category, which indicated the second level of the lecturer's instruction method and there was no PSET participating or answering on *always* category in the questionnaire.

These findings described five stages of perception in its category level. First, PSETs contributed their perception on *never* category of 8.2% or 7 toward the lecturer's method in involving PSETs' assessment mechanism. This category put the third level on this descriptive analysis. Second, there were 36.5% or 31 PSETs contributing their perception on *seldom* category which indicated to the second level of the lecturer's method in involving PSETs' assessment mechanism. Third, there were 48.2% or 41 PSETs contributing their perception on *sometimes* category which indicated to the highest or first level of the lecturer's method in involving PSETs' assessment mechanism.

Table 1. PSET s' Instruction Evaluation and Reflection toward Collaboration Need Identification

University		Instruction	Perception toward learning assessment	Students' involvement during assessment	Instruction Evaluation and Reflection
PSETs of Tidar University	Min.	2.60	2.60	2.60	2.88
	Max.	5.00	4.60	4.60	4.69
	Mean	<b>3.9489</b>	<b>3.6367</b>	<b>3.6455</b>	<b>3.7552</b>
	Median	4.0000	3.6000	3.7000	3.8125
	Std. Dev.	<b>.63080</b>	<b>.49491</b>	<b>.52272</b>	<b>.45705</b>
	N	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>
PSETs of Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.67	2.50	2.33	2.64
	Max.	5.00	4.60	5.00	4.56
	Mean	<b>3.7407</b>	<b>3.5293</b>	<b>3.3740</b>	<b>3.5601</b>
	Median	3.6667	3.4000	3.2000	3.5625
	Std. Dev.	<b>.65995</b>	<b>.54601</b>	<b>.64942</b>	<b>.49705</b>
	N	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>41</b>
	Min.	2.60	2.50	2.33	2.64
	Max.	5.00	4.60	5.00	4.69
	Mean	<b>3.8496</b>	<b>3.5855</b>	<b>3.5145</b>	<b>3.6622</b>
	Median	3.8333	3.6000	3.6000	3.7500
Std. Dev.	<b>.64952</b>	<b>.51961</b>	<b>.59944</b>	<b>.48374</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>86</b>

Fourth, there were 7.1% or 6 participants contributing their perception on *frequent* category which indicated to the fourth level of the lecturer's method in involving PSETs' assessment mechanism; and there was no participant contributing or answering on *always* category in the questionnaire.

The last part of this descriptive analysis focused on exploring the instruction evaluation and reflection. These findings described five stages of perception in its category level. First, there were none of 86 PSETs responded on *never* category, so this category would not be, further analyzed. Second, there were 11.6% or 10 PSETs contributing on *frequent* category. This level indicated the lowest criteria provided in the lecturer's instruction evaluation and reflection mechanism. Third level related to *seldom* category which PSETs had contributed by responding 3.5% or 4 of the total categorization determined on the lecturer's instruction evaluation and reflection mechanism. Fourth level related to *sometimes* category which ranked the highest level. There were 53.5% or 46 PSETs

contributing toward the lecturer's instruction evaluation and reflection. Finally, none of 86 PSETs contributed or answered on *always* category.

The statistical analysis shown in table 3 corresponded with the collaborative learning evaluation perceived by the PSETs. There were 2 profiles highlighting the collaborative learning evaluation. From the general perception upon the PSETs of Tidar University, the mean gained on the group's performance goal was 3.6047 with the number of participants (N) was 43 and standard deviation was .53238, perception toward interpersonal competence was 3.6202 with the number of participants (N) was 43 and standard deviation was .59797, group maintenance was 3.7907 with the number of participants (N) was 43 and standard deviation was .74986; classroom work style was 3.6977 with the number of participants (N) was 43 and standard deviation was .62454; and collaborative learning was 3.6731 with the number of participants (N) was 43 and standard deviation was .42288.

**Table 2.** PSET's Perception Upon Instruction Evaluation and Reflection toward Collaboration Need Identification

Description Measured	Category	Pre-Service English Teachers		Total
		Tidar University	Widya Dharma University	
Instruction	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	10 (22.2%)	12 (29.3%)	22 (25.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	16 (35.6%)	20 (48.8%)	36 (41.9%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	18 (40%)	9 (22.0%)	27 (31.4%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perception toward learning assessment	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.9%)	3 (3.5%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	18 (40%)	20 (48.8%)	38 (44.2%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	19 (42.2%)	16 (39.0%)	35 (40.7%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	7 (15.6%)	3 (7.3%)	10 (11.6%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
PSETs involvement in assessment	<i>Never</i>	4 (9.1%)	3 (7.3%)	7 (8.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	9 (20.5%)	22 (53.7%)	31 (36.5%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	28 (63.6%)	13 (31.7%)	41 (48.2%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	3 (6.8%)	3 (7.3%)	6 (7.1%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Instruction evaluation and reflection	<i>Never</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
	<i>Seldom</i>	11 (24.4%)	19 (46.3%)	30 (34.9%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	28 (62.2%)	18 (43.9%)	46 (53.5%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	6 (13.3%)	4 (9.8%)	10 (11.6%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 3. PSETs' Collaborative Learning Evaluation

University		Group's Performance Goals	Interpersonal Competence	Group Maintenance	Classroom Work Style
PSETs of Tidar University	Min.	2.25	2.33	1.50	2.00
	Max.	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.88
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.6047</b>	<b>3.6202</b>	<b>3.7907</b>	<b>3.6977</b>
	Median	3.7500	3.6667	4.0000	3.6250
	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>.53238</b>	<b>.59797</b>	<b>.74986</b>	<b>.62454</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>
PSETs of Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.00	2.33	2.00	2.50
	Max.	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.4952</b>	<b>3.3333</b>	<b>3.6731</b>	<b>3.6442</b>
	Median	3.5000	3.3333	3.5000	3.7500
	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>.76134</b>	<b>.60499</b>	<b>.86254</b>	<b>.63948</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Total</b>	Min.	2.00	2.33	1.50	2.00
	Max.	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>3.5447</b>	<b>3.4632</b>	<b>3.7263</b>	<b>3.6684</b>
	Median	3.5000	3.3333	4.0000	3.7500
	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b>.66642</b>	<b>.61559</b>	<b>.81138</b>	<b>.62997</b>
	<b>N</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>

Another statistical analysis as shown in table 4 attempted to understand PSETs' perceptions about the collaborative learning evaluation.

The descriptive analysis as shown in table 4 could describe that there were 11.66% or 11 participants contributing on *never* category which indicated to the lowest level; 26.3% or 25 participants contributing on *seldom* category which indicated to the second response level; 47.4% or 45 participants on *sometimes* category which indicated to the highest level; 14.7% or 14 participants contributing on *frequent* category which indicated to the third level on group's performance goals when they were engaged in collaborative learning during their genre-based lectures; and there was no participant contributing on *always* category in the questionnaire.

Next, upon the second descriptive analysis on interpersonal competence which involved participants in the genre-based writing lectures as shown in table 4, these analyses empirically described five stages of perception, namely: *never*, *seldom*, *sometimes*, *frequent*, and *always* category which calculatedly indicated its criteria. The

description began with the lowest level on *never* category, where there were 5.3% or 5 participants contributing their perception toward the lecturer's method on engaging PSETs' interpersonal competence during the genre-based writing meetings; 48.4% or 46 participants contributing on *seldom* category which indicated to the highest level; 37.8% or 35 participants contributing on *sometimes* category which indicated to the second level; 9.5% or 9 participants contributing on *frequent* category which indicated to the third level; and there was no respondent participating on *always* category in the questionnaire.

Then, the third category on group maintenance during the genre-based writing lectures had reviewed into some criteria as shown in table 4, these analyses described five stages of perception in its category level. First, there was 1.1% or 1 participant contributing on *never* category toward the lecturer's assistance in guiding the learning circumstances collaboratively; this category put the lowest level. Second, there were 12.6% or 12 participants contributing on *seldom* and *sometimes* category which indicated to the third level.

Table 4. PSETs' Perception upon Collaborative Learning Evaluation

Prescription Measured	Category	Pre-Service Teachers		Total
		Tidar University	Widya Dharma University	
Group's performance goals	<i>Never</i>	2 (4.7%)	9 (17.3%)	11 (11.6%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	11 (25.6%)	14 (26.9%)	25 (26.3%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	28 (65.1%)	17 (32.7%)	45 (47.4%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	2 (4.7%)	12 (23.1%)	14 (14.7%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interpersonal competence	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.3%)	4 (7.7%)	5 (5.3%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	18 (41.9%)	28 (53.8%)	46 (48.4%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	17 (39.5%)	18 (34.6%)	35 (37.8%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	7 (16.3%)	2 (3.8%)	9 (9.5%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Group maintenance	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	3 (7.0%)	9 (17.3%)	12 (12.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	4 (9.3%)	8 (15.4%)	12 (12.6%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	24 (55.8%)	22 (42.3%)	46 (48.4%)
	<i>Always</i>	11 (25.6%)	13 (25.0%)	24 (25.3%)
Classroom work style	<i>Never</i>	2 (4.7%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (3.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	11 (25.6%)	20 (38.5%)	31 (32.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	21 (48.8%)	18 (34.6%)	39 (41.1%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	9 (20.9%)	25.0%	22 (23.2%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Thus, between *seldom* and *sometimes* category had an equal result on its statistical data. Third, there were 48.4% or 46 participants contributing on *frequent* category which indicated to the highest level; and there were 25.3% or 24 participants contributing on *always* category in the questionnaire; this result had indicated to the second level.

The last part of this descriptive analysis focused on exploring the classroom work style. The general descriptive analyzed five stages of perception in its category level. First, there were 3.2% or 3 participants contributing on *never* toward the classroom work style which emphasized the collaborative learning evaluation during the genre-based writing lectures; this category was on the lowest level. Second, there were 32.6% or 31 participants contributing on *seldom* category which indicated to the second level. Third, there was 41.1% or 39 for *sometimes* category indicating to the first level. Fourth, there were 23.2% or 22 participants contributing on *frequent* category which indicated to the fourth level toward the classroom work style emphasizing the collaborative learning evaluation during the genre-based writing meetings; and there was no respondents

contributing on *always* category in the questionnaire.

## CONCLUSION

The study rationale was that genre-based writing lectures engaged in collaborative learning circumstance had promoted the undergraduate pre-service English teachers (PSETs) learning improvement. Learning mechanism emphasized on both individuals and groups within its learning differences and heterogeneity through their background learning experience and academic achievement in a semester. These conclusions illustrated the designed aspects on strengthening the collaborative learning implementation engaged in the genre-based writing which accommodated recount, narrative, explanation, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition themes as referred in the syllabus.

## REFERENCES

- Ahn, H. 2012. Teaching writing skills based on a genre approach to L2 primary school students: An action research. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2): 2-16.

- Brown, F. A. 2008. Collaborative learning in the EAP classroom: Students' perceptions. *English for Specific Purposes*, 7(1): 1-18. Retrieved October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012, from [http://www.esp-world.info/Articles\\_17/PDF/Collaborativelearning.pdf](http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_17/PDF/Collaborativelearning.pdf).
- Dunn, L., Morgan, C., O'Reilly., & Parry, S. 2004. *The student assessment handbook*. London: Routledge Falmer-Taylor & Francis Group.
- Falchikov, N. 2001. *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. 2005. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gilles, R. M., & Ashman, A, F. 2003. Co-operative learning: The social and intellectual outcomes of learning in groups. In Ross, J. A., & Rolheiser, C, *Student assessment practices in co-operative learning*. (Pp. 119-135). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Gokhale, A. A. 1995. Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, 7(1), 22-30.
- Hyland, K. 2008. Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, 41(4): 543-562.
- Hyland, K. 2003. Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12: 17-29.
- Kern, R. 2000. *Literacy and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lambert, D., & Lines, D. 2000. *Understanding Assessment: Purposes, perceptions, practice*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Lee, I. 2012. Genre-based teaching and assessment in secondary English classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 11(4): 120-136.
- Negari, G. M. 2011. A study on strategy instruction and EFL learners' writing skill. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1(2): 299-307.
- Nitko, A. J. 1996. *Educational assessment of students (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. New Jersey: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Osterholt, D. A., & Barratt, K. 2010. Ideas for practice: A collaborative look to the classroom. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 34(2): 26-35.
- Paltridge, B. 2001. *Genre and the language learning classroom*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. 2002. Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice. In Reppen, R., *A genre-based approach to content writing instruction* (Pp. 321-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, T. S. 2003. Online collaborative learning: Theory and practice. In Treleaven, L., *A new taxonomy for evaluation studies of online collaborative learning* (Pp. 160-180). Hershey: Idea Group Inc.
- Strickland, D. S., Ganske, K., & Monroe, J. K. (2006). *Supporting struggling readers and writers: Strategies for classroom intervention 3-6*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Sullivan, P., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, F. 2012. College writing in China and America: A modest and humble conversation, with writing samples. *The Journal of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, 64(2): 306-331.
- Swami, J. A. 2008. Sensitizing ESL learners to genre. *TESL-Education Journal*, 13(3): 1-13. Retrieved May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013, from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej47/a9.html>.
- Widodo, H. P. 2006. Designing a genre-based lesson plan for an academic writing course. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(3): 173-199.
- Yazici, H. J. 2005. A study of collaborative learning style and team learning performance. *Education + Training*, 47(3): 216-229.