Original Research | **Open Access**

The Effectiveness of Using Collaborative Writing Method and Metacognitive Writing Method in Enhancing Students' Writing in Secondary School Education

Taufik Arochman[*]
Pascasarjana – Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Margana
Pascasarjana – Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This study was aimed to find out: (1) whether the use of collaborative writing method is more effective than the use of metacognitive writing method in the teaching of writing ability, (2) whether the use of collaborative writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method, (3) whether the use of metacognitive writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method, (4) the most effective method among collaborative writing method, metacognitive writing method, and conventional writing method in the teaching writing ability. This study was a quasi-experimental research. The data were collected from 108 students of secondary school in February-March 2018 in Yogyakarta. The sample of the study was the students of Muhammadiyah School in Yogyakarta which were determined by using cluster simple random sampling. There were four hypotheses of this study and the research findings revealed that the hypotheses were accepted. It was indicated by all of the Sig values which were lower than the level of significance (0.05).
Keywords: Collaborative method; Metacognitive method; Writing.

1. Introduction

It is exceptionally critical that having a great composing ability is valuable in this period. This ability is utilized to degree the students' composing capability such as composing a few texts or composing some papers which are included within the educational programs in the academic context. Writing is a complex skill in academic English (Spratt *et al.*, 2005). The capacity to compose is critical for those who make commerce connection with others over the countries by sending mail or composing commerce report in the business context. It is considered that a writing ability is one of the productive abilities that determine the communicative competence.

Due to its significance, instruction in composing is in this way accepting an expanding part in both moment and outside dialect instruction (Weigle, 2002). Oshima and Hogue (2006) propose that writing is a process of expressing ideas. To create composing, people need thoughts or sources which may well be taken from daily papers, sites, magazines, and marvels. Besides, they learn unequivocally how to form a great composed content beginning with the arranging and gathering of thoughts (pre-writing), through the different stages of how to draft, alter, revise, and distribute it Harmer (2004).

There are a few different methodologies to instruct composing which will concern on individual, pairs, or, group. When the educating tends to allow more chance to the understudies to work together, collaborative writing method can be utilized within the practices of educating and learning. In any case, when the educating tends to be more personal, metacognitive writing method can moreover be utilized in enhancing academic writing.

This study was aimed at investigating the effectiveness of using collaborative writing method and metacognitive writing method in enhancing student writing. The study was conducted in SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta since being able to communicate in English is very demanding for the students also the graduates. Based on the preliminary observation in the school, there were some issues found in the teaching of composing. The students were difficult to express something in writing because they were difficult to understand the English words or the expressions. Besides, techniques used within the classroom exercises don't successfully back the educating and learning progress of composing yet. Considering the situation, the researcher proposed the use collaborative writing method and metacognitive writing method in enhancing student writing.

2. Literature Review

Collaborative writing improves and invigorates students' inspiration in progressing the composing abilities in some studies. A research by Storch (2005), which compared person and group on brief writing, found that works out completed in more than one person were more correct than when completed independently. It was since the learners found the criticism from their friends that were valuable for the improvement of creating the composing ability. Graham and Perin (2007), argue that collaborative composing method is in which the learners work together to arrange, draft, reflect, and the final draft can be changed. It requires students' inclusion when they are working as a group. In line with those, this strategy allows the students to work jointly with others or together especially in an

*Corresponding Author

intellectual endeavour (O' Neil *et al.*, 2009). On the other words, through collaborative writing method, the learners are able to learn along side companions following to him/ her. The technique values the social nature of the composing method.

In addition, Mandal (2009) adds that collaborative composing technique is cooperative composing technique that permits the learners to work in peer or teams within the method of composing. Collaborative writing at that point gets to be the method in which the learners are advertised the opportunity to grant and get immediate feedback on dialect utilized on their works which will be lost when they work exclusively. It requires the learners to work in teams which can advance neighborly competition among them. Thus, this method includes significant interaction and shared choice between or among learners within the course Dale (1997), This frequently spurs leaners to work better.

On the contrary, Dülger (2011), argues that metacognitive procedure may be a great way to be actualized within the method of instructing composing. This technique is found effective on add up to composing accomplishment in common, and on substance, organization, lexicon, and mechanics of composing in specific. Zohar and Dori (2012) state that metacognitive writing strategy allows the method of reflecting on our claim considering and keeping track of how our considering is getting learners closer to or assist absent from our objective amid the composing method. This technique may be a portion of indirect procedures which implies past, next to or with cognitive. In this technique, the action is learner-centered but more personal. When the students apply metacognitive writing strategy, they are allowed to think around considering or illustrate mindfulness and understanding of one's cognition (Mc Cormick, 2003).

Moreover, metacognitive writing procedure method contains three activities such as centering the learning, assessing the learning, organizing and arranging the learning (Dülger, 2011). These sets are famously called as CAPE (Centering, Arranging, Planning, and Evaluating). Finding out almost dialect learning, organizing, setting objectives and targets, recognizing reason of the dialect assignment, and looking for practice opportunity can reflect arranging and planning (Hacker *et al.*, 2014). Meanwhile, self-monitoring and self-evaluation can implement evaluating. In addition, Kuhn (2000), claims that metacognitive writing strategy allows the students manage what they learn by their own in learning writing. It is because the students are the owners of their knowledge and regulate their disposition toward learning especially in writing process.

Through this study, the researcher used a recount text as learning material to examine the students' writing skills. The decision was based on the basic competency in the national curriculum 2006; students in secondary school education at grade x ought to be able to express the meaning of the brief useful content precisely, smoothly, and acceptably utilizing composed dialect within the every day context. In short, the teaching of writing skill must be innovative and creative in order to get effective learning processes. Collaborative writing strategy and metacognitive writing strategy are believed to be appropriate to facilitate students to write because those strategies can provide an integrated approach in writing. Furthermore, teachers are able to apply those strategies to improve the students' writing skills.

It is known that writing skills are taught at all levels of the students. They are taught in university, senior high school, vocational high school, junior high school and elementary school. Many problems might happen to the students in their learning process on each level. As the result, the researcher should take into account the prioritized problems to be solved in conducting this study.

In a brief, the researcher attempt to answer four questions in this study. The questions are (1) whether the use of collaborative writing method is more effective than the use of metacognitive writing method in the teaching of writing ability, (2) whether the use of collaborative writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method, (3) whether the use of metacognitive writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method, (4) the most effective method among collaborative writing method, metacognitive writing method, and conventional writing method in the teaching writing ability. The result of this study will provide an insight into how those strategies can be used to support students 'writing ability. Besides that, it is expected that this study attempts to obtain a solution to help the students improve their writing skill. They are able to expose ways to develop their writing skill through the use of collaborative writing strategy and meta-cognitive writing strategy. Furthermore, students can do reflections toward their writings and can be given feedbacks so that they can be autonomous learners.

3. Method

To test the effectiveness of using collaborative writing method and meta-cognitive writing method in enhancing students writing ability, the researcher conducted a quasi-experiment inside a quantitative investigate strategies course advertised at Grade X of SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta. The school is located in Kiai H. Ahmad Dahlan Street, Purwodiningratan, Yogyakarta. The research design of this study was Quasi Pretest - Post-Test Control Group Design. The data was collected in February - March 2018.

The population of the study was all of students in SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta at grade X. Meanwhile, the sample of the study was the students at grade X of the school which consisted of three classes. The three classes were class XC as the experimental class I, class XF as the experimental class II, and class XB as the control class. Furthermore, the researcher used a technique of cluster simple random sampling to determine the experiment and control classes. In determining the sample, the lottery technique was employed together with the English teacher who teaches grade X students in the school.

In implementing a quasi-experimental research, there were 3 stages in this study. In the pre-experiment stage, the researcher conducted a teacher training. The English teacher of grade X in SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta

would teach both experiment and control classes. Before conducting the study, the researcher gave explanations related to teaching writing skills using collaborative writing method and metacognitive writing method. The materials, media, and assessment applied in the three classes would be the same. What was different during the experiment is on the use of teaching strategies: conventional writing method, metacognitive writing method, and collaborative writing method. The conventional writing method was applied in the control class.

The researcher gave the pre-test and treatment to the experimental and control classes during the experiment stage. The researcher had to decide which classes would be the experimental and control class. The preparation is done by determining the sample of the study and conducting a pre-test to both experiment and control classes to get an equivalence of the students' writing skills. The researcher used a technique of cluster simple random sampling in determining the sample of the study which will be control and experiment classes. An experiment is valid if the findings obtained is only caused by independent variables (manipulated) and if the findings can be applied on other researches. There are two validities must be filled; they are internal and external validity.

Meanwhile, on the post-experiment stage, the researcher conducted post-test to the students of the three classes to know the students' achievements after conducting the experiment. To assess the students' writings, the researcher employed an inter-rater reliability to avoid subjectivity and to get a valid assessment. After gathering the data, the researcher analyzed and interpreted the data to draw conclusions.

The researcher administered a writing test in the control and experiment classes for both pre-test and post-test. As the technique of data collection, the researcher assigned the students to write to collect the data in the form of students' writing scores. The students of the three classes: XB, XC and XF in SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta were assigned to write a recount text. The ability of students in Senior High Schools to express the meaning of brief useful writings and basic papers within the form of relate within the daily context is mentioned in BSNP 2006. The topics of recount texts were about terms found in the daily life such as true, happy, funny, or sad stories so that the students could express ideas related to their experiences.

The instruments of this study were in the form of essay (writing test) which are based on a blueprint and a consultation with a lecturer (expert judgment). For the writing test, the students were asked to write their experiences in a piece of paper. Furthermore, the instruments were designed by considering the standard of competence and the basic competencies of English in writing skill for grade X of Senior High School in the second semester. Supporting this, the basic competency of students in the Senior High School at the grade X states that the learners ought to be able to precise the meaning of the brief utilitarian content precisely and acceptably utilizing composed dialect within the every day context. The data which were obtained from the writing scores were analyzed to find out the significance and differences of the students' improvements. Moreover, the researcher used a scoring rubric in assessing students' writings.

This study used a content validity as the validity of the research instruments. The content validity examined whether the test items as the instruments of the study are related to the teaching syllabus or not. The instruments of this study were constructed based on the Basic Competencies and Standard of Competence of Secondary School Education of grade X students in second semester. The researcher also consulted the instruments to the lecturer and the English teacher (expert judgment). Besides, the researcher employed inter-rater or inter-scorer reliability to measure the reliability of the instruments. Inter-scorer reliability is the degree of understanding between two or more raters or scorers. The researcher used the correlation coefficient between two classes (Interclass Correlation Coefficients) to examine the reliability. It involved an assessment done by two individuals, i.e. the researcher was the first rater and the second rater was the English teacher.

The data analysis technique which was used in this study is a parametric statistical technique; that is One-Way Anova continued by *Scheffe* test. Nevertheless, to analyze the data, the researcher used a computer program as the instruments of the data analysis namely *IBM SPSS Statistics 22*. The researcher applied One-Way Anova because this is an experimental study which examined the significant difference of two strategies: collaborative writing strategy and metacognitive writing strategy as well as examined the effectiveness of the strategies compared to the control class which used a conventional writing strategy.

4. Research Findings

In this part, the researcher compare the pre-test scores of the three classes among experimental class I, experimental class II, and control class. From the analysis, it was found that the mean score of the experimental class I is 59.63; the mean score of the experimental class II is 58.47 whereas the mean score of the control class is 57.83. It seen from this data that the mean score of the experimental class I is greater than that of the experimental class II and the control class. It means that Although the mean score of the pre-test of experimental class I is greater than that of the experimental class II and control class, the three classes are classified into *fair* category. It is showed that the highest frequency of the pre-test of the experimental class I (twenty out of thirty-two students = 62.50%), the highest frequency of the pre-test of the experimental class II (twenty-five out of thirty students = 83.33%) and the highest frequency of the pre-test of the control class (twenty-two out of thirty-two students = 68.75%) which are categorized into *fair* category. Thus, the conclusion is that in the pre-test, most students of the three classes are classified into the same level. Meanwhile, the researcher employed *Anova* to examine whether there is any significant difference of the students' writing skills in experimental I, experimental II, and control class before the treatment was applied.

Table-1. Result of Analysis using Anova of Pre-Test in the Experimental I, Experimental II and Control Class

		df	F	Sig
Pre test	Between Groups	2	621	50
	Within Groups	91		
	Total	93		

Table 1 shows that the value of *Sig.* (0.540) is greater than 0.05. Based on the result, it can be inferred that before applying conventional writing method, metacognitive writing method, and collaborative writing method, the three classes had no significant difference on the students' writing skills. Therefore, the three classes were proper to be researched.

In the next part is comparison of the post-test scores of the control class, experimental class I and experimental class. After getting post-test, the mean score of the experimental class I is 73.77; the mean score of the experimental class II is 69.13; whereas the mean score of the control class is 64.25. It means that there was an increase as much as 13.14 in the mean score of the experimental class I; there was an increase as much as 10.67 in the mean score of the experimental class II; and there was an increase as much as 6.42 in the mean score of the control class (64.25). It means that the increase in the mean score of the experimental class I is higher than that of the experimental class II and control class.

Besides, it is known that the three classes are classified into different categories. The highest frequency of the post-test in the experimental class I (seventeen out of thirty-two students = 53.13%) is categorized into the *good* category. The highest frequency of the post-test in the experimental class II (sixteen out of thirty students = 53.33%) is categorized into the *good* category. Nevertheless, the highest frequency of the post-test score of the control class (twenty-one out of thirty-two students = 65.62%) is categorized into the *fair* category. Thus, it can be inferred that most of the students in the experimental class I and experimental class II achieved a greater significant improvement related to writing skills than that of the control class after the applied treatments. The significant difference related to the students' writing skills in the three classes after applying the treatments is presented in Table 2

Table-2. Significant Difference of the Students' Writing Skills

		df	F	Sig.
Post test	Between Groups	2	14.155	.000
	Within Groups	91		
	Total	93		

Table 2 shows that the value of *Sig.* (0.000) is lower than 0.05. Based on the result, it can be inferred that after applying the treatments, there was a significant difference on the students' writing skills.

Before testing the hypotheses, the researcher applied normality and homogeneity tests. The test of normality is s pointed at finding out whether the information appear the ordinary dispersion. To test the normality, the analyst utilized *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov*. Theoretically, in pre-testing analysis, if the value of *p* or *Asymp. Sig.2-tailed* is greater than α (0.05), the data have a normal distribution. However, if it is lower than 0.05 the data are not in a normal distribution. The result of the normality test of students' writing skills is presented in Table 3.

Table-3. Result of Normality Test

Data	P	α
Pre-Test of Experimental Class I	0.572	0.05
Post-Test of Experimental Class I	0.346	0.05
Pre-Test of Experimental Class II	0.902	0.05
Post-Test of Experimental Class II	0.690	0.05
Pre-Test of Control class	0.727	0.05
Post-Test of Control class	0.902	0.05

Table 3 shows that the values of *p* or *Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)* of the pre-test of the experimental class I (0.572), experimental class II (0.902), and control class (0.727) are greater than 0.05. In addition, the values of *p* of the post-test of the experimental class I (0.346), experimental class II (0.690), and control class (0.902) are also greater than 0.05. It implies that the information of the pre-test and post-test of the three classes are in the normal distributions.

Meanwhile, a homogeneity test is utilized to look at whether the test change is homogeneous. In this case, the analyst utilized *Levene* test to look at the homogeneity of the pre-test and post-test of the three classes. In pre-testing investigation, the data are homogeneous if the value of *Sig.* is greater than 0.05. Therefore, the result of the homogeneity test of the pre-test and post-test is presented in Table 4.

Table-4. Result of Homogeneity Test

Data	Group	*Levene*	*Sig.*
Pre-Test	Exp. I	2.224	0.114
	Exp. II		
	Control		
Post-Test	Exp. I	1.485	0.232
	Exp. II		
	Control		

Table 4 shows that the value of *Sig.* of pre-test (0.114) is greater than the level of significance (0.05). Besides, the value of *Sig.* of the post-test (0.232) is also greater than the level of significance (0.05). This means that the sample variance of the data in the three classes is homogenous. Since the data meet the requirements such as normal and homogeneous, the researcher then tested the hypotheses.

The hypothesis testing of the four proposed hypotheses is elaborated as follows. The first hypothesis says that the use of collaborative composing procedure is more effective than the use of metacognitive composing technique. After analyzing the data using *Scheffe* test, the researcher found that the first hypothesis is accepted. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that the students in the experimental class I could perform better in writing after getting the treatment i.e. collaborative writing strategy than the students in the experimental class II who used metacognitive writing strategy as the treatment as performed in Table 5.

Table-5. Hypothesis Testing I

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Exp. Class I	Exp. Class II	4.63229[*]	.043

Table 5 shows that the value of *Sig* (0.043) is lower than 0.05. It implies that there is a significant difference of the two classes. Thus, the use of collaborative writing method in the experimental class I is more effective than the use of metacognitive writing method in the experimental class II which is proved by the mean difference, i.e. 4.63229. It means that the hypothesis testing I of this study is accepted.

The second hypothesis says that the use of collaborative writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method. After analyzing the data using *Scheffe* test, the researcher found that the second hypothesis is accepted. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that the students in the experimental class I could perform better in writing after getting the treatment (i.e. collaborative writing method) than the students in the control class who got conventional writing method as the treatment as performed in Table 6.

Table-6. Hypothesis Testing II

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Exp. Class I	Control Class	9.51563[*]	.000

Table 6 shows that the value of *Sig* (0.000) is lower than 0.05. It implies that there is a significant difference of the two classes. Thus, the use of collaborative writing strategy in the experimental class I is more effective than the use of conventional writing strategy in the control class which is proved by the mean difference, i.e. 9.51563. It means that the hypothesis testing II of this research is accepted.

The third hypothesis says that the use of metacognitive writing method is more effective than the use of conventional writing method. After analyzing the data using *Scheffe* test, the researcher found that the third hypothesis is accepted. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that the students in the experimental class II could perform better in writing after getting the treatment (i.e. metacognitive writing method) than the students in the control class who got conventional writing method as the treatment as performed in Table 7.

Table-7. Hypothesis Testing III

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Exp. Class II	Control Class	4.88333[*]	0.031

Table 7 shows that the value of *Sig* (0.031) is lower than 0.05. It implies that there is a significant difference of the two classes. That the use of metacognitive writing method in the Experimental Class II is more effective than the use of conventional writing method in the control class which is proved by the mean difference, i.e. 4.88333. It means that the hypothesis testing III of this research is accepted.

The fourth hypothesis says that collaborative writing method is the most effective strategy among metacognitive writing method and conventional writing method on the teaching of writing ability. After analyzing the data using *Scheffe* test, the researcher found that the fourth hypothesis is also accepted. Furthermore, it can be interpreted that the students in the experimental class I could perform best in writing after getting the treatment (i.e. collaborative writing method) compared to the students in the control class who got conventional writing method and the students in the experimental class II who used metacognitive writing method as the treatment as performed in Table 8.

Table-8. Hypothesis Testing IV

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
Exp. Class I	Control Class	9.51563[*]	0.000
	Exp. Class II	4.63229[*]	0.043

Table 8 shows that the value of *Sig* of the control class (0.000) and the value of *Sig* of the experimental class II (0.043) are lower than 0.05. It implies that there is a significant difference of the three classes. Thus, collaborative writing method in the experimental class I is the most effective strategy of all which is proved by the mean difference of the experimental class II, i.e. 4.63229 and the mean difference of the control class, i.e. 9.51563. In the other words, the experimental class I has the highest mean of all. Therefore, the hypothesis testing IV of this research is accepted.

5. Discussion

It is crucial to consider the context of the current research. Both of collaborative writing method and metacognitive writing method are believed to be beneficial to facilitate the students in learning writing. Collaborative writing method can be utilized within the educating and learning practices when the instructing tends to grant more chance to the learners to work together. In any case, when the educating tends to be more personal, metacognitive writing method can also be implemented.

In carry out collaborative writing method, teachers not only emphasize on the content but also the relationship of the social development among students. According to Ferris (2003); Widodo (2013), collaborative writing method is a strategy which is based on cooperation or discussions between the instructor and the learners or among the students in the class. This method uses a group-study task structure. In addition, the students can learn new concepts and procedures that invigorate their improvement through their social contacts. Hunzer (2012), adds that collaborative learning is an instructive strategy in educating and learning that includes team of learners working together to unravel a issue, finish a assignment, or make a product. By implementing this strategy, the students have much time to discuss in groups about something they did not understand before they work in front of the class and work individually (Langan, 2010).

On the contrary, metacognitive writing strategy places the students more in the self-evaluation writing (Anderson, 1992; Oxford, 2006). In this method the students tend to be individual because self-planning and self-evaluation are emphasized in this method. The interactions among students are less than in metacognitive writing strategy. This method also gives more chance to the students to work by themselves. Kuhn (2000); Perfect and Schwartz (2004), argue that metacognitive writing method is the procedures which are utilized to supervise direct or self-direct dialect learning. It includes different forms as arranging, prioritizing, setting objectives, and self-management.

Based on data analysis of the study at Grade X of SMA Muhammadiyah 5 Yogyakarta, it was found that there was a significant difference in writing ability among students in experimental class I taught using collaborative writing method, experimental class II taught using metacognitive writing method, and control class taught using conventional writing method. Moreover, the use of collaborative writing method in experimental class I is the most effective strategy among all.

In teaching writing, collaborative writing strategy gives students opportunity to dig up their own ideas and share their ideas in groups before they share their works in front of the class. In implementing strategy, the instructor makes a team that comprises of the learners with distinctive levels of accomplishment so that they are able to work cooperatively. Students in some different levels of writing do writing practices in small group of four. For the reason that collaborative writing strategy teaches students to apply collaborative strategy, the combination of both composing enlightening and agreeable learning methodologies can encourage the learners in their forms of composing. The strategies cover prewriting, drafting, revising and appreciating.

In collaborative writing strategy, students are developing a greater sense of responsibility helping them to get along with others and give an opportunity to know their classmates better. They are also given opportunity to compose, revise and modify what they have composed. Peer or group feedback helps learners sharpen their information approximately expositions structure and linguistic rules. In arrange to assess successfully somebody else's papers, learners must know what to search for and be able to legitimize their comments. It also gives them less pressure to do a good job, could share the work load, and allows saving time because of the shared effort. Collaborative writing strategy also makes the students learn from the other learners and persuade them in education. These processes are helping the students to stay awake in class and strengthening the quality of the content because it helps the students to find mistakes more efficiently. According to Diaz and Brown (2010), collaborative learning is a guidelines strategy in which learners work in group together on a task. By implementing collaborative learning, it progresses the execution of the low accomplishing learners when being gathered with higher accomplishing learners.

In a brief, in reference to the research findings, it is known that the use of collaborative writing strategy in the experimental class I could enhance the student's writing skill more than the use of strategies both of metacognitive writing method in the experimental class II and conventional writing method in control class. It is reasonable since the students in the experimental class I performed best in writing. Therefore, it can be stated that collaborative writing method is the most effective method among all applied in the three classes.

6. Conclusion

The research finding shows that collaborative writing strategy is the most effective strategies of all: metacognitive writing method and conventional writing method. It implies theoretically that the use of collaborative writing strategy is an alternative strategy which is not only used to increase students' ability in writing but also used to show the progress of the students' works or writings. Additionally, collaborative writing strategy provide chances to the students to give comments and do reflections. The teacher and students can provide feedbacks or comments which are very important for the students to improve their writing skills. Practically, the research findings can be used as a consideration for the English teachers to take into account the students' needs in writing and improvements in writing skills. Since the findings conclude that collaborative writing method is the foremost compelling technique, the teacher can apply this alternative strategy to facilitate the students in improving their writing skills.

Further, the researcher realized that this study only focuses on the use of collaborative writing method. Likewise, this strategy gives an accentuation on students' composing on experiences writings. Therefore, the other analysts may conduct study on other class of writings which can encourage them to progress their composing abilities and enrich their information completely different kind of both real and literary writings.

References

Anderson, N. J. (1992). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. *ERIC Digest,* 7(1): 47-52.

Dale, H. (1997). *Co-authoring in the classroom, Creating an environment for effective collaboration.* National Council of Teachers of English: Illinois.

Diaz, V. and Brown, M. (2010). Educause learning initiative. *Educase Journal,* 3: 63-73. Available: http://www.jstor.org/stable/20182660

Dülger, O. (2011). Meta-cognitive strategies in developing EFL writing skills. *Contemporary Online Language Education Journal,* 1(2): 82-100.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing, Implications for second language students.* Lawrence: California.

Graham, S. and Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high school.* Alliance: New York.

Hacker, D. J., Dunlosky, J. and Graesser, A. C. (2014). *Handbook of metacognition in education.* Routledge: New York. 92.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing.* Esrex, Longman.

Hunzer, K. M. (2012). *Collaborative learning and writing.* Jefferson, McFarland & Company, Inc. Publishers.

Kuhn, D. (2000). Metacognitive development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 9(5): 178-81.

Langan, J. (2010). *Exploring writing sentences and paragraph.* Mc Graw Hill: New York.

Mandal, R. R. (2009). Cooperative learning strategies to enhance writing skill. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 1(2): 94-102. Available: www.mjal.org/removedprofiles/2013/Coop.pdf

Mc Cormick, C. B. (2003). *Handbook of psychology, Metacogniton and learning.* John Wiley & Sons: New Jersey.

O' Neil, P., Moore, C. and Huot, B. (2009). *A guide to a college writing assessment.* Routledge: New York.

Oshima, A. and Hogue, A. (2006). *Writing academic english.* 4th edn: Pearson Longman: New York.

Oxford, R. L. (2006). *Language learning strategies.* Heinle & Heinle Publishers: Boston. 18.

Perfect, T. J. and Schwartz, B. L. (2004). *Applied metacognition.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A. and Williams, M. (2005). *Teaching knowledge test course.* Cambridge University Press: New York.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing, Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 14(3): 153-73.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Cambridge Press University: Cambridge.

Widodo, H. P. (2013). Implementing collaborative process based writing in the EFL college classroom. *Research Papers in Language Teaching & Learning,* 4(1): 198-206.

Zohar, A. and Dori, Y. J. (2012). *Metacognition in science education.* Pearson: New York.